

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

3-5-1998

Faculty Senate Chronicle March 5, 1998

Heather M. Loughney
hl@uakron.edu

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

Recommended Citation

Loughney, Heather M.. "Faculty Senate Chronicle March 5, 1998." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 5 Mar 1998. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/437>

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 5, 1998	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 5, 1998	15
A. Teaching Salaries Report for 1997-98	15
B. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	17

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

Teaching
Salaries
Report

MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MARCH 5, 1998

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:03 p.m. on Thursday, March 5, 1998, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-one of the sixty-three members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Batur, Borowiec, Konkel, McGucken, and Woodley were absent with notice. Senators Braun, DePaul, Isayev, Pitchford, Reed, Smolen, and Stevenson were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- **APPROVED A CHANGE IN NAME FOR THE SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS AND FAMILY ECOLOGY TO THE SCHOOL OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES**
- **APPROVED A CHANGE IN DESIGNATION FOR THE FIVE DIVISIONS OF THE COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE TO THAT OF DEPARTMENTS**
- **APPROVED FIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPACE ALLOCATIONS FROM CFPC**
- **REFERRED A UNIVERSITY SMOKING POLICY ISSUE TO THE UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chairman asked for a motion to approve the agenda which was made by Senator Peggy Richards and seconded by Senator H. Michael Cheung. Since there were no additions or changes, the body approved the agenda.

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

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN - The Chairman said that on March 3, 1998, the Chairs of the Faculty Senates of all of the 14 four-year schools had been summoned by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, and he wanted to report what had happened at that interesting meeting.

The meeting was chaired by Chancellor Roderick Chu who said in no uncertain terms that this would be the last time he would issue a summons. He wanted the Chairs to be proactive, and absolutely said that he wanted the Chairs to be representatives of the campus faculty to form a formalized structure within which they can consult with each other and the Board of Regents.

His remarks had expanded over 45 minutes; the meeting itself had lasted about 2-1/2 hrs. It really had fallen into three categories - one was that he wanted to share his philosophy of governance, and where faculty input fit into the overall frame of mind he had, and then how he was going to open up the process through which the Ohio Board of Regents would work. With regard to the first, he outlined his philosophy of governance which was not one of command or control, but what he called a style of engagement and partnership. He believed that command and control did not work in higher education. He also viewed his role as Chancellor basically in a three-fold manifestation. He said his primary role was to be cheerleader for higher education. Secondly, his role was to monitor how state funds would be allocated for higher education. Thirdly, he talked at length about what he called synergy. In this context he mentioned that the faculty of the universities, the administration of the universities and the Ohio Board of Regents needed to develop what he called one consolidated vision of higher education so that the higher education system of the whole state would speak with one voice.

He also indicated that faculty was in his view probably the most important resource which higher education had, and their input on higher education issues in his mind was critical. He said that while he was on the Board of Governors of the SUNY System he had dealt with faculty in the past and enjoyed dealing with what he referred to as "smart people," and in that context he would institutionalize a process through which faculties at various universities would provide input to the Ohio Board of Regents. He said that we should have a state-wide association of Faculty Senates rather than the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Ohio Board of Regents as it was constituted right now. He had not met with the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Ohio Board of Regents; in fact, he said he had refused to meet with them because he did not think it was a representative body. He thought that many members there had been prompted by administration - some of them had been there for 25 years; not each and every member had been elected directly by the faculties of the various universities. So in his mind he would much rather deal with the elected representatives of the faculties from the various universities. It was in that context that he would much rather have an association of Faculty Senates of Ohio.

When asked as to what structure he had in mind, he said it was not his style to make pronouncements and to tell the faculty what structure they should adopt. He would be very supportive of whatever structure we developed as long as it consisted of members either directly or indirectly elected by the faculty of the universities. He went to the extent that if there were any financial resources needed, he indicated he would be willing to do that, so much so that the Chair of this group using the SUNY model, would be on an administrative sabbatical and would have his office in the Ohio Board of Regents in Columbus, and therefore would act as a liaison on a daily basis between the faculties of the various universities and the Ohio Board of Regents.

At this point Chancellor Chu left the meeting, and the chairs of the Faculty Senates of 14 four-year schools looked at each other and wondered what had hit us. We recovered after a cup of coffee and said that obviously we had to do something; we could not just walk away from this. And in true political tradition, we decided that we needed another meeting. The chair of the Faculty Senate at Cleveland State University volunteered to be convener for the meeting scheduled for April 17, where an agenda would be developed for the upcoming year that would be presented to our universities and faculties and to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

We decided that since Chancellor Chu was very insistent that he wanted to deal directly with chairs of the Faculty Senates, that each university would send two members for this committee, one

being an *ex officio* member, the Chair of the Faculty Senate, and the other would be elected directly or indirectly by the faculty of that university. In our context we already had such a member in Senator Baranowski, who was elected as our representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Ohio Board of Regents. So Senator Baranowski and Chairman Malhotra would attend the April 17 meeting and then report back to the Senators at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate what had transpired there.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chairman stated that the Student Amenities Survey Report was in the Faculty Senate office. Any Senator or any other faculty who wished to take a look at it was invited to visit the Faculty Senate office, on the third floor of Carroll Hall overlooking the vast vista of the green of Jackson Field.

V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, I was notified today by the North Central that the institution has been awarded full accreditation in accordance with the preliminary report they sent back to us about four months ago. I anticipated this, but as I explained before, our report goes back to a Reader Panel and then goes on to North Central, so everything has been concluded.

I have several areas I want to address today, and specifically I'm going to discuss the recent campus safety concerns that all of us have, the current health plan study, facilities planning, and the early retirement incentive program.

The campus safety: I want all of you to know that I believe the safety of our students, faculty and staff is one of utmost importance. The University maintains its own police force to help ensure our safety, to enforce the law and to catch those who break the law. All in all, I feel that our police do a good job, and from time to time they will have helped nearly everyone on campus. In the past two weeks two female members of the University community have been assaulted; one off campus on Feb. 21 and one in Olin Hall on Thurs. morning, Feb. 26. These random acts of violence have caused a great deal of fear on our campus, and the police are investigating those crimes. I think our response as a community should be one of support for the victims, increased concern for each other's well-being, and a heightened awareness to respond in that manner. We need to deal with the facts, and I emphasize the facts, because I'm going to talk to you about some rumors that have been going around that do not please me.

Unfortunately, someone wrote an inaccurate memo and I underline inaccurate that was circulated throughout the campus causing a great deal of confusion. The memo stated that the two assaults were related, though police say the suspects in each case are different. The memo also referred to additional assaults that were fictitious, 100% fictitious. The memo named a person as a suspect, but that was false. But this memo and similar rumors resulted in numerous calls from

students, faculty, staff, and parents of students, and I don't blame any of them for calling. They all asked whether the rumors were true, so a statement was released to address these rumors.

I want all of you in the Senate to understand that I personally am very appalled with these random acts of violence against members of our community. We need to respond effectively and efficiently as a community, and to do so we need to deal with the facts. We need to focus on supporting the victims and addressing the crimes. Now it's very easy to get carried away with rumors in a case like this because these are the kinds of things that look real good and are sensational in print and so on, but they've been blown way out of proportion. I would suggest to any of you that I think we have to be cautious, and any of you who want to contact the police to go ahead and do so. I've had three daughters and my wife who went to school here, and I would be very concerned if they were in school right now. So I think it's something we have to keep in context as to what's going on.

The next few items I want to address concern areas of planning. For the past several weeks our Human Resources office and an outside consultant have been conducting focus groups on health care benefits. The last two focus groups I understand were run today. I've instructed the Human Resources division to work with the University Well-Being Committee in analyzing and drawing conclusions from the data that we have gathered. As you well know, this subject is important, it's complex, and very controversial. So we need broad-based involvement to get to the right solution.

Physical facilities planning, primarily in the area of Polsky's: We're working on a process of developing several master plans - the academic master plan and the physical facilities master plan. Right now we're looking into the idea phase of considering a number of options and conducting some analysis. Some of the ideas we're examining involve the Polsky building. Several concerns have been raised about the usefulness and effectiveness of that building; specifically, Polsky's appears to have isolated many students from the main campus. Now let me elaborate a little bit on Polsky's. We have \$38 million in that building, and we're not using two floors of the building. Now if I owned the University, as I've said before to this group and I took home everything that I made in profit, I would look very seriously at this building as to what we should do with it. We're exploring many options with the building, but these are still in preliminary discussions and I intend to involve the Campus Facilities Planning Committee in this process in the near future, because I feel you should have some involvement in this. However, I doubt very much whether any of you had any involvement in it when we bought Polsky's. I don't know - maybe you did. I was here and I did not at that period in time. But I think we have to look at this as an investment in the future for the University. We're already having the architectural plans drawn up for Olin Hall 2, which will be a multi-purpose classroom, on this building. As I look at our total auxiliary efforts on the campus, we have suffered when we made the move to Polsky's because our Student Center has suffered, our food service program has suffered, and our bookstore has been diluted by having two of them. Now we haven't made any decisions, but we're going to take a hard look at this.

I'm not opposed to the University having a presence on Main St., and I think we could do this through administrative facilities and so on. But when the Mayor and Dr. Muse first talked about Polsky's as being the University on Main St., they anticipated that students would go to class, then at noon they would go out and mingle with the patrons from downtown and buy things in the restaurants and so on. That's not our student body. Our student body goes to class, gets back in the car, and

goes home. They don't go down on Main St., and the Mayor understands this. So we're going to take a look at it, but you will be involved as we look at it.

One of the other areas being examined in our long-term planning is the Early Retirement Incentive Program. My thinking right now is that there will be no additional ERIP windows past 2000. The program has simply become too expensive to extend it any further. Now I'm not closing the door completely on 2003. I doubt very much that I'll be here in 2003, but there's a possibility. But where we're at right now, by the year 2000 we have reached the point of diminishing returns economically as far as what this program can do for us. So I would have to say that my recommendation right now would be that there will be no extension beyond the year 2000.

Finally, I would like you to know that I'm continuing the standard practice of reporting teaching salary data for the year to the Senate, and the report will be sent to the campus tomorrow, but I see that Tim (Norfolk) already has it."

Assistant to the President, Richard Gigliotti commented that the reports had been distributed to Senators at this meeting (Appendix A).

President Ruebel then asked for questions from the Senators.

Senator Susan Clark said that the President had addressed the importance of sifting through the rumors to ascertain the facts. Not knowing the facts of the cases, Senator Clark asked if the President could please clarify them.

President Ruebel responded that we had one incident, and he did not know whether it was a rape or attempted rape, off campus. The Akron police had taken care of it, and he had forgotten the exact date of that incident. The second one was that one of our Visiting Instructors had walked down the hall in Olin Hall last week and nodded to one of our students. The Visiting Instructor had gone into the women's restroom and the student had followed her into the restroom, and had pushed open the stall. The Visiting Instructor had screamed, and the student had run. That was the honest-to-God's truth; nothing more had taken place.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson, as a member of Facilities Planning Committee, was both interested and glad that we would be involved in the whole process of planning. Since the President had stated that we were in an idea phase she wondered whether he could tell us what kind of time line he would be working on.

President Ruebel replied that if he could see that we could lease the third and fifth floors of Polsky's tomorrow and it was with the right kind of an organization, we would do it. We had one offer from before, but what he did not want was to have people who would go through our classrooms to get to the court, where 50% of them would have on orange suits. However, he would be interested in something such as an extension of the Cleveland Clinic who might want to rent one of the floors, or perhaps the Veterans Administration. This would be a nice thing. We had to remember - when we had two vacant floors, it was costing us money every day that that space was empty. When we talked about \$38 million and we talked about our total budget, the President got real nervous.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Senator Gary Oller reported that the Committee had met on February 11, discussed various items and set the agenda for today's Senate meeting. The Committee had not yet met with Senator Baranowski on the issue which she had raised at the last meeting concerning GEAC, but hoped to do that in the near future. Finally, the Committee had met on the 21st with President Ruebel and Presidential Asst. Gigliotti to discuss matters of mutual interest.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO FACCOBOR - Senator Shelley Baranowski stated she had just entered the room and did not have much to report, other than that she was out of a job.

Chairman Malhotra responded that she had just been hired back.

Senator Baranowski then reported that the new Chancellor had decided to dissolve FACCOBOR because he preferred to work with the Presidents and Chairs of the campus Faculty Senates on the grounds that they would be more representative of faculty opinion than FACCOBOR was. His argument was that FACCOBOR consisted of people who were elected, but also people who were appointed. She had informed Chairman Malhotra of this decision. Of course, the Chairman was absolutely deliriously happy at the possibility of commuting to Columbus once a month to go to the meetings. However, now she understood that she would still be on the job.

Chairman Malhotra explained that Chancellor Chu mentioned that there would not be regular monthly meetings. He had said that as issues arise we could meet every week if we need to meet every week, and if this proposed Ohio Senate Council or whatever this committee would be called felt that they had to meet and needed Chancellor Chu to come to the meetings he would be glad to come, but there would not be regular meetings. The Committee would now consist of two members - the Chair of the Faculty Senate and another elected representative, so both Chairman Malhotra and Senator Baranowski would go to Columbus on April 17 where the Chair of the Faculty Senate of Cleveland State would act as the convener.

ACADEMIC POLICIES & CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Dennis Kimmell stated that he had two items for consideration, both in the form of recommendations. Item one: **the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee recommends that Faculty Senate approve a change in name for The School of Home Economics and Family Ecology to The School of Family and Consumer Sciences.**

There was no discussion, and the motion carried unanimously.

Senator Kimmell then introduced item two: **a recommendation by the Committee to the Faculty Senate that it approve a change in designation for the five divisions of The Community and Technical College to that of departments. This change would make the designation for those units consistent with the rest of the University.**

Senator Erickson asked for one clarification. She wanted to know if the divisions supported the change.

Senator Kimmell responded that they did.

Since there was no further the discussion, the body unanimously voted its approval.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Assoc. Provost Graham Kelly made available to the Senate a memo listing the proposals that have matured without objection and have been approved by the Provost's office. On the back of the second page was a list of proposals that at the time the memo was written had matured without objection but had not yet been approved by the Provost's office. All of those proposals on the back except CT-98-13 and CT-98-14 have been approved by the Provost's office. Those two proposals were still on hold. Unless there was any objection to all proposals except CT-98-13 and CT-98-14, Assoc. Provost Kelly asked that they be approved by Faculty Senate (Appendix B).

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

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Jerry Drummond said there were several items that would be reviewed individually to allow for comments. Five issues related to space allocations and recommendations that were before the Senate for deliberation.

No. 1 involves reallocation of CBA 135 and 139 to be used as part of the Fisher Sales Laboratory and as a multimedia classroom respectively. These are presently general usage classrooms that will be set aside for specific departmental use, but the present usage is mostly in the CBA. The college will cooperate with scheduling to make the rooms available for outside use as the need arises. The Registrar's Office thought the change would be feasible and it appears to be of substantial benefit to CBA and the Fisher Sales Lab. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend this change to the Senate.

There was no discussion and the recommendation was carried unanimously.

No. 2 is the reallocation of Leigh Hall 201E to Women's Studies. The space appears to be needed and is consistent with the present use of the building as swing space. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend this change to the Senate.

There was no discussion and the Senate voted its unanimous approval.

No. 3, reallocation of Leigh Hall 203 as a general purpose classroom. This was a departmental classroom, departmental meeting room that may now be scheduled as a small classroom or seminar room. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend this change to the Senate.

There was no discussion and the recommendation was carried unanimously.

No. 4, the assignment of Leigh Hall 110, 104, 106, and the Leigh Hall 64 complex (the basement area below LH 110) to the Department of Statistics. This proposed new department would have its offices and laboratories located in this area with some ADA questions still needing to be considered. The space in Ayer Hall vacated by the Statistics faculty will be retained by the College of Arts & Sciences to be allocated by the dean of that college. The rooms vacated by moving the Statistics laboratories (SHS 359, 360, 362) will be given temporarily to the Provost's Office until best usage of the space can be determined. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend this change to the Senate.

There was no discussion and the motion was carried unanimously.

No. 5 we approved earlier, in December, moving the English Language Institute to Carroll Hall. That has been on hold until the present occupants can be moved. Since this move must be preceded by the completion of renovations to the Lincoln Building basement, it is recommended that the ELI be assigned the space in Leigh Hall 101 and 109 instead. The Committee voted unanimously to recommend this change to the Senate.

There was no discussion and the recommendation was carried unanimously.

Senator Drummond stated that this was highly uninteresting without any arguments, without something controversial. It was really boring. We did also receive a letter requesting that we ban all smoking in the Gardner Student Center. Our discussion concluded that since the University Well-Being Committee was the original author of the University smoking policy, and because of the attendant legal issues, the CFPC unanimously recommends that this issue be referred to the University Well-Being Committee and that they consult University Legal Counsel.

Again, there was no discussion and the motion was carried unanimously.

Senator Drummond wanted to comment on a couple other items of information - because of the rumors circulating about planning, construction, destruction, etc., of buildings, the CFPC would be meeting with Dr. Wilson regarding this on April 1. CFPC would be trying to get into this planning process as soon as they could. They would also like, and Senator Drummond did not know whether this required Senate approval or not, but as a committee they wanted to form an *ad hoc* committee to talk about child care facilities on campus. Senator Connie Murray would head this up, and she had people who wanted to serve in this capacity.

Chairman Malhotra commented that the approval of Senate was not necessary. The Committee could form any subcommittee and then fashion a report and bring it to the Senate.

Senator Drummond said they would do that; apparently there was a need for this subcommittee.

Senator Kris Gill wanted to know what the Committee would be exploring in regard to child care facilities.

Senator Drummond asked Senator Murray to address the question.

Senator Murray said the sub-committee would be looking at our current child care facilities on campus and considering how that may be expanded. Many faculty had remarked that they have had a lot of their students bringing their children into the classrooms. They also had reported instances where children had been left unattended outside of classrooms, in the Student Center, and wandering around campus, all safety issues. So Senator Murray had polled different people on campus; for example, the Director of the current Child Development Center and different instructors, to see what might have been involved. Apparently, at the C&T building they had an instance where a child was

climbing on the ledge overlooking the atrium down in the Polsky building. She did not know whether members of the Senate had instances in their classrooms, but a lot of children seemed to be wandering around the campus. The sub-committee would look to see what they might be able to do to remedy that.

Senator Drummond added that Senator Murray did have a list of the people who had volunteered so far, and the Senate was free to look at that. They had also received the incident study, the survey, but they had not looked at it yet.

RESEARCH FACULTY PROJECTS COMMITTEE - Senator Mark Tausig stated that the principal activity of the Research Committee was the solicitation, review, and awarding of research grants to The University of Akron faculty. The research grants awarded by the Committee were intended to act as seed money for faculty projects that would ultimately result in external research funding. The Committee had passed faculty research grants and returned external funds equal to approximately ten times the additional University funding. The Committee reviewed grant proposals three times a year - the fall and spring semesters, and the summer. Fall and spring grants could receive a maximum of \$3,500. Last year the Committee voted to increase the summer awards to \$8,000. As a result, the Committee reviewed 14 faculty fall grant proposals and funded 6; reviewed 49 summer proposals and funded 20; and were in the process of reviewing 25 spring proposals. The Committee had been relatively well-supported by the Provost's Office through Interim Assoc. Provost Mark Auburn, with pledges of approximately \$210,000 this year.

The Provost had also reconvened the University Research Council which includes the Office of Research Services and sponsored programs, the Deans of the Arts & Sciences College, Polymer Chemistry College, Engineering, and two appointed faculty representatives recommended by the Senate Executive Committee. Legal counsel had also been provided. Senator Tausig, as Chair of the Research Committee, was appointed to serve on this Committee which had transmitted a preliminary report to the Provost suggesting some actions that might be taken to increase research activities on campus. In turn, the Provost had transmitted this report to the entire Senate Research Committee for comment, and the Committee would meet to discuss the report on March 6. Members on the Committee should be aware of this. The Committee would make recommendations to the entire Senate at a later date.

The University Research Council had recommended that The University of Akron attempt to become a Carnegie Foundation Research Level 2 institution, which requires a certain number of annual doctoral degree awards, and \$15.5-30 million of annual federal research support. The University currently maintains about \$4.5 million of such support. The Committee would clearly have more to report on this matter later in the year.

Senator Tausig asked whether there were any questions.

Senator Barbara Heinzerling wondered whether anything had been heard from Dr. Auburn concerning a request made by Dr. Virginia Gunn and herself along with Dr. Isabelle Stombaugh about looking at the policy of assigned release time for research. The request had been forwarded to the Graduate Council and there had been no response from Dr. Auburn's office concerning this. Was there a campus-wide policy?

Senator Tausig replied that he did not have an answer for this question.

Senator Heinzerling surmised that it had not been one of the recommendations that went forward.

Senator Tausig responded that the responsibility of the Committee was actually by bylaws just to consider the faculty research grants; this appointment would be a separate matter.

Senator Jesse Marquette noted that there was a workload policy with a research assigned time component that was passed last year, 2 years ago. It would be in there, the University-wide policy.

Senator Heinzerling replied that some of the individual departments had been surveyed and they had not found that policy. Although each department in each college did prepare a policy, where in the University system of documentation could the policy be found, and who had the responsibility for implementation of it?

Chairman Malhotra replied that there was a University-wide guideline for workload policy which was then written into the framework of the University guidelines, but each department developed its own workload policy. He would clarify that and get the information to Senator Heinzerling.

Senator Heinzerling added that the concern that was driving this issue was the very thing we were talking about, which was if we were moving toward a different status in our research, then it would not seem equitable for full-time faculty in various colleges to not have available to them assigned research time if one of the yardsticks even more so than in the past would be research productivity. Quite honestly, an informal survey suggested that there were considerable discrepancies among the colleges and even within the colleges. The original request for clarification had been sent to the Graduate Council and Dr. Auburn's office in November. So that's why the question had been raised at this time, the first of March.

PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Marquette reported that the Committee had heard presentations from three of the vice presidents on their budget requests. The request from the Assoc. Provost for Information Services had created a giant sucking sound in the room, but would be dealt with in time. Action had been taken to endorse the concept advanced by the Research Committee in the sense that we would make the Research 2 status a central goal of the plan that would be recommended. That extensive debate had covered two sessions of the Planning & Budgeting Committee. Dr. Dick Gigliotti and Senator Marquette had been going through the requests that went out to campus on load production degree programs and would be producing a report for the Planning & Budgeting Committee on the responses of the various departments in terms of what might be done to save money in that regard. The results were expected to be available for the next meeting.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - There was none.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Lasher and his colleagues had been directed by the faculty of the College of Education to raise some concerns about faculty input regarding University governance. Senator Lasher stated that at one time we were hearing all about shared governance, but it now seemed to be boiling down to a lack of communication, such as the presidential search. What was going on as far as communication was concerned?

Chairman Malhotra replied that what he had been told or what he had picked up while being an observer at the Board of Trustees meetings, was that in January a request for proposals had gone out for the new firm and the new firms were supposed to have turned in their proposals by Feb. 18. The Board should be now actively looking at those 7 or 8 proposals which had been turned in, and very soon they would find another consulting firm and then the process would be back on track. Beyond that he did not have much information, but in line with the concerns of the faculty of the College of Education which were legitimate, Chairman Malhotra and the Executive Committee in various meetings with either the Secretary to the Board of Trustees or with other administrators have raised the issue that if and when we get to a stage of either screening candidates or interviewing candidates on campus, there should be a much broader involvement of the faculty in that process beyond just talking to the five representatives of the Faculty Senate.

Senator Ralph Turek stated that one of his colleagues had come to him a few days ago - he had been one of the people invited to the focus group meetings on the health insurance - and had complained that it seemed that the group had not asked for any input, and in fact when he had tried to express his concerns, they had not been very receptive. Senator Turek wondered whether anyone else had had this experience, and if they had, then the focus group should be made aware of this.

Senator Chand Midha wanted to know how many present here received the surveys. Five hands were raised.

Senator Oller reported that he could only speak about the focus group he had attended the past Monday, and he thought it was handled quite well. There was ample opportunity for discussion for anyone after they had heard the initial presentation; there was a question asked about why we had answered the questions the way we did. Anyone had an opportunity to say whatever he or she wanted to; in fact, Mr. Likovich had to try rather hard to get some people to talk by throwing some rather severe suggestions just to see what reaction it would bring. So at least in one focus group, opinion was solicited and ample opportunity was given for it, and no one was shot down.

Chairman Malhotra commented that Senator Turek's concerns, if they indeed had happened, were serious. He suggested that the appropriate people in the administration should be notified to see what their take on the incident was.

Senator Clark wanted to segue off of Dr. Lasher's point and what President Ruebel had to say. The College Council of the College of Education had been concerned about the rumors and the uncertainty that they had produced and about not having any vehicle or established means of communication so that the facts could get out and be shared. This was also part and parcel to other matters of uncertainty where actions had been taken and when nothing was heard back, the situation was compiled. So the College was concerned about communication and getting the facts.

President Ruebel asked whether they had college meetings, and if people reported back to the faculty regarding these meeting.

Senator Clark responded "yes" to each question.

President Ruebel then wanted to know what the problem was.

Senator Clark replied that sometimes there had just been questions and concerns. For example, the Polsky rumor had been circulating and had created a lot of undue worry over whether the building was going to be sold, whether the programs would go, and so forth.

President Ruebel stated that at one time we had 30,000 students. We had not torn down any buildings, and we now have 24,000 students. So logic would dictate to him that we probably have enough room for the students. He asked whether that sounded reasonable.

Senator Clark agreed that it was reasonable, but those were not facts that everyone at the College was apprised of.

President Ruebel reminded Senator Clark that she was talking about his college. Rumors - and this really irritated him about the police thing - rumors did not do our institution any good. The things we were talking about were the same rumors we had in the United States Army. But this thing about the police was a serious thing, and we have to do the best we possibly can. This is why we had, as far as the health care is concerned, the small groups so people could report back to their faculty.

Senator Heinzerling did not want to take an opposition stand, but pointed out that rumors sometimes really got started and really spread when we were told for example in December that the presidential search committee was off, and then in *Northern Ohio Live* there was an article in which supposedly there was a statement or conversation between the Chairman of the Board of Trustees and a Senator who was about to be out of a job with the Ohio Senate. One of the concerns was if that circulates and if there was nothing on the search committee, then those rumors were really going to be flying. It was a published article with a direct quote from Roy Ray, and there was no explanation for it given by the Board of Trustees.

Chairman Malhotra stated that he had informed the Executive Committee after he was apprised of that report, and a xerox copy was made available to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees to be transmitted on to the Board of Trustees.

Senator Heinzerling did not doubt that it was sent, but said that was the kind of thing that continues to circulate the rumors. Quite frankly, two people from her department came to Senator Gunn and Senator Heinzerling and expressed great concern about the focus group, but that was prior to the Executive Committee meeting with President Ruebel when it was decided that it should be going to Faculty Well-Being. So the early focus groups in particular might have been run somewhat differently than the later ones.

Senator Malhotra said he actually did not disagree at all especially with the presidential search process, that there needed to be a much broader, much more comprehensive and open communication between the Board of Trustees and the rest of the community. If that did not happen, it would make the process a lot more difficult to bring to its logical culmination.

Senator Richards reminded the body that we do have a committee working supposedly with the Board of Trustees to keep us posted on the presidential search information.

Chairman Malhotra asked Senator Marquette, as the elected leader of that group, whether he would enlighten us.

Senator Marquette replied that no one had deigned to communicate with him any more than they had communicated with the Chairman.

President Ruebel noted that the Secretary of our Board of Trustees was present and suggested that we should cut through all the chafe and ask him about the search.

There was no objection to the Secretary to the Board of Trustees addressing the body.

Mr. Ted Mallo, Secretary to the Board of Trustees, affirmed that the information the Chairman indicated about the request for proposals going out in January was accurate; they had gone out. Lists were used that had been compiled from other state universities. From The Ohio State University for example, all of the search firms that were on their list as well as from other state universities in Ohio had been included. Eight proposals had come back. Those had all been provided to members of the Board of Trustees.

A presidential advisory and screening committee, a committee of the Board that would be doing the screening on those committees, would meet March 30 to interview several of the firms, and it was their intent to have a decision, if one would come out of those interviews, within a very short period of time. As soon as that would occur, the Secretary had been requested to be prepared to set up meetings with all the constituency groups including Dr. Marquette and others, to inform them as to the status of things. The last communication that went to the members of the University formally was from the Chairman of that committee, Mr. Lee Tobler, about mid-January. That was when the secretary of the Board was instructed to put out an RFP, a request for proposals.

Mr. Mallo indicated that all of the firms that did respond were very large, highly-qualified firms in executive searches in higher education.

Senator Markovich asked whether there would be a response to the staff and contract professional request for an advisory committee to that group. It had been sent to Mr. Tobler and Chairman of the Board Alex Arshinkoff back in December.

Mr. Mallo said he would check into that, but his recollection on this was that there might have been a discussion in one of the meetings where they concluded that they were represented through this body.

Chairman Malhotra had a question on the presidential search itself. Given the fact that one firm had decided not to continue and the process had been delayed because we wanted to hire another consulting firm, what was the Board's view in terms of the time line as to how the search would proceed?

Mr. Mallo said the intent was to get it on track as soon as possible.

Chairman Malhotra asked again, whether in terms of completing the process, there had been any discussion on the time line.

Mr. Mallo did not think that the Board could address that until a firm had been hired. The indication from the previous firm was that there would have been a strong focus on this spring and the window for this spring, and of course that was behind us now. He doubted that there would be a major window in the summer, so his guess was, again without hearing from whatever firm would be selected, that the focus would be on the fall.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Chairman Malhotra noted that in April we would consider the budget, hopefully, so there may be some additional meetings which needed to be scheduled. If and when that would happen, we would try to inform Senators as early as possible. And secondly, would the members of the Executive Committee stay behind because the Parliamentarian wanted to take a photograph of the Committee.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn, which was given, seconded, and approved. The meeting ended at 4:03 p.m.

DRAFTAPPENDIX A

February 26, 1998

TO: Full-time Faculty
Akron campusFROM: Marion A. Ruebel
President

SUBJECT: Teaching Salaries for 1997-98

It has been customary for many years for the President to announce to the Faculty Senate the overall statistics on faculty salaries for the current academic year. This is in accordance with the Faculty Personnel Policy as approved by the Board of Trustees and recorded in the Faculty Manual. The maximum, minimum, median and average salaries paid to full-time teaching professors, associate professors, assistant professors and instructors are computed on a nine-month basis; the salaries of those faculty members who are engaged on a twelve-month basis have been reduced proportionately. Dollar amounts listed here are base salaries and do not include any stipend many persons receive for Summer Session instruction or for courses taught as overload, etc. Retirement and other additional University benefits (which cost the University an average of 25.7 percent more for each faculty member at the Akron campus) are included under "Compensation". The following figures are based upon the individual contracts approved for 1977-98. For your easy reference, last year's statistics are also included.

AKRON CAMPUS

	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98
MINIMUM								
Salary	\$40,000	\$41,387	\$34,867	\$37,456	\$30,000	\$28,000	\$28,000	\$28,000
Comp	53,869	54,966	43,372	46,399	37,772	34,698	34,121	39,792
MEDIAN								
Salary	\$59,934	\$62,535	\$46,556	\$47,966	\$38,476	\$39,865	\$35,937	\$37,664
Comp	76,173	76,945	60,895	62,636	47,108	49,165	48,997	48,195
AVERAGE								
Salary	\$62,642	\$65,785	\$49,220	\$51,264	\$40,497	\$42,223	\$35,928	\$37,724
Comp	77,875	81,461	62,412	64,804	51,830	53,963	46,904	49,442
MAXIMUM								
Salary	\$117,780	\$121,548	\$77,941	\$80,958	\$67,671	\$75,000	\$49,636	\$51,622
Comp	139,607	143,804	98,112	101,284	83,218	94,501	64,540	66,843

DRAFT

February 26, 1998

TO: Full-time Faculty
Wayne CollegeFROM: Marion A. Ruebel
President

SUBJECT: Teaching Salaries for 1997-98

It has been customary for many years for the President to announce to the Faculty Senate the overall statistics on faculty salaries for the current academic year. This is in accordance with the Faculty Personnel Policy as approved by the Board of Trustees and recorded in the Faculty Manual. The maximum, minimum, median and average salaries paid to full-time teaching professors, associate professors, assistant professors and instructors are computed on a nine-month basis; the salaries of those faculty members who are engaged on a twelve-month basis have been reduced proportionately. Dollar amounts listed here are base salaries and do not include any stipend many persons receive for Summer Session instruction or for courses taught as overload etc. Retirement and other additional University benefits (which cost the University an average of 27.7 percent more for each faculty member at Wayne College) are included under "Compensation". The following figures are based upon the individual contracts approved for 1997-98. For your easy reference, last year's statistics are also included.

WAYNE COLLEGE

	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Instructor	
	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98	1996-97	1997-98
MINIMUM Salary Comp	\$54,773 65,695	\$57,216 73,014	\$40,699 50,396	\$42,682 56,891	\$36,500 45,278	\$36,050 46,768	\$33,481 41,801	\$33,504 41,879
MEDIAN Salary Comp	\$56,106 71,785	\$58,489 74,723	\$48,407 62,847	\$51,029 64,995	\$38,000 48,775	\$37,634 49,684	\$33,667 45,100	\$35,130 44,633
AVERAGE Salary Comp	\$58,355 73,013	\$60,739 77,329	\$49,376 62,607	\$51,476 65,569	\$37,964 49,384	\$37,848 48,968	\$34,077 44,474	\$35,130 44,633
MAXIMUM Salary Comp	\$64,187 81,559	\$66,513 84,250	\$69,333 87,139	\$71,713 90,193	\$39,218 52,862	\$40,222 54,130	\$35,491 45,895	\$36,756 47,388

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

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 972-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

Date: March 3, 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 March 5, 1998 these proposals will be approved.

AS-98-01	AS-98-29	CT-98-01
AS-98-02	AS-98-32	CT-98-20
AS-98-03	AS-98-33	CT-98-21
AS-98-04	AS-98-34	
AS-98-05	AS-98-35	ED-98-01
AS-98-06	AS-98-36	ED-98-04
AS-98-07	AS-98-51	ED-98-07
AS-98-08	AS-98-52	ED-98-27
AS-98-09	AS-98-53	ED-98-29
AS-98-10	AS-98-54	ED-98-47
AS-98-11	AS-98-57	
AS-98-12	AS-98-59	EN-98-21
AS-98-13	AS-98-60	
AS-98-15	AS-98-61	FAA-98-03
AS-98-16	AS-98-62	
AS-98-20	AS-98-64	NU-98-002
AS-98-21	AS-98-65	NU-98-003
AS-98-22a	AS-98-66	NU-98-004
AS-98-22b	AS-98-67	NU-98-005
AS-98-26	AS-98-68	NU-98-006
AS-98-28	AS-98-69	

March 5, 1998

Page 18

The following proposals have matured without objection but have not yet been approved by the Provost. An update on those proposals which have received Provost approval will be given at the March 5, 1998 Faculty Senate meeting.

AS-98-17	ED-98-22
AS-98-37	ED-98-28
AS-98-47	ED-98-42
	ED-98-49
CT-98-13	ED-98-50
CT-98-14	ED-98-52
CT-98-17	ED-98-53
	ED-98-54
	NU-98-01

aldcum98\fs835

