

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

2-1-1974

Faculty Senate Chronicle February 1, 1974

Heather M. Loughney

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

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

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

AU Chronicle

a report to the faculty of
the university of akron



1973-74, No. 5 (14 pages)

February 1, 1974

UNIVERSITY DATES

- Special Meeting of University Council—Thursday, February 7, 1974, Business Administration 307, 3:00 p. m.
- The President's Open Faculty Forum—Wednesday, February 20, 1974, Kolbe Theatre, 3:30 p. m.
- Regular Meeting of University Council—Thursday, February 21, 1974, Business Administration 307, 3:00 p. m.
- Ground Breaking for new \$3.4 million Social Science—Humanities Building, E. Buchtel Avenue and S. Union Street—Friday, February 22, 1974, 1:15 p. m.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES

Social Science-Humanities Committee for Ground Breaking
Dean Robert A. Oetjen, Dean of Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, chairman; Mr. George Ball, Executive Director of University Relations and Development, secretary; Dr. Paul Wingard, Associate Dean of Buchtel College. The other members of the committee are representatives of the eight departments to be housed in the new structure: Dr. Robert McNeil, Assistant Professor of Classics; Dr. Ali Fatemi, Associate Professor of Economics; Dr. William Stevens, Associate Professor of English; Dr. Robert Jones, Professor of History; Dr. Eugene Maio, Associate Professor of Modern Languages; Dr. Paul Uhlinger, Professor of Philosophy; Mr. Vernon Cook, Assistant Professor of Political Science; and Mr. John Ramey, Associate Professor of Sociology.

Ad Hoc Committee of Council re: Bylaw Amendments

The Procedural Committee, at the request of Council, has appointed the following members of Council to comprise the Ad Hoc Committee on the Reapportionment of University Council Representation: Dr. Roger Keller, Secretary of Council, designated chairman; two faculty members—Mr. Merlin Briner and Dr. F. M. Schultz; two administrators—Deans W. M. Petry and W. A. Rogers; two students—Mr. Leon Ridley and Miss Sue Traub. The Ad Hoc Committee will consider two items on the January 17, 1974 agenda of Council relative to proposed amendments to the Council Bylaws: Article III. Composition of the Council. Section b. and Section d. and make recommendations at the February 21 meeting of Council.

REGENTS' TASK FORCE

A third representative of The University of Akron has been appointed by President D. J. Guzzetta to the Ohio Board of Regents' Task Force on Personnel Management. Dr. Roger Keller, Professor of Biology and Secretary of the University Council, will represent the Faculty and will serve with Mr. Charles Blair and Mr. William Doyle.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Announcements	Page 1
Minutes of Regular University Council Meeting, January 17, 1974	Page 2
Minutes of Special University Council Meeting, January 24, 1974	Page 10
Appendix to University Council Minutes of January 17, 1974:	
Report of Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor	Page 11
Report of Akron Representative on Ohio Faculty Senate	Page 13

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, January 17, 1974

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:05 p. m. on Thursday, January 17, 1974, in Business Administration 307.

Fifty-seven of the 64 members of Council were present. Those who were absent with notice were Dr. T. Brittain, Dr. P. Hayes, Dean J. Hedrick and Dr. D. Jackson. Others absent were Dr. B. Bayless, Dr. J. Coe and Mr. E. Corneille.

The Chairman called for consideration of the minutes of the December 6, 1973 meeting of University Council as printed in the AU Chronicle of January 2, 1974. The Secretary of Council noted an error in the tabulation of the roll call vote on the ombudsman report on page 7, which should have read 35 against by including the name of W. A. Rogers. Dr. Pfeiffer corrected the second paragraph on page 6 by changing "Mr. Blair" to "the committee", and ending the sentence with the present wording, "...permission to speak", by deleting the balance of the original sentence which read, "as he had been an ex officio member of the committee." With the incorporation of these corrections, the Council approved the minutes as printed.

In presenting his "Remarks", President Guzzetta first informed the Council of the monthly meeting of the Inter-University Council which he chaired in Columbus the preceding Monday morning, prior to the state university presidents conferring with Chancellor James Norton in the afternoon. He has been delegated to be the initial overall spokesman for the state university presidents in presenting IUC's position on a number of educational issues before the Governance and Finance Committees of the state's Task Force on Higher Education, on Friday, January 25, 1974. Following his summary of those common interests, each state university representative will have an opportunity for individual input. At this same meeting last Monday the question of a change in the academic calendar was introduced. Dr. Shriver of Miami was armed with supporting data for the early semester plan and there seemed to be considerable encouragement for this arrangement from most of the institutions represented except Ohio State and Cincinnati.

At the meeting with the Chancellor that same afternoon, Dr. Guzzetta continued, Dr. Shriver suggested the possibility of two academic calendars in the state. The Chancellor seemed receptive to these proposals, but not to more than two variations. The President stated that he hoped Dr. Leathers would ascertain the interest of our faculty in the early semester calendar, as the University Council members had indicated their preference in December 1973. Dr. Guzzetta stated that he personally favored the early semester plan to be optional on a regional basis if not statewide. Transferring would be difficult for a spring quarter, he observed, but there would be no problem in fall and winter. However, he continued, no state university could afford to implement a different calendar without regional or statewide agreement.

Dr. Guzzetta announced that he had broadened the representation of the University by recommending the appointment of Dr. Roger Keller, Secretary of the University Council, as a faculty representative on the Personnel Management Task Force of the Ohio Board of Regents. The next meeting of this group is scheduled for January 31, and he requested that any suggestions or comments be forwarded to Dr. Keller. The other members from the University are Mr. Charles Blair and Mr. William Doyle.

The committee investigating the use and costs of the Hower House has made a report which the President will present to the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the University Board of Trustees at its meeting on January 18. Consideration had been given to the preservation of the mansion and the use which could include parts of the first and second floors for the Institute for Civic Education while the front portions of the house could be maintained as a museum. It is estimated that the cost of

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

renovation would approximate \$200,000 to \$250,000. There have been overtures from a number of civic-minded organizations in the community, and if some group, possibly known as Friends of Hower House, could assume the financial responsibility, the project could go forward. The President would endorse this move, but only with funds collected entirely outside the University.

On February 22 ground will be broken for the new Social Science-Humanities Building. He has asked Dean Oetjen and his committee to plan a modest program and then a dedication later which "would have the same treatment we always give."

Dr. Guzzetta said that he was forwarding to the University Board of Trustees the resolution adopted by University Council on December 6, 1973 concerning the amendment of the Council Bylaws, Article II. Power and Duties. He would recommend its approval, but it would first have to be referred to the Board's Educational Policy Committee before coming before the entire Board for review.

Spicer Hall, the President continued, had recently been inspected by a team from the Regents investigating all state university buildings constructed prior to 1961. The building in the present condition was considered marginal for our use, and the architects have completed plans for its renovation. This work is scheduled to begin in late May or June and will require about six months. The functions now carried out in Spicer will have to be temporarily relocated. He asked for cooperation of students and faculty in putting up with some temporary administrative inconveniences.

Dr. Guzzetta told the Council that the Regents have prepared a document on space planning which Dr. MacGregor has summarized for administrators and faculty members to assist them in understanding and programming requirements for renovations and for new buildings, and in preparing the paperwork involved. He hoped that this would give the faculty an initial and continuing opportunity to offer suggestions in planning needed structures.

Regarding energy conservation, the President felt that efforts toward this goal have worked well on campus thanks to the cooperation of the faculty, administration, staff and students. He realized that there have been difficulties in obtaining uniformity in heating, etc. He couldn't definitely answer queries as to the overall success of energy economies because of the changing rates for utilities and gasoline and the addition of new buildings. He did know that University cars have affected savings in operating at reduced speeds. The Regents have acceded to requests to schedule meetings of various groups on the same day so that the car pools could save on mileage. Again he expressed appreciation for what he felt has been real cooperation from everyone.

Proceeding to the reports of the Standing Committees, Dr. Leathers called upon Mrs. Sugarman who stated that the Procedural Committee had met on January 7, 1974 to plan the agenda for today's meeting.

On behalf of the Executive Committee Dr. Poston reminded the Council that at its March 15, 1973 meeting the following statement was reiterated: "In no case may final examinations be given before the official end of classes." The Executive Committee considered it important to call the attention of the faculty to this regulation at the beginning of the quarter rather than near the end. There were reported to be some violations of this rule last quarter. Dr. Poston also announced that a new ruling of the Ohio Board of Regents stipulates that all classes beginning at and after 5 p. m. are considered as evening classes. Formerly 4 p. m. was the change point. This will be effective with Summer Session I for uniform statewide reporting. Dr. Leathers observed that this would not affect our subsidy, but might have to be taken into consideration for future capital planning.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

In the absence of the chairman, Dr. Merrix reported for the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee, stating that they were considering recommending a proposed sick leave policy. The committee continues to meet and will soon have hearings for faculty participation. They hope to have final procedural guidelines reviewed soon, but have been delayed because of the illness of subcommittee members. Guidelines previously passed by University Council, used by the committee in checking departmental, divisional and college guidelines, are to be checked for discrepancies.

Mr. d'Amico said that the Reference Committee had been charged with checking the Faculty Manual and the Bylaws for consistency of wording and thought. The Reference Committee, on evaluating the Faculty Manual changes passed by the Committee of the Whole, had no major changes to recommend. They would welcome any suggestions to add to the minor revisions they had noted. In response to a query, Mr. d'Amico explained that their specific assignment from University Council had been to compare Article B, Sections 1. a., 3. and 4. with the Board's Bylaws, etc., and discover whether or not any inconsistencies were present.

As Akron representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, Dr. Fatemi summarized the discussion at the meeting held with Chancellor Norton in Columbus on January 9, 1974. The full report submitted by Professor Blin Scatterday who attended as alternate, is recorded in the Appendix to these minutes.

Vice President Leathers added that he had attended a meeting in Columbus on January 16 and at that time representatives from Miami University had indicated that they would not push for calendar reform this year. Since most other state universities seem disposed favorably toward the early semester plan, they thought it might be implemented for fall 1975. All the institutions have been asked to forward resolutions from the faculty if they support this change, so that the Chancellor can present the request to the Regents. Dr. Leathers commented that in his opinion Dr. Norton will permit some flexibility in calendar scheduling.

Inasmuch as Dr. Coe, Akron representative on the Ohio Faculty Senate, was not able to be present, his written report previously submitted to the Chairman of Council is recorded in the Appendix to these minutes.

Under "Old Business", the Chairman called for consideration of the proposed amendments to University Council Bylaws, the first being agenda item 6. a., Article III. Composition of the Council. Section b. which read, "Delete the words from the last two lines: 'plus three other administrators whom the President wishes to appoint.' and change the comma (,) following the words 'Dean of Student Services', to a period."

Mr. Kerr moved, and Dr. Fatemi seconded the motion, that Council instruct the Procedural Committee to form an Ad Hoc Committee on the Reapportionment of University Council Representation; that the Ad Hoc Committee be chaired by the Secretary of Council and be composed of two administrators, two faculty and two student members of University Council; and that items 6. a. and 6. d. of today's Council agenda be referred to this Ad Hoc Committee for consideration with the further instruction that the Committee report back to Council on February 21 at which time their recommendations will be acted upon. Item 6. d. reads as follows:

"Article III. Composition of Council. Section d.

Delete the present Section and substitute the following: 'Twenty-eight student representatives comprising twenty-one from the undergraduate enrollment without regard to college or day-evening status. Of the undergraduate representatives, ten will be elected during special mid-winter quarter elections,

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

eleven will be elected during the General Elections held during the spring quarter. Undergraduate seats are to be filled over a period of not less than two and one-half years, nor more than three years from the date of adoption of this amendment and in a manner agreeable to both University Council and Associated Student Government. There shall be four students selected from the Graduate Student Council in a manner agreeable to that Council. Full representation of graduate students shall be achieved on University Council not less than one year nor more than two years from date of adoption of this amendment, and in a manner agreeable to both University Council and Graduate Student Council. There shall be three students selected from the Student Bar Association in a manner agreeable to that Association. Full representation of the Student Bar Association shall be achieved on University Council not less than one year nor more than two years from the date of adoption of this amendment, and in a manner agreeable to both University Council and the Student Bar Association. At the end of three years after the adoption of this amendment, student membership on University Council shall not fall below 30 percent of the total number of seats on University Council, nor exceed 35 percent of the total number of seats on University Council.' "

In response to Dr. MacGregor's question as to the import of Mr. Kerr's amendment, Dr. Poston pointed out that it could change the whole composition of the Council. Dr. Gerlach argued that the Ad Hoc Committee should consider only the three appointments made by the President, and the proposed amendment regarding student members of the Council and not the matter of representation of the several Colleges.

It was pointed out that the first part of Mr. Kerr's tripartite motion was unnecessary, i.e. the words "on the Reapportionment of University Council Representation." Mr. Kerr and Dr. Fatemi accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Dr. Fatemi spoke in favor of the motion, and suggested that, if appointed, the committee should hold an open hearing to solicit opinions from other persons at the University.

Dean Rogers felt that presentation of the recommendations of such an Ad Hoc Committee at the next regular meeting of University Council on February 21 would not provide sufficient time to evaluate the proposals if they were to be voted upon on the same day. Dr. Leathers assured him that if there was new content, as an amendment, voting must then be delayed until the next meeting.

Dr. Poston observed that the two suggested Bylaw changes had far-reaching implications, which might not be apparent at this time.

Dr. Merrix commented that the decision as to voting could be made at the February meeting if the content was new and warranted further deliberation.

The motion to appoint an Ad Hoc Committee, as amended, was put to a vote and carried, 42 to 2. The motion read:

"The Procedural Committee to form an Ad Hoc Committee chaired by the Secretary of Council and composed of two administrators, two faculty and two student members of University Council; and that Items 6. a. and 6. b.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

of today's Council agenda be referred to this Ad Hoc Committee for consideration with further instruction that the Committee will report back to Council on February 21 at which time their recommendations shall be acted upon."

The next item under "Old Business" for consideration was proposed amendment to Article VI. Procedural Committee of Council. Section d. which read: "Insert the words, 'University Budget;' in line ten between the word 'Athletics;' and the words, 'Campus Facilities Planning;'. At the end of Section d, add the following, 'At least two-thirds of the membership of the University Budget Committee shall be elected members of the University Council.' "

Dr. Gerlach considered it important to have this committee a part of University Council so that information relative to curriculum and other pertinent subjects could be properly evaluated by Council in a financial context. The exact duties of the committee could be spelled out later, as had been the case earlier with other Council committees, and need not be a part of the Bylaws.

Dr. Poston pointed out that there is already a University Budget Committee, and if Council approved this amendment, the Council committee should have a different name.

It was Dr. Fatemi's opinion that there should not be two budget committees, as he had stated at the last meeting, as one would have the facts. He suggested that a second committee would be wasteful, and that he would abstain from voting.

Dean Petry said that he would not vote for a committee if it was not clear what its duties were.

Vice President Leathers explained the make-up of the present University Budget Committee: Mr. R. W. Duff, chairman; Dean Major (elected by the Deans), Dr. Noble (elected by Buchtel College), Professor Scatterday (elected by Community and Technical College), Dr. Poston, Dr. Leathers, Mr. Glenn McDonald (undergraduate student); and three ex officio members—President Guzzetta, Mr. Nettling (Controller) and Mr. Wysocki (Director of the Budget).

Miss Tovey inquired what Dr. Gerlach's intention was for the other one-third of the membership of the proposed new Council Budget Committee. He replied that it could include others not on Council, students, etc. Dr. Fatemi noted that "elected members of the University Council" could include only students, but Dr. Gerlach observed that surely the Procedural Committee would not name only student members of the Council to such a committee.

In an effort to reconcile the two views, Dr. Merrix asked how much information is now conveyed from the University Budget Committee. Dr. Anderson thought one issue to be resolved was the relationship between the two committees, executive versus legislative, for information gathering. Dr. Fatemi reminded the Council that the present University Budget Committee has elected members and it would be possible to have these persons make reports to Council. Dr. Merrix was still concerned about dissemination of information from the Committee, but favored the present Budget Committee if the Council would receive pertinent data to help in deliberations. He could see value also in a University Budget Committee for possible consultation. Dean Barker commended the make-up of the present Budget Committee with some elected members and said that he would oppose the creation of a second Committee.

Dr. Zangrando suggested that such a committee would be useful. He thought it would be analogous to the existence of legislative and executive budget committees in our federal system, and he felt there were no conflicts there.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

Dr. Gerlach said that although Dr. Guzzetta had made commendable steps forward with faculty representation, he might not always be here, and that he, or a successor might alter the present system. Observing that it was not wise to "put your trust in princes" he argued for instituting good rules and set procedures. He did not consider a University Council Budget Committee necessarily as a rival group or Council could duly specify its duties.

President Guzzetta rose to reply to Dr. Merrix's assumption that no information seemed to be available from the University Budget Committee. He explained that the first meeting of the 1973-74 University Budget Committee for this year would be the following day (January 18) and that although he did not customarily meet with the group, he would attend its initial conference. Since the Committee had not yet met, there could be nothing to report until later. He stated that there were no predetermined allocations, and he would expect that Dr. Noble and Mr. Scatterday could report and also convey information to the other Colleges (with Dean Major representing Engineering also, three Colleges are already represented on the Committee).

The motion to create a University Budget Committee as a Standing Committee of University Council was put to a vote and lost by a clear majority.

Dr. Noble invited anyone with concerns or suggestions about the budget to approach any members of the committee. Dr. Merrix suggested monthly reports by elected members on the Council agenda. The Chairman ruled this suggestion out of order, adding that this would be a matter for the Procedural Committee to handle.

The next item 6.c. under "Old Business" was consideration of the proposed amendment to University Council Bylaws, Article VII. Executive Committee, which read, "Delete. Renumber existing Articles VIII and IX as VII and VIII respectively in accordance with this change. The Board of Trustees is requested to amend its Regulations in conformity with this amendment. Article II, Section 6 of Division A, would be eliminated and subsequent Sections renumbered, and the phrase, 'of the Executive Committee', struck from Article IX, Section 1a of Division A." On putting this motion to a vote, there were 21 voting yes, and 12 opposed. The motion to pass did not appear to have the necessary majority of Council membership required for approving an amendment to the Bylaws. Dr. Fatemi then moved for a roll call vote. The motion was seconded and carried.

The secretary then called the roll and the vote was 38 for and 13 against the amendment to eliminate the Executive Committee, so the amendment passed. The tabulation follows:

<u>FOR the amendment</u>	<u>FOR the amendment</u>	<u>FOR the amendment</u>	<u>AGAINST the amendment</u>
L. Anderson	D. Jamison	C. Salem	R. Adams
G. Atwood	R. Keller	R. Sandefur	M. Briner
H. Barker	E. Kerr	H. P. Schrank, Jr.	D. Dobrindt
T. Chandler	I. MacGregor	F. Schultz	J. Edminister
M. d'Amico	C. Major	P. Stuyvesant	D. Jenkins
J. W. Dunlap	R. P. Merrix	L. Sugarman	E. Lively
A. Farres	A. Noble	T. Sumner	E. Naes
A. Fatemi	W. Petry	H. Taylor	R. Oetjen
D. Gerlach	H. Pinnick	A. Voorhees	C. Poston
D. J. Guzzetta	A. Pollock	R. Zangrando	D. Rich
R. Hansford	L. Ridley		W. Rogers
M. Harrington	F. Rogacs	<u>Voting "Present"</u>	E. Tovey
A. Hart	B. Rostan	S. Samad	J. Watt
J. Huggins	M. Ruebel		

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

In Council's considering agenda item 6.e., amending Council Bylaws Article IV. Elections. Section b., Dr. Leathers observed that a change should be made in the next to last word from "of" to "to". The proposed agenda item then read: "Add a second sentence, 'No person who sits in University Council by virtue of administrative appointment or of administrative office shall be entitled to vote in the elections of elected members to Council.' "

Dr. Gerlach then explained that the gist of his argument for the amendment was fairness, and that there was a reasonable analogy in comparing the administrative officers who are members of Council with peers in the British House of Lords, and that, according to Frederic A. Ogg, "Peers may not vote in parliamentary elections, on the theory that as members of the upper house they are already endowed with an appropriate amount of political power. Lunatics and idiots are likewise debarred from voting."

Dean Barker was appalled that with all the problems having to be faced, this particular issue was discussed at Council.

The motion to amend Article IV was put to a vote and lost by 27 to 17.

The Chair thereupon entertained Dr. Gerlach's motion to have a roll call vote, which was seconded and carried.

The secretary then called the roll and the vote was 34 against and 16 for the amendment to amend Article IV. The tabulation follows:

FOR the amendment

L. Anderson
A. Farres
A. Fatemi
D. Gerlach
M. Harrington
A. Hart
D. Jamison
E. Kerr
A. Noble
H. Pinnick
A. Pollock
B. Rostan
P. Stuyvesant
H. Taylor
A. Voorhees
R. Zangrando

AGAINST the amendment

R. Adams
G. Atwood
H. Barker
M. Briner
T. Chandler
M. d'Amico
D. Dobrindt
J. W. Dunlap
J. Edminister
D. J. Guzzetta
R. Hansford
J. Huggins
D. Jenkins
E. Lively
I. MacGregor
C. Major
E. Naes

AGAINST the amendment

R. Oetjen
W. Petry
C. Poston
D. Rich
L. Ridley
F. Rogacs
W. Rogers
M. Ruebel
C. Salem
S. Samad
R. Sandefur
H. P. Schrank, Jr.
F. Schultz
L. Sugarman
T. Sumner
E. Tovey
J. Watt

Voting "Present"

R. Keller
R. P. Merrix

Dean Samad stated that this was the third roll call vote in recent meetings, and he considered it after the fact, it being his understanding that roll call votes should be called for prior to any voting on a motion. Dr. Gerlach was inclined to agree. However, in this instance he stated that it had been his

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 1/17/74

intention to request a roll call vote prior to this vote, but that the Chair had not recognized him. He felt that under the circumstance, Council was correct in conducting a roll call vote. The Chair had perhaps misunderstood his earlier attempt to move a roll call vote.

Dr. Leathers informed the Council that Dean Hedrick has been taken to Cleveland Clinic and was at that very hour undergoing emergency cardiovascular surgery.

The next item on the agenda was "New Business". Dr. Fatemi moved that the proposed amendment to University Council Bylaws be considered as follows: Article IV. Elections. Section c. (from Buchtel College), "Add the word 'Instructor' following 'rank of' so that the section would read 'Those eligible for election are full-time teaching members of the faculties of the colleges and librarians with the rank of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor, with or without tenure.' " The motion was seconded.

Dr. Fatemi spoke to the amendment, explaining his belief that instructors are an important and increasingly large segment of the faculty and that they are presently disfranchised by not being permitted to be members of University Council.

Dean Samad cited the lack of provision for including Distinguished Professors.

Dr. Gerlach pointed out that instructors have the franchise in the election of Council members although they may not be elected to become members of Council.

Dr. Poston, observing that the amendment could not be voted upon until the next regular meeting of the Council at which time there would be further opportunity for debate, moved that the meeting be adjourned.

Before concluding the business, Dr. Leathers called the attention of Council to the special meeting, already scheduled, for next Thursday, January 24, 1974 at the same time and place for the sole purpose of continuing consideration of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Revise the Faculty Manual.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Any comments concerning the contents of AU Chronicle may be directed to the Office of the President or to the Executive Director of University Relations and Development.

MINUTES OF SPECIAL MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, January 24, 1974

A special meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, January 24, 1974, in Business Administration 307.

Forty-two of the 64 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dr. B. Bayless, Dr. J. Coe, Dr. R. Ferguson, Dr. D. J. Guzzetta, Dean J. Hedrick, Dr. R. P. Merrix, Dean W. Petry and Mr. R. Pollock. Others absent were Dr. L. Anderson, Mr. M. Briner, Mr. E. Corneille, Miss D. Dobrindt, Mr. A. Farres, Dr. P. Hayes, Mr. D. Jamison, Mr. D. Jenkins, Dean C. Major, Dr. I. Pfeiffer, Mr. F. Rogacs, Dean S. Samad, Dean T. Sumner and Mr. J. Thatcher. Dr. E. Hanten and Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter, members of the Ad Hoc Committee to Revise the Faculty Manual, were present as resource persons.

Dr. Leathers stated that in keeping with the call of the meeting, the only item of business for discussion would be further consideration of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Revise the Faculty Manual.

Dr. Rich moved that the meeting be resolved into a committee of the whole for this purpose. The motion was seconded and carried. Dr. Leathers thereupon called upon the President Pro Tem, Dr. Gerlach, to preside.

Following a long discussion of the changes proposed, Dr. Fatemi moved that the committee rise and report. The motion was seconded and carried. Dr. Leathers then assumed the chair, and asked for a report from the Committee of the Whole.

Dr. Gerlach stated that the Committee of the Whole had examined the Ad Hoc Report on the Revision of the Faculty Manual, beginning with Article B, Section 13—"Retirement", at the top of page 14 of the Report, through Article C, Section 13 [end of Article C], at the bottom of page 20 of the Report. A summary of the approved changes will be added to the list of amendments to date and circulated at once to the members of Council. Dr. Gerlach moved that Council accept the report. The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Leathers informed the Council that when the Procedural Committee met on January 7 another date had been selected for a special meeting if the consideration of the Faculty Manual was not completed on January 24. Accordingly, there would be a special meeting of University Council on Thursday, February 7, for further discussion of the proposed revisions of the Faculty Manual. It was the consensus of Council that one special meeting and one regular meeting of Council in a month should be adequate. The next regular meeting is scheduled for February 21. Agendas will be sent in due course.

On motion the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, January 17, 1974

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents—Professor Blin Scatterday, Alternate

The Committee met on January 9, 1974 and went over proposed changes in the Personnel Manual developed by the State Committee. The changes were discussed by the group before and after the meeting with the Chancellor; some deletions were made. Other manuals are at the printers and will be released soon.

Collective Bargaining

The Chancellor asked about developments on the campuses and was informed that:

1. At Kent 66 percent favor collective bargaining.
2. Toledo is voting this spring—AFT probable agent.
3. Oberlin voting this year.

The Chancellor said the legislation on collective bargaining is now in the House. The Board of Regents needs direction, amenable to suggestions on what they can do. It is the general feeling that enabling legislation will be passed this year or early next year. Dr. Norton says he does not anticipate a rush toward collective bargaining on the college campuses. He feels the passage of a Public Employees Bargaining Act could result in:

1. State contract.
2. Loss of individual institution's autonomy.
3. Altering of governing structure of the University.

Bowling Green Subsidy Problem

In determining Bowling Green's allocation the Board of Regents took into account the limit of 15,000 FTE enrollment ceiling placed on the University. The allocation of funds was decreased (penalty for not following law) by multiplying the FTE over 15,000 by the lowest subsidy and subtracting this from their allocation. The University has appealed this decision on the basis that out-of-state students resulted in the overage of FTE and since no subsidy is received for out-of-state this decision was not fair. An interpretation from the Attorney General is forthcoming.

Medical Schools

The Board of Regents did not originally take a position on new medical schools but Dr. Norton feels they should have taken one. Again this year they were not asked as to what should be done. He feels that the planning funds which were approved was the first step toward commitment on this issue. The Governor has let it be known that he was unhappy from a budget point of view and the Task Force on Health Care is getting the facts

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, January 17, 1974, continued

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents—Professor Blin Scatterday, Alternate, continued

out on the table, i. e., graduate school medical students—only 40 percent practice in the area where they took medical education. The Board of Regents was accused of holding up medical schools but they were only holding up extra facility funds requested by Wright State for probable construction related to the construction of a medical school. Dr. Norton would like his staff to make a presentation to the Board of Regents on the actual costs of not only the two proposed schools but the existing medical schools now in operation in our state. The exact cost must be told to the Legislature so that they will add this to higher education's budget in a realistic fashion. A report will be forthcoming in the early part of February. Personally, Dr. Norton said he would rather see one built and then build a second if needed. The state should be divided into six regions and medical schools in each should have an obligation for some health care service. He was worried about the minimum research costs in the Wright State plans because he felt a medical school must do extensive research to be a viable school. This was supported by the representative of the Toledo Medical School who was present.

Calendars

Dr. Norton stated that he would support Miami's request for a calendar change. He might even support three calendars but not twelve different ones in the state. He felt that transferability is a key issue as there must be some kind of relationship among programs with the state. He would therefore present the specific of Miami to the Board first and then possibly an overall plan.

Announcements

Chancellor's Conference on Instructional Development will be February 21 and 22. A team from each state institution consisting of two faculty members, one academic administrator and one instructional supervisor to attend this meeting.

Next meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee will be February 19, 1974 at 1:30 p. m.

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, January 17, 1974, continued

Report of Akron Representative to the Ohio Faculty Senate—Dr. John W. Coe

The Ohio Faculty Senate met on January 12, 1974 on the Ohio State University campus in Columbus, Ohio.

A number of important issues were dealt with at this meeting. Many of these issues will require action based on information and opinion gathered at the various campuses around the state.

1. Alternatives to the Present FTE Funding Formula.

In a climate of declining enrollment, it is imperative that all parties concerned with the future of public supported higher education begin to focus their attention on the problems inherent in a funding formula linked almost exclusively to student credit hour production. Since the development of a new funding formula which will allow for the maintenance of quality educational programs while enrollments decrease will require a concerted effort between many groups in the State of Ohio, the Ohio Faculty Senate began their involvement by charging a committee to begin to assemble information on funding formulas currently being used in other state university systems.

2. Escalator Clause in Retirement Benefits.

The following resolution was adopted by the Ohio Faculty Senate at the January 12, 1974 meeting:

"The Ohio Faculty Senate urges the officers of the STRS to recommend to the Legislature and the Governor that a statute be enacted that will bind all pensions and all survivors' pensions to the federal consumer price index so that pensions will rise by the same percentage that the cost of living rises beginning from the date of retirement or death."

3. Social Security Coverage for State University Faculties.

The following paragraph is contained in the Ohio Faculty Senate Legislative Affairs Committee report of January 12, 1974:

"A committee needs to be formed to investigate and recommend for legislative action the participation of state university faculties in Social Security."

With the increase in Social Security benefits and the current provisions for Medicare, it may be desirable for state university faculties to have this coverage. A decision would have to be made on a statewide basis. To do this, information concerning costs and benefits will have to be obtained from the local Social Security office or representative and disseminated to faculty members on campus. It will be useful to have a series of campus-wide meetings, at which time questions could be asked of the local Social Security representative. Such action will require that a follow-up survey be distributed to faculty members in an effort to get their views on the issue.

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, January 17, 1974, continued

Report of Akron Representative to the Ohio Faculty Senate—Dr. John W. Coe, continued4. Higher Education Candidate for the STRS.

The Ohio Faculty Senate endorsed a candidate for the STRS. He is Professor Charles Reichheld III from Cuyahoga Community College who is running for the one-year term. In order to get any candidate from higher education elected to the STRS, it will be necessary to vote as a bloc.

5. Collective Bargaining.

It would appear, based on the reports of the delegates to the OFS, that the issue of collective bargaining is a major item of concern on most campuses in the state. The delegates heard statements from Youngstown, Kent State, Cleveland State, The University of Akron, University of Cincinnati, Bowling Green, and Toledo that indicate a different state of readiness on the collective bargaining issue. The various campuses in the state range from one where collective bargaining is already a fact to many where information about the process is desired. On several campuses petition cards have been circulated that show mixed results at this point. The major issues around the state are retrenchment and the rate of inflation.

6. Inter-University Council Resolution.

On November 16, 1973, the Inter-University Council unanimously adopted and presented orally to the Ohio Board of Regents the following resolution:

"The Inter-University Council observes the increasing consultive role of private representatives in the review of undergraduate and professional programs in the public universities. We believe such participation is appropriate only if programs in the private sector are also subject to identical procedures of approval, review, and full accountability as are applicable to the public sector."

The Ohio Faculty Senate vigorously seconded and approved this resolution; the OFS shared the concern of the Inter-University Council that unilateral review procedures are neither appropriate nor equitable to public institutions or to the citizens of the State of Ohio who through their taxes support the public institutions.

The next meeting of the Ohio Faculty Senate will be on February 23 in Columbus.
