

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

5-3-1973

Faculty Senate Chronicle May 3, 1973

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



1972-73, No. 8 (28 pages)

May 3, 1973

COMMENCEMENT AND COMMISSIONING

The 101st annual June Commencement will be held at Blossom Center on Sunday afternoon, June 10, 1973, at 3 p.m. Dr. Ernest L. Boyer, Chancellor of the State University of New York, will address the graduates.

The 20th annual Joint Army and Air Force Commissioning Exercises will take place on Saturday afternoon, June 9, 1973, at 2 p.m. in John S. Knight Auditorium. Major General Daniel James, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, will address and commission the new Second Lieutenants.

The traditional Alumni Banquet will be held the week before, on Saturday evening, June 2, in the Hilltop Dining Room of the Gardner Student Center.

FACULTY RECOGNITION LUNCHEON

The annual Faculty Recognition Luncheon, honoring those who retire this year, will be held in the Student Center on May Day, May 18, 1973, at 12:30 p.m. All faculty are invited to attend this friendly and informal occasion, which this year will honor Dr. Helen Arnett, Mr. Kenneth Cochrane, Dr. Emily Davis, Dr. Paul Huss, Dr. Samuel Newman, and Mr. Darrel Witters. Reservations may be sent to Dr. Charles Poston, chairman of the committee.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Meetings

Adjourned meeting, from April 19 and April 26, will be convened on Thursday, May 3, at 3 p.m. in Business Administration-Law Building, Room 307.

The regular meeting of the University Council will be held on Thursday, May 17, at 3 p.m. in Business Administration-Law Building, Room 307. This will be the organization of the new Council for the 1973-74. Membership will be listed in the June 1973 AU Chronicle.

Committee Assignments

At the request of University Council and with the endorsement of the Procedural Committee, the President has invited the following students and faculty to serve on an Ad Hoc Committee to study the concept of a University Ombudsman as it might relate to The University of Akron: Professor John P. Finan, Miss Kathy Kozar, Mr. Jim Macak, Dr. Allen Noble, Dr. Isobel Pfeiffer, Dr. Howard Taylor, Miss Beverly Tucker, Mr. Tramontte Watts, and Mr. Charles V. Blair (Ex-officio Resource Person). The group will elect its own chairman.

The Procedural Committee in April named Dr. Howard Reinmuth to the Student Affairs Committee in succession to Mr. Donald Jenkins who had resigned.

Note: The Procedural Committee of University Council invites all faculty members to inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs by June 10 of any standing committee they would be interested in serving. The Procedural Committee will be considering these assignments after Commencement. Announcement of memberships will be made in advance of the fall 1973 quarter.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

In answer to another query as to who would take over the Administrative Committee's duties, Dr. Guzzetta said that it had no duties, and had served only as an advisory committee that met regularly and sometimes had made some decisions. It is valuable to have occasional meetings of some associates in an advisory capacity, but they will not keep minutes.

When Mr. Moldea inquired whether the President supported the addition of information tables in the Student Center, Dr. Guzzetta replied that this was not pertinent to his remarks, and that he had already told the students that they were expected to adhere to the current rules and regulations.

Proceeding to the reports of the Standing Committees, the Chairman called upon Dr. Gerlach to speak on behalf of the Procedural Committee. Dr. Gerlach said that the Procedural Committee had met on April 10, 1973 to formulate the agenda for today's meeting. It had also decided that if the business before Council on this agenda was not completed by about 5 p.m. that day, the meeting should be adjourned to the following week, on Thursday, April 26, at 3 p.m. when the agenda could be continued; this process may be repeated, adjourning to May 3, etc., if necessary, until the agenda is completed. (When a meeting of Council is simply adjourned to a certain day, as decided above, then the agenda may be resumed and considered in order at the next meeting, etc., without need for going back to and reconsidering committee reports and other items on the agenda completed in an earlier session.) The Procedural Committee had appointed Dr. Howard Reinmuth to serve on the Student Affairs Committee in succession to Mr. Donald Jenkins, who has resigned. The membership of the Ad Hoc Committee on a University Ombudsman was not yet settled since President Guzzetta had not yet approved of appointments. Dr. Wingard was granted permission to speak in Council at this meeting. Also at the meeting of the Procedural Committee, in reaching a decision in response to a request to report back to Council, the vote had been three to two that Academic Deans may vote in their Colleges in the election of faculty members to University Council. This decision was based on the question of interpreting Council Bylaws, Article IV, Section b "full-time teaching members of the faculties" etc. Since the Vice President had broken the tie to make the vote three to two, Dr. Gerlach offered a minority report in opposition to this ruling. He felt that Article IV, Section b of the Bylaws of University Council referred only to full-time teaching members ("All full-time teaching members of the faculties of the colleges—Instructors, Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors—and all librarians of faculty rank are electors of Council members."). He hesitated to ask Council to adopt his report since it contained both a majority and a minority expression of one position.

Dr. Bee said that Council can act officially only on a majority report.

Dr. Gerlach then moved the acceptance of the report, which was seconded.

Dr. Fatemi moved to divide the report to vote. Dr. Bee said this was out of order.

Council voted to adopt the report of the Procedural Committee.

Dr. Fatemi moved that the minority report pertaining to the electoral function of College Deans relative to faculty membership on Council be adopted. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Jackson thought that the election of faculty members should be by faculty members.

Dean Samad reviewed the formation of the present University Council Bylaws which he and Dean Naes had worked on with Dr. Simonetti, and he said that the Deans were never intended to be excluded in voting for elected members of Council. He noted that for the last six years since the adoption of these Bylaws, all the Colleges have accepted ballots of the Deans in all cases and the matter has

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

never been challenged. Whether the Deans serve on Council in an ex officio capacity or not, they vote and are full-time and many teach, and all hold academic rank. The question is comparable to a national one of denying or extending the franchise.

Dr. Gerlach interjected that he had conferred with Dr. Riede who was also on the original Bylaws committee and it was his recollection that there was not any intention to give the Deans the right to vote to elect faculty members to Council, especially because special status was already granted to Deans as ex officio members of Council.

Dean Petry observed that there was another group of Deans, such as Assistant Deans, who are not on this Council.

It was Dr. Hart's opinion that it is a mistake for Deans to hold rank, and that "full-time" does not apply to University assignment, but to teaching.

Dr. Fatemi thought that perhaps the Deans should run for election. He said in some small faculties the Dean could break a tie at his discretion. It was the original Committee's intent to have a smaller Council, but Council itself had sanctioned additions. Provisions could be made later to outline a process for Deans to be represented on Council. The Faculty should have the benefit of checks and balances.

Mr. Switzer felt that if a Dean is a full-time member of the faculty and teaches, he should vote.

Dr. Lestingi stated that in the Presidential Search Committee there are three faculty members who are elected by elected members of Council, and this would tend to differentiate between Deans and faculty.

Dr. Gerlach pointed to the clarity of the Council Bylaws on "all full-time teaching faculty"; "full-time" modifies "teaching" and all three words modify "members of the faculties" so that although Deans may be full-time faculty members, they are not deemed to be full-time teaching members, etc. He argued that this distinction was especially notable in the special provision made for "librarians of faculty rank" as electors, for they are not "full-time teaching" faculty any more than the Deans are.

Dean Major asked whether department heads will then be considered full-time teaching faculty.

Dr. Gerlach replied that the discussion here pertained only to Deans.

Mr. Briner then asked the question: If a faculty member does not teach six hours, should he vote?

Dean Samad noted that librarians do not teach, that occasionally the President teaches; the criteria were not being evaluated clearly.

Dr. Fatemi said the issue was teaching versus administration, but that the AAUP extends the courtesy of faculty status to librarians so they are not denied due process and academic freedom.

It was recalled that Deans Dunlap and Major had to give up elected membership on University Council when they were honored by appointment as Deans.

Dr. Fatemi requested a roll call vote. It was determined that the requisite number of Council concurred.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

The motion to adopt the minority report of the Procedural Committee which would have denied Deans the right to vote in electing members of their College to serve on University Council was defeated 29 to 26 as the following tally indicates:

Those voting FOR the minority report

J. D. Bee
J. W. Coe
T. Davis
D. R. Durst
L. Farris
A. Fatemi
D. R. Gerlach
Alan Hart
P. Hayes
W. H. Heintz
J. D. Huggins
J. Hunt
D. L. Jackson
R. F. Keller
E. Kerr
J. Lestingi
H. Lijeron
D. Moldea
J. Mowery
R. Myers
J. Richardson
J. D. Switzer
D. Van Fleet
A. Voorhees
F. Williams
C. W. Wilson, III

Those voting AGAINST the minority report

G. A. Atwood
H. K. Barker
M. G. Briner
W. Crabtree
J. W. Dunlap
P. Godfrey
D. J. Guzzetta
R. L. Hansford
J. G. Hedrick
D. Jenkins
N. Leathers
E. L. Lively
I. MacGregor
C. J. Major
E. Naes
R. Oetjen
W. Petry
D. I. Rich
R. S. Roberts
L. Roemer
Frank Rogacs
W. A. Rogers
M. A. Ruebel
S. A. Samad
R. Sandefur
H. P. Schrank
T. Sumner
E. Tovey
M. Wales

The President left the meeting at this point for another appointment.

Since Dr. Poston was out of town, there was no report for the Executive Committee.

On behalf of the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee, and in Dr. Poston's absence, Dean Rogers presented the report which had been circulated to Council on April 13. He distributed a corrected page 4 to be substituted in the report.

Dr. Rogers moved the adoption of the first statement on the document of April 13, which was the paragraph at the top of page 1. It read as follows:

"WHEREAS budgetary constraints, limitation of facilities and leveling off of enrollments dictate a more cautious approach to expansion of our curriculum, a moratorium on the consideration of curricular changes during the 1973-74 academic year shall be enforced, except for proposals which the Academic Vice President believes warrants consideration."

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

With the suggested change of "warrants" to "warrant", Dr. Gerlach moved to amend the statement by deleting the period, and adding "and which the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee must agree to entertain." The motion was seconded.

Dean Lively mentioned several concerns he had regarding the statement, such as whether the Graduate Council should also have to give consent, etc.

Dr. Gerlach's interpretation was that the Academic Policies Committee would only need to listen to the general rationale.

Dr. Fatemi inquired whether in this instance the Academic Vice President could be superseded by the Committee. Dr. Leathers said that if he approved the recommendation, he could send it to the Academic Policies Committee, but that he would be the higher authority.

Dr. Gerlach's amendment was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Richardson wondered whether this procedure would also apply to deletions and substitutions. Dr. Leathers said that there had been almost unanimous opinion on this in the discussion of the statement. It was the intent to have innovation and change slowed down.

Dr. Lestingi deplored any restrictions on the teaching faculty and as a minority opinion moved to substitute the following statement which had been passed earlier that day by the Engineering faculty:

"WHEREAS the University is under budgetary constraints, finds its facilities somewhat limited, and is experiencing a stabilized enrollment,

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, That a more cautious approach to curricula development and change be the policy of this University during the 1973-74 academic year. Specifically,

1. Only curricular proposals which do not result in an increase in the credit hour offerings of any department shall be processed in the present manner.
2. Curricular proposals which increase the credit hour offerings of any department must be approved by the Academic Vice President before being considered by any University curricular committee."

The motion was seconded by Dr. Wilson.

Dr. Gerlach thought that no change was so urgent and preferred the stronger language of the original proposal. In fact he said that if he didn't get to teach the History of Timbuctu next year, the world would go on and doubtless be the better for it!

Dr. Hart pointed out that Dr. Lestingi's proposal discussed credit hour increases, but many changes have no increase in credit hours.

Dr. Wilson supported Dr. Lestingi's proposal since he felt that the original one implied that the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee was incapable of coping with the job (though it might be true). He thought the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee should learn to say "no", but shouldn't simply stop functioning on curricular matters. Some departments cooperated last year by not submitting any curricular changes as they had been requested, and now they would be penalized because they had cooperated.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

On behalf of the students, Mr. Moldea advocated a moratorium on new courses to permit time for an evaluation of the whole curriculum.

Dr. Van Fleet endorsed Dr. Lestingi's substitute amendment and the setting up of appropriate guidelines for the Academic Policies Committee.

Mr. Switzer said that Council deserved censure if the Academic Policies Committee doesn't do its job, and then averred that he sounded like Dr. Gerlach!

Mr. Kerr expressed dismay if change was to be discouraged. He felt that curriculum changes come ridiculously slowly and he would lose hope if there were no possibility of change. He advocated getting a committee that could handle the work load faster.

All this criticism of the Academic Policies Committee shocked Dr. Bee who explained that the proposal does not put a lid on change, but made it mandatory for proposers of change to substantiate it and to set the tone. He reminded the Council that the last four or five years they had favored change, and he asked if this policy is altered, does it mean that previous change was wrong.

Dr. Myers objected giving power to an administrative officer that might touch on academic freedom, and advocated faculty autonomy.

Dr. Rogers was opposed to Dr. Lestingi's motion. He said a similar motion was initiated last May and discussed but it never was submitted to Council last fall.

Dr. Coe asked what the Academic Vice President's policy would be when some programs' enrollments are still increasing. Dr. Leathers said that these considerations had been noted in the Committee and that was why provision for exceptions was included.

Referring to Dr. Myers' views, Dr. Gerlach argued the need for checks and balances between departments and faculty and administration; he didn't want to see autonomy carried too far.

Mr. Williams thought that if anyone should be chided, it should be Council as not getting anywhere. He opposed Dr. Lestingi's motion.

Dr. Lestingi's motion was put to a vote and lost.

The original motion, as amended was put to a vote and carried. It now reads:

"WHEREAS budgetary constraints, limitation of facilities and leveling off of enrollments dictate a more cautious approach to expansion of our curriculum, a moratorium on the consideration of curricular changes during the 1973-74 academic year shall be enforced, except for proposals which the Academic Vice President believes warrant consideration and which the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee must agree to entertain."

Dean Rogers moved that the statement on Joint Appointments, on the April 13, 1973 document circulated by the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee be approved. The motion was seconded.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

Dean Oetjen moved to amend the sentence in the Item 3 on page two beginning with "Courses available for negotiation" by deleting "principal" and adding at the end, "of instruction in which the courses are listed." The motion was seconded. He added that the rationale was to avoid ambiguity, as things pertinent should be handled by the department of concern. The motion was put to a vote and carried. The Item 3 (through the change) reads:

"3. The apportioning of teaching and other responsibilities of a joint appointee will be reached through conferences in which the faculty member and heads of departments involved participate. Courses available for negotiation should be defined by the department of instruction in which the courses are listed. To assure....."

Dr. Van Fleet asked whether Item 2, Section a. meant that a faculty member holding dual appointments could vote in both departments. Dr. Hart felt that each department should determine its own policy. Dr. Richardson felt it important that the faculty member participate fully in each department.

The amended motion to adopt the statement on Joint Appointments (pp. 2 and 3) was put to a vote and carried. It now reads:

JOINT APPOINTMENTS

A primary academic objective of The University of Akron is the search for and development of new knowledge which will enhance institutional programs and contribute to the University's research responsibilities. Recognizing the contribution of interdisciplinary studies in meeting this objective, the University seeks to encourage such efforts by creating joint appointments for faculty where appropriate.

The joint appointment provides for greater program flexibility, the enhancement of intellectual stimulation, and broader insights into matters under faculty investigation and research.

A joint appointment is defined as applying to faculty whose research and teaching competencies are better served through activities involving two or more academic units of the University, each of which offers academic programs leading to undergraduate or graduate degrees.

In order to recognize the status of faculty holding such appointments, the following academic policies apply:

1. The faculty of each department to which the joint appointee is to be related must concur with the proposal that he be affiliated with that department. (The procedure used in making this decision is to be established by each department concerned.) One of the departments will be identified as the department of his principal appointment, even though the faculty member could well have approximately equal responsibilities in two or more academic units. The appointment to academic units other than the department of principal appointment will be for not more than three academic years. It may be renewed by means of the procedure used in making the original joint appointment. The joint appointment will be terminated automatically if the appointment in the department of principal appointment is terminated.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

2. The degree of participation in departmental affairs will be determined by the faculty of each academic unit. These arrangements should fall under one or more of the following categories and should be specified in the written statement described in Section 3 below:

- a. Full participation in affairs of both departments (voting rights should be spelled out)
- b. Participation in curricular matters (by teaching load responsibilities)
- c. Participation in research efforts and projects
- d. Participation in teaching regular or special courses

3. The apportioning of teaching and other responsibilities of a joint appointee will be reached through conferences in which the faculty member and heads of departments involved participate. Courses available for negotiation should be defined by the department of instruction in which the courses are listed. To assure that there is complete understanding, a written statement will be prepared following each such conference, copies of which will be retained by the faculty member, the department heads, the deans, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. The distribution of teaching and other responsibilities may be changed through subsequent conferences, with amended written statements to follow. (It is hoped that limits can be stated broadly enough to avoid the necessity for frequent change.) On occasion, it may be appropriate for the dean or deans to participate with the faculty member and the department heads in these conferences.

4. At the time of appointment, a faculty member's academic rank will be determined in the department of principal appointment and his/her rank will be the same in the non-principal department. Board of Trustees notification will reflect this and will also indicate the department(s) in which a non-principal appointment is applicable.

5. Recommendation for the granting of tenure will originate in the department of principal appointment. If the second department does not concur, the joint appointment may be terminated. Termination of the joint appointment after tenure has been granted will not affect the faculty member's tenure status in the principal department.

6. Recommendation for promotion to a higher rank will originate in the department of principal appointment. Other departments with which the joint appointee is affiliated will prepare statements supporting (or opposing) the recommendation and will supply copies to the faculty member, the head of the department of principal appointment and the academic dean or deans. The dean of the college in which the department of principal appointment is located will forward all documentation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs with his recommendation supporting (or opposing) the original recommendation. If the department of non-principal appointment does not agree with the final decision, the joint appointment may be terminated.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

7. Joint appointments between academic unites of a given college shall be reviewed by the dean. Joint appointments crossing college lines shall be reviewed by the appropriate deans and the Vice President for Academic Affairs to ascertain that the arrangements meet intended objectives.

8. In all instances concerning college and/or University affairs, the faculty person shall be considered as a member of one department—the department of principal appointment—unless specifically chosen to represent the non-principal department.

ADDENDUM

This policy for joint appointments shall obtain in all new appointments effective on or after July 1, 1973. For faculty members currently holding joint appointments, the concerned parties shall review any and all previous commitments and construct written agreements through appropriate procedures, which are mutually agreeable.

Dean Rogers said that there were a number of changes, as enumerated on the circulated Corrected Page 4, despite the fact that the 1973-74 General Catalog had just been printed. He moved that the first statement on Corrected Page 4 be approved. It was seconded and carried. This revised statement on transfer student policy under "Entrance Requirements" in the General Bulletin now reads:

"Applicants for admission who have formerly attended other institutions of higher education are eligible to transfer to the University if they present satisfactory scholastic records as judged by The University of Akron officials and if they are eligible to re-enter the institution from which they desire to transfer. Applicants who present fewer than 45 quarter credits or their equivalent of accredited transfer work will be required to submit results of the ACT, SAT or an equivalent test as well as a high school transcript. Applicants 25 years of age or older may be excused from one or more of these requirements."

Dr. Rogers then moved that the revised statement as Item 4, on transfer student policy under "Admission Procedure" in the General Bulletin be adopted. The motion was seconded and carried. It reads:

"4. If you are a transfer applicant, request registrars of all institutions of higher education previously attended to send complete and official transcripts to the Admissions Office. If you have completed less than 45 credits of course work at these other institutions, you must also submit a copy of your high school transcript, and the results of the ACT, SAT or an equivalent test. These documents must be received and evaluated before final admission action can be taken by the University."

Dean Rogers moved that the statement entitled "Transfer from Non-Baccalaureate Programs" be deleted from the General Bulletin since it is redundant (already under "Admission Procedure"). The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Rogers moved that the statement on "Transfer Credit", pp. 4-5 of the Academic Policies document, be accepted. The motion was seconded. It reads:

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

"Course work taken at an institution of higher education which:

- (1) is fully accredited by an appropriate regional accrediting association, or
- (2) has an "A" listing in the Report of Credit Given, the American Association Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO), or
- (3) is not fully accredited by an appropriate regional accrediting association but which is listed "B", "C" or "I" in the AACRAO Report of Credit Given

will be listed on The University of Akron official academic record. Each course will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no quality point value will appear on the record and no grade point average will be calculated for the course work listed. In addition, the name of the institution will be listed on The University of Akron official academic record as well as the time period during which the courses were taken.

"For courses which have been taken at an institution of higher education of the types listed above, the Dean of the College in which the student intends to obtain the degree will specify which courses listed will apply toward the degree requirements at The University of Akron. This specification will be made at the time the student enters the degree granting college. The Dean of the General College will specify which courses listed will apply toward the General Studies requirements when the student enters the University. For courses which have been taken at an institution of higher education of type (3), the specification will be made by the student's Dean on a provisional basis and must be validated by successful completion of credit work at The University of Akron.

"The validation will normally consist of completing 24 credits of designated course work at The University of Akron with a grade point average of 2.000 or better."

Dr. Van Fleet questioned the necessity of having sections (1), (2) and (3) spelled out, as they appear redundant.

Dr. Sumner explained that these are important designations of categories used nationally in evaluating transfers from various areas in the country and work from more obscure institutions (as a help, for instance, in appraising credits from a denominational school where we might accept their English and chemistry but not their "dogmatic theology"). Dr. Van Fleet could see the rationale, but recommended clarification. Dean Dunlap suggested utilizing other wording from the end of the section, to this purpose.

Mr. Switzer moved that the Reference Committee consider the wording in the statement on "Transfer Credit".

The motion to adopt the statement on "Transfer Credit" was put to a vote and carried.

The motion to send the statement on "Transfer Credit" to the Reference Committee was put to a vote and carried.

Because of a time element in presenting a resolution to Council, Dean Rogers deferred to Dr. Fatemi, who presented the following resolution:

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

"WHEREAS the Personnel Management Manual and other proposed manuals have only recently been circulated on this campus, recognizing the complexities of these documents, the far reaching implications of many of their provisions, the scope of activities that will be affected at each institution of higher education within the state and the extensive work and research carried on in this regard by the staff of the Board of Regents, we hereby request that the Board of Regents ask the Ohio Legislature to extend the date of completion of these documents to June 30, 1974. We believe that this extension will provide adequate time for full faculty consultation and contributions to the final documents."

It is the hope of the appropriate Task Forces on each state university campus to vote favorably so that the Regents can get a year's extension to permit more consultation and digestion of this report. The Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee has endorsed the resolution. Dr. Leathers informed the Council further that he and the faculty members would work with Dr. Guzzetta in considering all the Task Force documents.

Dr. Fatemi moved the adoption of the resolution. It was seconded and unanimously carried (with no abstentions). It was further moved that the Chairman of Council forward this Resolution to Mr. Coulter, Acting Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, as soon as possible. The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Rogers moved that the statement on the "Transient Student" (bottom of page 5 and top of page 6) be approved. The motion was seconded and carried and reads:

"Revised statement on description of a transient student which appears in the General Bulletin under "Types of Students":

"From The University of Akron - A student enrolled at The University of Akron who pursues credit course work at other institutions of higher education."

"Statement on Transient Student to be included in the General Bulletin under "Procedures and Requirements":

TRANSIENT STUDENT

"A University of Akron student may take course work at another institution of higher education as a transient student. For all courses other than General Studies, the student must obtain prior written permission from the Dean of the College in which he is enrolled; for General Studies courses, prior written permission must be obtained from the Dean of the General College. Courses taken by a transient student will be listed on The University of Akron official academic record. Each course will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no quality point value will appear on the record and no grade point average will be calculated for the course work listed. The name of the institution will be listed on The University of Akron official academic record as well as the date that the course work was taken."

Dr. Rogers moved that the statement on "Repeating Courses" (page 6) be adopted. (This corresponds to the new General Bulletin, page 26). Seconded. It reads:

"Any course may be repeated as many times as necessary by an undergraduate student subject to the following conditions:

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

- (1) In order to secure a quality point value grade (A, B, C, D, F) or a grade of NC, CR or AUDIT, the student may repeat a course in which he previously received the grade of D, F, AUDIT or NC. Registrations under the CR/NC option are subject to the restrictions in the CR/NC policy.
- (2) The student must repeat the same course within 12 months of the completion of the prior attempt unless given special permission by the student's Dean to extend this period or substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered. Such course must be repeated at The University of Akron.
- (3) Grades for all attempts at a course will appear on the student's official academic record.
- (4) Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the grade point average.
- (5) All grades for attempts at a course will be used in grade point calculation for the purpose of determining graduation with honors and the student's class standing."

Dr. Fatemi moved to amend Item 1 by inserting "C" to read in the middle of the paragraph: "in which he previously received the grade of C, D, F, AUDIT or NC." Miss Tovey wished that "B" could also be inserted. The motion to add "C" was seconded.

Mr. Moldea advocated passage of the amendment to help students who have "bad" quarters and need another chance. He commended the Academic Policies Committee for liberalizing this provision.

Dean Lively, who said that he seemed to be "making a career out of speaking against this motion", considered it irresponsible and noted it had previously been defeated. He said a student's purpose should be to get an education and a degree, and they can get this with a "C" average. To repeat these courses is a waste of everyone's time, and there is no reason for repeating just to get a "4 point" but to get off "Ds" and "Fs" in order to graduate. There was no justification to repeat "Cs" and "Bs".

Dr. Keller pointed out that all grades are recorded and there is no other way to transfer out with a "D". He favored the amendment.

Mr. Kerr added another angle of support as it applied to students on scholarships who need this extra chance to continue with financial aid. Dr. Bee thought some might be irresponsible in repeating courses, but it helps students get a better education.

Dr. Gerlach maintained that this is erosion of academic standards and penalizes excellence and is unfair to good students. This does not encourage and reward excellence.

Several declared that this provision will circumvent those professors who grade unfairly and therefore unjustly penalize a student's future professional status. Discussion ensued about those faculty who give vicious grades, and whether a "C" is vicious, etc.

Mr. Jenkins commented on the financial implications of repeating courses, as well as the lowering of standards which he deplored.

Dr. Lestingi stated that in the Academic Policies Committee, it was felt that grades should show the level of attainment and be allowed to be repeated.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 4/19/73

The motion to amend by inserting "C" was put to a vote and failed, 25 to 18.

Dr. Oetjen moved to delete Item 4 which reads, "Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the grade point average." The motion was seconded.

Dr. Sumner considered Item 4 to be the heart of the statement, and the policy would be an exercise in futility, if deleted. Mr. Moldea argued against deletion; Drs. Durst and Gerlach argued in favor of deletion. Mr. Kerr put some of the blame for students' failure on instructors.

Mr. Williams, observing the departure of several members of Council due to the lateness of the hour, moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach moved to adjourn to April 26, 1973, at 3 p.m. in BL-307. The motion was seconded and carried, at 5:20 p.m.

APPENDIX TO MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, April 19, 1973School of Law

Pursuant to prior University Council authorization (Minutes, February 19, 1970, page 12, Faculty Bulletin, March 5, 1970 Issue), I certify that the following course changes have been duly adopted by a two-thirds vote (or better) of the faculty of the School of Law on April 12, 1973, and are submitted for filing with the University Council Minutes. The course changes are effective the fall quarter 1973.

Add: 920:604 Moot Court. 2 credits. Prerequisite, none. Credit is awarded to participants in the National Moot Court Competition, the Philip C. Jessup International Law Moot Court Competition, or other approved moot court project, who satisfy the requirement of either a brief or written argument. Finalists in the foregoing competitions shall be required to represent the School of Law in regional and national competitions, if any. Credit earned in this course shall count toward the maximum allowable credit of ten hours established for course 920:655. Not more than two credits may be awarded for course 920:604, and the course shall not be open to first year students. A "Credit" or "No Credit" grade shall be entered.

Change: 920:650 Seminar in Product Liability. Change from 3 to 4 credits.

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.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

General Fund
Preliminary Budget - Fiscal 1973-74

	Actual July 1, 1971 June 30, 1972	Approved Budget 1972-73	Preliminary Budget 1973-74
<u>BEGINNING BALANCE - JULY 1</u>	\$ 101,101	\$ 297,133	\$ 368,234
<u>INCOME</u>			
Student Fees	\$12,337,225	\$13,760,000	\$13,162,170
Subvention - State of Ohio	14,533,200	15,000,000	16,257,904
Special Approp. - State of Ohio	-0-	480,000	-0-
Additional Tuition/Subvention	-	-	730,692
Endowments & Gifts	48,132	40,000	44,000
Transfer-In	400,677	1,379,663	1,445,000
Other	367,658	295,000	370,000
Total Available Income	<u>\$27,787,993</u>	<u>\$31,251,796</u>	<u>\$32,378,000</u>
<u>EXPENSE</u>			
Instructional & General:			
Instructional	\$14,374,896	\$16,788,527	\$16,986,149
Instructional Services	981,962	1,278,660	1,490,345
Library	1,160,859	1,373,329	1,529,208
Plant Operation	2,571,667	3,119,122	3,331,076
Student Services	1,311,185	1,548,614	1,629,186
General Expense	1,632,630	1,668,191	1,603,742
General Administration	1,467,158	1,617,793	1,705,426
Total Instructional and General	<u>\$23,500,357</u>	<u>\$27,394,236</u>	<u>\$28,275,132</u>
Research	\$ 244,159	\$ 241,125	\$ 228,874
Public Services	\$ 326,118	\$ 345,383	\$ 410,994
Student Aid	\$ 554,389	\$ 167,818	\$ 70,000
Transfers to Other Funds	\$ 2,365,837	\$ 2,235,000	\$ 2,520,000
Contingency	<u>\$ 500,000</u>	<u>\$ 500,000</u>	<u>\$ 500,000</u>
Total Expenditures	<u>\$27,490,860</u>	<u>\$30,883,562</u>	<u>\$32,005,000</u>
<u>Excess of Income over Expenditures and Ending Balance June 30</u>	<u>\$ 297,133</u>	<u>\$ 368,234</u>	<u>\$ 373,000</u>

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, April 26, 1973

The adjourned regular meeting of the University Council (from April 19, 1973) was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:06 p.m. on Thursday, April 26, 1973, in Business Administration-Law Building 307.

Forty-nine of the 64 members of Council were present. Those who were absent with notice were Dr. L. Anderson, Dr. W. Crabtree, Mr. R. W. Duff, Dr. Ali Fatemi, Dr. D. J. Guzzetta, Dean R. L. Hansford, Dr. R. P. Merrixx, Mr. M. A. Wales and Mr. F. Williams. Others absent were Mr. G. Gilson, Dr. P. Hayes, Mr. Jeff Hunt, Mr. Earl Kerr, Mr. F. Rogacs and Mr. L. Vuillemin.

Dr. Leathers announced that this meeting was to continue, as stipulated at the conclusion of the April 19 session, with the unfinished agenda. The report of the Academic Policies Committee was still on the floor and Dr. Poston (who was out of town last Thursday) now opened the discussion in place of Dr. Rogers who had presented the material in his absence on April 19. Referring to the document circulated by the Academic Policies Committee, Dr. Poston noted that on page 6, under the heading, "Repeating Courses", a motion was pending, introduced by Dean Oetjen, and seconded, to delete Item 4 which read "Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the grade point average." The motion was put to a vote and was defeated.

Dr. Richard Roberts then moved to substitute this wording, "When a course is repeated, the grade for the first attempt will not be included in the grade point average." The motion was seconded.

Dr. Lestingi suggested that the probation policy provided for this contingency instead, and Mr. Switzer advocated a change in the present heading, "Any course may be repeated as many times as necessary...", by limiting the number of times to one.

The motion by Dr. Roberts to amend, was put to a vote and lost.

Dr. Wingard, who had permission to address Council, suggested that a statement be added as Item 6 (under "Repeating Courses"), relative to duplicate credit, "For purposes of this section, credit for this course or its equivalent will apply only once toward meeting degree requirements." Dr. Oetjen so moved, and it was seconded.

Dean Petry asked if an exception should be noted regarding seminars which can be repeated. Dr. Leathers pointed out that provision was incorporated in the motion, "For purposes of this section, etc."

Dr. Lestingi considered this clause unnecessary as being covered under "Transfers", but Dr. Roberts asserted that it would clearly eliminate the student who might wish to "major" in the same course.

The motion to add this Item 6 was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Wingard then suggested that under the same heading of "Repeating Courses", in Item 2 (page 6), this phrase be added after the end of the first sentence which now concludes, "...is no longer offered.": "If a substitute course is offered in a department outside the jurisdiction of the student's Dean, the student's Dean should confer with the Dean responsible for the course before approving the substitute course."

Following a discussion of pros and cons, the motion, which was made by Dean Oetjen and seconded, was put to vote and lost.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Dr. Poston then moved that all six items under the section on "Repeating Courses" be approved.

Dr. Gerlach interjected his opinion that this was out of order, since Council was voting on individual sections ad seriatim and that they would then be voted on in their entirety.

Dr. Lestingi then projected the possibility of this interpretation making similar action on April 19 subject to reconsideration although already voted, such as the vote to refer the statement on "Transfer Credit" to the Reference Committee. Mr. Switzer said that that motion was intended to refer at the appropriate time.

Dr. Bee stated that since procedure was established at the last meeting, it would be awkward to change it now. Dr. Leathers said the whole could be reviewed later, and that the manner followed at the last meeting would prevail.

Dr. Leathers ruled that the method of consideration and action on the report would continue as established at the beginning of the meeting on April 19.

Dr. Poston moved the adoption of the amended "Repeating Courses", which was seconded and carried.

The amended statement now reads:

REPEATING COURSES

"Any course may be repeated as many times as necessary by an undergraduate student subject to the following conditions:

- (1) In order to secure a quality point value grade (A, B, C, D, F) or a grade of NC, CR or AUDIT, the student may repeat a course in which he previously received the grade of D, F, AUDIT or NC. Registrations under the CR/NC option are subject to the restrictions in the CR/NC policy.
- (2) The student must repeat the same course within 12 months of the completion of the prior attempt unless given special permission by the student's Dean to extend this period or substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered. Such course must be repeated at The University of Akron.
- (3) Grades for all attempts at a course will appear on the student's official academic record.
- (4) Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the grade point average.
- (5) All grades for attempts at a course will be used in grade point calculation for the purpose of determining graduation with honors and the student's class standing.
- (6) For purposes of this section, credit for this course or its equivalent will apply only once toward meeting degree requirements.

Dr. Poston then moved that the revised statement on "Auditing Courses", at top of page 7, be approved, changing the statement in the current General Bulletin under "Types of Students". The motion was seconded and carried. It now reads:

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

"AUDITOR - One who enrolls in a course with the intention of not obtaining a quality point value grade (A, B, C, D, F) or a grade of NC or CR. A student must indicate that he is an auditor at the time of registration. Audit status may be denied if space is not available. An auditor is expected to do all prescribed course work except the writing of examinations."

Dr. Poston moved that the revised statement on "Academic Reassessment", on page 7, be approved. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Sumner observed that it was not a policy change, but an editorial revision.

The only major change was in the last paragraph and Dr. Gerlach moved to delete the words, "obtained at The University of Akron", to give more recognition to the work done at other institutions in fairness to our own students. Motion was seconded.

Dr. Lestingi felt that the motion was out of order as the matter was covered in the "Transfer" section. Dr. Poston pointed out that transfer credit is often higher than the student might have earned on our campus, and that we had more danger of being unfair to our students from high grades than from low.

The motion to delete was put to a vote and defeated.

The motion to adopt the statement on "Academic Reassessment" was put to a vote and carried. It reads as follows:

ACADEMIC REASSESSMENT

"An undergraduate student who has not attended an institution of higher education (which is fully accredited by an appropriate regional accrediting association or which has an 'A' listing in the Report of Credit Given, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) for at least three calendar years and enrolls at The University of Akron and maintains a grade point average of 2.5 or better for his first 36 credits may petition his Dean to delete from his grade point average the grades of his previous enrollment at The University of Akron. If the student qualifies, all previous grades will be deleted from the grade point average up to the maximum allowed.

"The number of credits deleted from the grade point average shall not exceed 30 percent of the hours required for the degree objective of the student. If the number of credits earned before the three year interval exceeds 30 percent of his degree requirements, the 30 percent factor will apply to the first credits earned.

"This policy is to apply only to the grade point average. All grades will remain on the student's official academic record. A student may utilize this academic reassessment policy only once.

"In the determination of graduation with honors and in the determination of the student's class standing, all grades obtained at The University of Akron shall be used in the calculations."

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Dr. Poston moved to adopt the revised item, No. 7 of policy on Credit/Noncredit Option which appears in the current General Bulletin under "Procedures and Requirements" (top of page 8 of document before Council). The motion was seconded by Dr. Sumner and carried. It reads:

"Revised Item No. 7 of policy on "Credit/Noncredit Option" which appears in the General Bulletin under Procedures and Requirements:

7. A student may repeat a course for Credit (CR), or a quality point grade (A, B, C, D, F) after receiving a grade of NC."

Dr. Poston then moved that (on page 8) Council approve the revised Items No. 2, 3, and 7 of the policy on "Requirements for Baccalaureate and Associate Degrees" in the current General Bulletin under Procedures and Requirements (if Item Nos. 2 and 3 are approved, the two footnotes should also be deleted). The motion was seconded.

Dean Rogers requested that the schedule of effective dates for implementation be published.

Dr. Wingard suggested the addition of an Item 8 to read, "If a student who has transferred from another institution wishes to present for his major fewer than 20 credits earned at The University of Akron he must have the written permission of both his Dean and head of the department concerned." Dr. Oetjen then moved the adoption of this addition, which was seconded.

Following a question as to Deans' authority to make the exceptions, Dr. Gerlach urged that the criteria be spelled out since he didn't believe in such a broad trust of Deans or department heads.

It was affirmed to Mr. Switzer that the amendment would make the taking of 20 hours work in residence mandatory.

The motion of Dr. Oetjen's was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Poston then moved that the combined Items 2, 3, 7, and 8 be approved, to include the schedule of effective dates (bottom of page 8). The motion was seconded.

A discussion ensued as to the interpretation of the time factor in repeating courses. By common consent, the policy, as pronounced by Vice President Leathers, is to be effective September 1, 1973, with a retroactive provision of one year, or back only to September 1, 1972.

The motion, with the effective dates, on "Requirements for Baccalaureate and Associate Degrees", was put to a vote and carried. It now reads:

2. Earn a minimum 2.000 grade point average as computed by the Registrar for work attempted at The University of Akron consistent with the REPEATING COURSES policy.
3. Earn the minimum grade point average specified in the CREDIT AND GRADE POINT REQUIREMENTS FOR GRADUATION TABLE as computed by the appropriate college and/or major department for work attempted in the major field at The University of Akron consistent with REPEATING COURSES policy.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

7. Earn the last 48 credits in the baccalaureate degree total or 24 credits in the associate degree total in residence at The University of Akron unless excused in writing by the Dean of the College in which the student is enrolled.
8. If a student who has transferred from another institution wishes to present for his major fewer than 20 credits earned at The University of Akron he must have the written permission of both his Dean and head of the department concerned.

Recommended implementation dates for all proposed changes:

<u>Policy</u>	<u>Effective Date For All Students Entering Fall Quarter 1973</u>	<u>Will students presently en- rolled be covered by new policy after effective date?</u>
ACADEMIC REASSESSMENT	September 1973	Yes
AUDITING OF COURSES	September 1973	Yes
CREDIT/NONCREDIT COURSES	September 1973	Yes
REQUIREMENTS FOR BACCALAURE- ATE & ASSOC. DEGREES	September 1973	Yes
REPEATING COURSES	September 1973	Yes
TRANSFER CREDIT	September 1973	No
TRANSIENT STUDENTS	September 1973	Yes

Dr. Leathers wished to state for the record that the Academic Policies Subcommittee had worked long and hard hours in putting together all the items for this report, and he offered his commendations.

Mr. Switzer asked if all of these would now be voted in their entirety, but the Chair considered this unnecessary since items had all been approved separately.

Proceeding to the reports of the other Standing Committees, the Chair recognized Dr. Heintz who spoke for Dr. Crabtree who was absent. He distributed to Council a copy of the report of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee, a duplicate of which had been previously circulated to Council by the Procedural Committee. He noted that the only difference in procedure recommended for this committee in naming of campus facilities is reporting directly to the President instead of going through University Council. This is predicated on the necessity for maintaining the confidential nature of its discussions and recommendations until action can be taken and publicized by the Board of Trustees. This is similar to the situation with the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee. He moved the adoption of this report recommending "Procedure for the Naming of Campus Facilities". The motion was seconded.

In response to Mr. Moldea's query, Dr. Heintz said the committee would probably not meet until next fall. Dr. MacGregor added that a meeting could be called when suggestions had been received. Dr. Heintz solicited information and advice on a campuswide basis.

Dr. MacGregor, answering further inquiry, said that no buildings "have" to be named or renamed, but there are new ones being built, and there have been some complaints that "East", "West" and "North" Halls are not appropriate, and even that there would be an advantage in giving names to buildings now housing the Colleges of Education, Business Administration, etc. He concluded by emphasizing the last sentence in the Committee's report which reads, "The ultimate authority to name a campus

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

facility is recognized as resting with the Board of Trustees and alternate avenues established by the Board are not excluded by this procedure."

Dr. Gerlach opposed empowering the Committee to go directly to the President with its implied delegation of authority away from the Council, which he felt competent to keep matters confidential. However, he also condemned any secret actions of Boards, colleges and committees, noting that secrecy violated the University's motto, "Let There Be Light". He thereupon moved to amend the last paragraph of the report which currently reads, "Following due consideration of the recommendation, the Committee may by majority vote make a recommendation to the President of the University regarding the name of the facility in question, for presentation to the Board of Trustees.", by this change: "...make a recommendation to the University Council regarding the name of the facility in question, for presentation to the President of the University and the Board of Trustees." The motion was seconded.

Dr. Poston pointed out that this could lead to very embarrassing and unsatisfactory situations, as the Board might have other names and reasons, and if a person was not chosen, it could be extremely embarrassing and difficult for persons or their families. Dr. Poston did not consider this a significant academic issue, and confidentiality is helpful in these instances.

Dr. MacGregor reminded Council that this proposed procedure outlined by the Committee was a response to an effort to provide an open route by which faculty and students could easily make suggestions. There is an imperative need for secrecy, which is apparent, as people and their families should be protected from public record of debate on these personal matters.

Mr. Moldea cited the recommendations of the Executive Committee on honorary degrees as an arm of University Council which preserved its confidential discussions, and the Committee could therefore be entrusted similarly.

Dr. Gerlach could see no embarrassment in people being recommended for this honor, and anyway no name, in his opinion, should be on a building unless the person was dead. Mr. Davis also saw no wrong in a public forum debate on such matters.

Dr. Bee decried the use of the word, "secrecy". He agreed that subjects such as budget and curriculum and public policy should not be secret, but he felt the emphasis should be on the word "discrete" in naming a building. Even those people deceased have relatives who could be embarrassed, and discussions on these recommendations should by all means be discrete.

Dr. Gerlach's motion was put to a vote and lost.

The motion to adopt the report of the Committee on Campus Facilities Planning was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Hart moved to change the order of the agenda by considering as the next item on the agenda, those items under "New Business". The motion was seconded.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Dr. Jackson opposed this motion as he felt it important to complete the reports of the Standing Committees. He said the Committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities had often withheld many details from Council's long agendas, and he wished to present his report today. Mr. Moldea made a similar statement regarding the still uncompleted "Statement on Student Rights and Responsibilities".

Dr. Gerlach supported Dr. Hart as he thought the motion could be adopted and the business handled speedily so that the proposed Bylaws changes could simply be laid over to be voted upon at the next meeting (as per Bylaws).

The Chairman at this point interjected an observation and warning: As presiding officer he had sat through successive Council meetings and detected noticeable hints of ad hominen remarks. He declared that in the future they will be ruled out of order and the offender disbarred from speaking on the topic then under discussion unless the Chairman's ruling is voted down by Council. He could condone the light touch of good humor and well intentioned asides and comments, but personal insinuations were a reflection on the Council and were to be avoided.

Returning to the question before the house on changing the order of the agenda, Dr. Roberts stated that the proposed Bylaws amendments would have to come up for vote after presentation at the May 3 meeting of Council, since it had been established as a continuation of the April 19 meeting.

Dr. Jackson withdrew his objection to the change in the agenda.

In answer to Mr. Moldea's query as to whether amendments could be introduced as "New Business" without going first to the Procedural Committee, Dr. Hittle commented that there would be a new membership of Council at the regular May meeting, and opined that all unfinished business would fall to the ground and would have to be formally reintroduced.

The motion to change the order of the agenda was put to a vote and lost.

Dr. Jackson then moved that Council accept the April 19, 1973 report of the Committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities, including: a. General Recommendations for Preparation of Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, Retention and Initial Appointment; b. Recommendations for Changes and Additions to Fringe Benefits and University Policy; c. Guidelines for Academic Retrenchment due to Financial Exigency. The motion was seconded.

Since there were questions to be considered on various items of the report, the Chair ruled that each section would be considered separately.

Dr. Poston commended the Committee for the preparation of the document and said that he would like to change the order of two phrases in Section (I.) of the General Recommendations for Preparation of Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, Retention, and Initial Appointments so that it would now read:

Initial appointments should involve the entire full-time faculty of the department* and should include appointment of a search committee, circulation of vitas, review of any scholarly work, an interview with departmental faculty, and, where appropriate, presentation of seminars.

*(or division or college, where appropriate)

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Then there was discussion of Item (i.) which originally read:

Composition of the committees for recommendations should be as follows: recommendations on promotion shall be made by at least all tenured faculty members within the department with one year of service at The University of Akron, and who are at rank or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered. A tenure recommendation committee shall be composed as stated in the Faculty Manual. A retention recommendation committee shall be composed of at least all the tenured members of the departmental faculty who hold a rank equivalent to or higher than that of the candidate.

Dr. Richardson said there was a distinction between the criteria for those deciding on tenure or promotion, and sometimes there are nontenured faculty at the higher rank who should participate on the committees.

Dean Dunlap observed that it was the intention of the College of Business Administration to have tenured and nontenured persons participate. Also, these proposals were as guidelines, and he felt that each College might have variations in its rules, but, as in his College, they could adjust or live with their current practices.

Dr. Leathers raised the question as to the meaning of "one year of service at The University of Akron" meaning one year in the Department.

Dr. Jackson wondered if others wished to be included, must they have one year at this University.

Mr. Switzer moved to delete the phrase, "with one year of service at The University of Akron". The motion was seconded. It was put to a vote and carried, with several abstentions.

Dr. Jackson moved to add a sentence in Item (i.) after the sentence ending "...the candidate is being considered." to read: "Any person on such a committee should have served at least one year at The University of Akron in the Department". The motion was seconded.

Dr. Richardson observed that this would conflict with the practice of inviting off-campus personnel to participate.

The motion by Dr. Jackson to amend was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Poston moved the adoption of his proposed revised wording of Item (i.). The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Bee observed that it was rumored that quotas for promotion and tenure existed; if so, he asked whether these provisions be incorporated in this document. Dr. Poston said there was no evidence of quotas in all his years on campus. Dr. Van Fleet inquired if there were "numerical guidelines" to be recognized. Dr. Poston emphasized, despite others' statements, that there were no quotas.

Dr. Leathers reminded the Council that the Committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities had been charged with formulating general guidelines, as they were varied throughout the campus, and to see how they might be fitted into current practices while recognizing collegiate differences.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Dr. Lestingi asked whether Item (j.) would be adopted. It read: "An appeal or review procedure shall be established by each College." Dr. Leathers averred that it was a general recommendation to be reviewed in each College.

Dr. Gerlach deplored loose and varied language employed without consistency, such as "shall" which is an imperative and "may" or "should" which are permissive. He wondered how such guidelines could be enforced if there is reluctance to comply since we are no longer in a day of "commanding any more".

Dean Samad moved to amend Item (j.) by changing "shall" to "should", while observing that the entire document is inconsistent in its use of "shall" and "should". The motion was seconded.

Dean Petry noted that each department could be guided by the statements in Item (l) which recommend that a set of procedures be prepared and approved by each department.

Dr. Jackson reiterated that the Committee drafted guidelines, following certain basic ideas, which everyone should bear in mind. The use of "shalls" and "shoulds" could have been accidental or purposeful, but emphasis should be placed on the spirit of the document and what it was trying to accomplish. He referred to the Committee's effort to get some standardization and a reasonable approach, citing their attempt to reduce the number of complaints by providing suitable grievance procedures, etc.

Dean Dunlap affirmed the intent of the guidelines and the hope that any collegiate variations would not nullify these beginnings. The College of Business Administration could adapt.

Dean Samad's motion was put to a vote and lost.

Dr. Jackson moved the adoption of the document 1. a. on General Recommendations for Preparation of Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, Retention and Initial Appointment. The motion was seconded. Despite Dr. Gerlach's lament of the lack of time to read it since its late circulation and his abstention, the motion carried. The amended document now reads:

1. (a) Each department* should have a set of procedures concerning promotion, tenure, retention, and initial appointments.
- (b) The procedures should be prepared by each department* and should be formally approved by that department.
2. Irrespective of differences between departments (size, numbers in various ranks, professional guidelines), each document should contain the following as minimum provisions.
 - (a) A general introduction, including a statement of the responsibilities and goals of the department* or College.
 - (b) Separate procedures on promotion, tenure, retention, including appropriate committees for each.

*(or division or college, where appropriate)

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

- (c) Each candidate under consideration and the committee members should receive at least two weeks' notice of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting and other details should be explained in writing.
- (d) The department head will call the initial meeting of each appropriate committee, at which time the committee will elect its own chairman. If the department head does not otherwise qualify to be a member of a committee, he shall be a member ex officio so that he may provide information and explain his views concerning the candidate.
- (e) The candidate should be invited to submit a vita and other professional data, and should be invited to meet with the committee before a recommendation is made. This recommendation shall be reached by secret ballot.
- (f) The candidate should be notified, in writing, by the department* head of the committee's recommendation as soon as possible after a decision is reached, with a copy of such recommendation to the committee chairman.
- (g) The department* head shall transmit copies of the committee's recommendation to the Dean and Academic Vice President, whether or not he concurs. He shall, however, be free to make a separate recommendation, but if it differs from that of the committee he must discuss this with the committee, and a copy of such recommendation sent to the faculty members concerned.
- (h) Criteria for promotion, tenure, and retention need clear definition.
- (i) Composition of the committees for recommendations should be as follows: recommendations on promotion shall be made by at least all tenured faculty members within the department, and who are at rank or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered. Any person on such a committee should have served at least one year at The University of Akron in the Department. A tenure recommendation committee shall be composed as stated in the Faculty Manual. A retention recommendation committee shall be composed of at least all the tenured members of the departmental faculty who hold a rank equivalent to or higher than that of the candidate.
- (j) An appeal or review procedure shall be established by each College.
- (k) With the exception of tenure recommendations (see Faculty Manual), if there are not sufficient personnel with the necessary rank to form a committee to make recommendations, advice should be obtained from outside the department.
- (l) Initial appointments should involve the entire full-time faculty of the department* and should include appointment of a search committee, circulation of vitas, review of any scholarly work, an interview with departmental faculty, and, where appropriate, presentation of seminars.
- (m) Some departments* may wish to have two or three members of the department elected to work with the department head in salary adjustments.

*(or division or college, where appropriate)

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Dr. Jackson then presented 1. c, Guidelines for Academic Retrenchment due to Financial Exigency." He informed the Council that hearings had been held, and there were relatively few changes incorporated.

Dean Dunlap asked for clarification of what he interpreted as intent to be tenured by the University, and also if this was inconsistent with the one year provision. In some parts of the document, tenure is construed as being within a College of department.

Dr. Wilson considered the meaning to be tenure at the University. There is no purposeful relationship to the document just approved.

Dr. Poston inquired why new committees were to be established instead of using the present University Council standing committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities (on pages 2-3), which would be the most knowledgeable and adequate, and which would preclude inexperienced new membership.

Dr. Jackson said there had been controversy about the appointment of members to the Council Committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities, and it would be reasonable to have one member from each major division of the biggest College—Buchtel College, and it would also help to distribute the large volume of work which comes to the latter committee.

Dr. Poston envisioned contradictory positions among the three new committees which would complicate their effectiveness.

It was Dr. Wilson's feeling that it was in reality one parent committee with two subcommittees, and its findings could be worked out with the administration.

Mr. Switzer felt that if retrenchment ever became necessary, every committee could be utilized because of overwork.

Dr. Leathers explained that it was the intent to insure full faculty advice and consultation if these situations should arise. However, he recognized that two committees could conceivably work against each other.

Dr. Jackson suggested that if two subcommittees would have to talk out their differences at length, possibly nobody would ever get fired!

It was Dr. Wilson's interpretation that it would be up to the President, the University Administration and Trustees to make the decisions. Although the President would consult with all, he would have to make the decision. The proposed Faculty Review Committee was only advisory and there was no intent for it to take over the University in time of crisis.

Dr. Lestingi inquired the meaning of "seniority" as appearing under Article VIII on page 5 of the document. He wondered about the legal ramifications for the faculty member and for the University.

Dr. Leathers said that these questions would have to be considered by the Board.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 4/26/73

Dr. Poston could foresee many causes for consternation if some of these recommendations were adopted, such as transfer from one department to another, if this should involve a bumping process (where similar disciplines were presented in more than one college). Also, there could be the question of order of complying with financial exigency such as beginning with part-time, people on probation or leave, then by rank, the lowest to leave first, etc.

Dr. Bee wondered whether these proposals were different from common practice or provisions on other campuses.

Dr. Lively, observing that he hated to introduce anything academic in the group, saw potential danger in the guidelines inasmuch as a subdiscipline could be completely wiped out if there were no protective clauses. Miss Tovey referred to the provision for "Consultation" at the beginning of the document to cover these instances. Dr. Lively reiterated the possibility of decimating personnel and thereby ruining certain academic programs.

Dean Barker hated to think that the University would act on a seniority basis instead of adhering to its standards of excellence.

Dr. Poston questioned how seniority could be based on "total years", and how quality could be thus equated. He noted that younger faculty have to be added often to upgrade a department.

Dr. Gerlach referred to Article VII, Section D (page 5) to which he took strong exception because of its partiality. It reads: "Where minority and female faculty members have been recently hired under a newly implemented minority and female hiring program, exceptions may be made to this procedure to guarantee the integrity of the minority and female hiring program." He asked whether there was to be a racism in reverse and a compromise of quality in personnel for the sake of certain "quantities".

Dr. Leathers again reminded the Council that it had asked this Committee to draw guidelines and that the Committee had held hearings without discovering such varied objections.

In response to Dr. Van Fleet's question, Dr. Wilson thought that some 12-15 individuals had written to the Committee, some in detail and some not. The Committee had included almost all of the suggestions. Two or three not on the Committee had come in person, and of course some had approached the Committee members individually.

Since Dr. Poston had been out of town all last week, he had no opportunity to prepare the amendments he wished to present, or to investigate more thoroughly some of the legal ramifications and state retirement regulations. He expected to make a number of concrete recommendations on May 3. Consequently, he moved to postpone the consideration of this report of the Committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities until the May 3 adjourned session of this Council meeting. The motion was seconded and carried.

The Chairman asked that any comments be returned to Dr. Jackson or to Dr. Wilson in writing in time for assembly and orderly presentation to the Council on May 3.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 p.m. to meet again on Thursday, May 3, at 3 p.m. at the same location, in a continuation of this same meeting.

Mr. Noel Leathers
Vice President for Academic Affairs