

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

6-6-1973

Faculty Senate Chronicle June 6, 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.

Hearing Board Pool, 1973-74, continuedCollege of Nursing—Mrs. Perry Bomar, Miss Dorese DilleySchool of Law—Mr. Bertram Gire, Mr. Richard GrantCommunity and Technical College—Mr. Ronnie Adams, Mr. Charles Salem, Mr. James Taggart,
Mr. Milton WalesLibrary—Miss Nancy Knight, Miss Judith MoweryUNIVERSITY COUNCILMembership 1973-74

The elections for faculty representatives to University Council, according to the Bylaws, are to be completed by May 7, and all elected Council members are to be seated at the last spring meeting of the academic year. The roster of 1973-74 membership of University Council, as announced at the regular May 17 (continued on May 24) meeting continues at 64, which includes the chairman of the Committee of Department Heads (ex officio). The list follows:

Elected from the Faculty: 10Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences—Dr. Lascelles Anderson, Dr. Ali Fatemi, Dr. Don Gerlach,
Dr. Alan Hart, Dr. Dale Jackson, Dr. Roger Keller, Dr. Paul Merrix, Dr. Allen Noble,
Dr. Phillip Stuyvesant, Dr. Robert Zangrando, _____.College of Engineering—Dr. Glenn Atwood, Dr. Thomas Brittain, Mr. Joseph Edminister. 3College of Education—Dr. P. C. Hayes, Dr. Isobel Pfeiffer, Dr. D. I. Rich, Dr. M. A. Ruebel,
Dr. F. M. Schultz. 5College of Business Administration—Mr. M. F. d'Amico, Mrs. Linda Sugarman, Dr. H. L. Taylor. 3College of Fine and Applied Arts—Dr. B. S. Bayless, Jr., Dr. John Coe, Mrs. Leona Farris, Mr. D.
L. Jamison. 4College of Nursing—Miss Dorothy Dobrindt, Miss Evelyn Tovey. 7School of Law—Mr. Merlin Briner, Mr. Donald Jenkins. 7Community and Technical College—Mr. Ronnie Adams, Mr. Jack Huggins, Mr. Arthur Pollock, Jr.,
Mr. James Switzer. 4Elected from the Library:

Mrs. Anna Voorhees, Mr. A. Neil Yerkey. 7

Elected from Student Organizations: 4Associated Student Government—Mr. Eddy Cornielle, Mr. Earl Kerr, Mr. Bill Rostan, Miss Sue Traub.Evening Student Council—Mr. Leon Ridley, Mr. Frank Rogacs.Graduate Student Council—Mr. Al Farris.Student Bar Association—Mr. John ThatcherHolding Office by Virtue of Administrative Assignment: 10

President D. J. Guzzetta; Dr. Noel L. Leathers, Vice President for Academic Affairs; Mr. Richard Hansford, Vice President and Dean of Student Services; Dr. E. L. Lively, Dean of Graduate Studies and Research; Dr. R. A. Oetjen, Dean of Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences; Dr. C. J. Major, Dean of College of Engineering; Dr. H. K. Barker, Dean of College of Education; Dr. J. W. Dunlap, Dean of College of Business Administration; Dr. Ray Sandefur, Dean of College of Fine and Applied Arts; Dr. Estelle Naes, Dean of College of Nursing; Dr. S. A. Samad, Dean of School of Law; Mr. W. M. Petry, Dean of Community and Technical College; Dr. Thomas Sumner, Dean of General College; Mr. J. G. Hedrick, Dean of Evening College and Summer Sessions; Dr. W. A. Rogers, Executive Dean of Continuing Education and Public Services; Mr. H. P. Schrank, Jr., University Librarian.

Appointed by the President: 3

Dr. I. R. MacGregor, Vice President for Planning; Dr. C. F. Poston, Director of Institutional Research and Systems Development; Dr. John Watt, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Ex Officio: 1

Dr. Robert Ferguson, Chairman, Committee of Department Heads.

36
10
3
1
56
p. 3

10
3
5
3
4
2
2
4
2
56

Officers of University Council for 1973-74

- Dr. Noel L. Leathers, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Presiding Officer
- Dr. Roger Keller, elected Secretary
- Dr. Don Gerlach, President Pro Tempore, who would preside vice Dr. Leathers and/or President Guzzetta

Members of Procedural Committee for 1973-74

- Dr. Noel L. Leathers, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chairman
- Dr. Roger Keller, elected Secretary of University Council
- Dr. Dick Rich, continuing member, 1972-74
- Mrs. Linda Sugarman, newly elected member, 1973-75
- Dr. Howard Taylor, newly elected member, 1973-74
- President D. J. Guzzetta, ex officio

Change in Council Committee Membership

The Procedural Committee has made a change in the membership of the University Council's Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Concept of a University Ombudsman. When Miss Beverly Tucker declined appointment, Miss Sue Hamilton was named and accepted. At the first meeting of the Committee, on May 21, Dr. Isobel Pfeiffer was elected chairman.

HOWER HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Hower House at 60 Fir Hill was deeded to the University during the Challenge '70 campaign. Under the terms of the gift, Mrs. John M. Crawford, one of two donors, was to continue residing in the house during her lifetime. Mrs. Crawford passed away on Tuesday, May 29, 1973. This spring the mansion was designated as an Historic Place by the National Park Service of the U. S. Department of the Interior. It may be some time before the family decides, under her will, on the disposition of the furnishings and contents of the home. However, anticipating the University's eventual complete ownership, I have appointed a committee to study the possible utilization of this building and to suggest a priority listing of restoration, repair and remodeling projects for this historic facility. Dr. George Knepper, University Historian, has consented to serve as chairman of a committee to include Dr. Theodore Duke, Dr. Noel L. Leathers, Dr. I. R. MacGregor, Mr. H. Paul Schrank, Jr., Mr. Ronald D. Taylor and Mrs. Bonnie Thomas-Moore.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

University Council Minutes, 5/3/73	Page 4
University Council Minutes, 5/17/73	Page 14
University Council Minutes, 5/24/73	Page 21
University Council Minutes, 5/31/73	Page 31
<u>Appendix</u>	
Guidelines for Financial Exigency	Page 36
Recommendations Regarding Fringe Benefits	Page 40
Grievance Case	Page 44
Function of Standing Committees	Page 47
Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities	Page 50
Report of Faculty Advisory Committee to Chancellor, 4/17/73	Page 55
Report of Faculty Advisory Committee to Chancellor, 5/24/73	Page 57
Faculty Research Grants	Page 59
University Calendar, 1973-74	Page 60

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, May 3, 1973

The adjourned regular meeting of the University Council (from April 19 and 26, 1973) was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:06 p. m. on Thursday, May 3, 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. D. J. Guzzetta, Dr. R. P. Merrix, Dr. L. Roemer, Dr. W. A. Rogers, Dr. R. Sandefur and Mr. F. Williams. Others absent were Dr. W. Crabtree, Mr. G. Gilson, Dr. P. Hayes, Dr. E. Hittle, Mr. E. Kerr, Mr. F. Rogacs, Dr. M. Ruebel, Dr. S. Samad, and Mr. L. Vuillemin.

Dr. Leathers said that since this would be the last session of the 1972-73 University Council, he wished to thank them for the time and dedication they had given to the work of the Council during the year; he also mentioned the time-consuming work of the committees and commended them particularly.

Inasmuch as this was a continuation of the April 26 meeting, the Chairman announced, in accordance with the agenda, the business would continue with the discussion of the report of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee, the section on Guidelines for Academic Retrenchment due to Financial Exigency. He called upon Dr. Poston, who, at the conclusion of the session on April 26, was to present amendments today which he had proposed for the document.

Referring to page 3 of the document, Dr. Poston suggested the substitution of a phrase for the words concluding the second paragraph of Article IV. Dr. Wilson accepted this as a friendly amendment, and the paragraph now reads:

"During the regular academic year (from September 16 through the following June 15) the 30 day maximum time interval for preparation of the Committee report must be strictly observed, unless waived by the University President. However, during the summer term (June 16 to September 15), the preparation of the Committee report may require more time but may not be delayed more than 60 days."

Dr. Poston then referred to Article V on page 3, the second paragraph, and moved that "in these matters" at the end of the first sentence be replaced by "regarding the items in the preceding paragraph." Acceptable to the committee, the motion was seconded and carried. The paragraph now reads:

"The Advisory Subcommittee may consult with and make appropriate recommendations to the University President regarding the items in the preceding paragraph. The Grievance Subcommittee shall consider grievances from those faculty members affected by financial exigency decisions."

Dr. Poston then offered another friendly amendment, which had been accepted by the committee, that the last paragraph under Article VI (top of page 4) be moved to the end of the first paragraph in Article VII, continuing the sentence following the addition of the word, "however", so that the paragraph would read:

"A faculty reduction in force (release) should, whenever possible, be treated as a layoff—temporary in nature—not as a termination, however, if an appointment is terminated before the end of the period of appointment, because of financial exigency, or because of the discontinuance of a program of instruction, the released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline."

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

Dr. Poston presented a further friendly amendment acceptable to the committee, providing a substitute wording for the beginning of the third paragraph in Article VII. Procedures for Faculty Reduction in Force (Faculty Release). The originally proposed wording was: "Early retirement and transfer from full-time to part-time service may be acceptable alternatives to release in some situations of financial exigency. However, such decisions should be governed by the same guidelines and procedural safeguards as those which result in release." The newly accepted wording now reads: "If a faculty member wishes, he may accept early retirement or transfer from full-time to part-time service as an acceptable alternative to release in some situations of financial exigency. However, such decisions should be governed by the same guidelines and procedural safeguards as those which result in release."

It was also agreed as proposed by Dr. Poston, that in the following paragraph in Article VII, the phrase, "within the affected program", should be underlined in each of the subsections—(A), (B), and (C).

On Dr. Wilson's motion, seconded, the heading of Article VIII was lengthened to include the phrase, "Full-Time", so that the heading now reads: Rights and Benefits for Full-Time Faculty Members Released Because of Financial Exigency.

Dr. Poston proposed the insertion of the phrase, "academically qualified and trained" to the first sentence in Article VIII, Section 1. He explained that this did not imply training of someone in a minor capacity for a major discipline.

Dr. Fatemi considered "trained" as too restrictive, as compared to administrators, who, he thought, were not always specially trained for the particular position they filled.

Dr. Poston emphasized that the clause was purposely restrictive, as the document as circulated provided for "bumping" and seniority. Dr. Wilson insisted that there was no provision for "bumping" in the document.

Dr. Van Fleet was of the opinion that "qualified" was sufficient, without adding "trained", although he saw merit in the addition of "academically".

The proposal to add "academically qualified and trained" was put to a vote and failed.

Dr. Poston suggested a change in the wording of Article VIII, Section 2, which originally read: "The University should provide a retraining program to assist any faculty member to meet the necessary qualifications to fill any such vacancy." He moved that the section be changed to read: "The University should provide retraining possibilities within existing programs to assist faculty members to meet the necessary qualifications to fill any such vacancy to which he wishes to transfer." He explained that "within existing programs" would ensure that the University not be obligated to pay for such training off campus, especially since this would be in a time of financial exigency. The motion was seconded.

In reply to Dr. Durst's query as to the Committee's reaction, Dr. Jackson said that he thought it a reasonable amendment to preclude any misinterpretation about financial support off campus.

The motion to amend was put to a vote and carried. It now reads:

- "2. The University should provide retraining possibilities within existing programs to assist faculty members to meet the necessary qualifications to fill any such vacancy to which he wishes to transfer."

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

Dr. Poston expressed concern about parts of Article VIII, Section 4, which were currently in conflict with state and/or policy, such as guarantee of maintenance of retirement benefits, and he advocated deletion of that phrase.

In order to resolve this conflict, Dr. Jackson moved to add the phrase, "unless expressly prohibited by law", following the word "should" in the first line. The motion was seconded and carried. The passage now reads:

"Faculty members who have been released and later recalled should, unless expressly prohibited by law, suffer no loss of benefits (such as annual increments, retirement benefits, sick leave, tenure, etc.), and should be given a reasonable salary increase upon recall."

Dr. Poston took exception to Article VIII, Section 5, as he had grave doubts that the Board could guarantee salaries, even for one year, in the face of financial exigency. He moved to eliminate Section 5. The motion was not seconded.

In response to Dr. Leather's inquiry, Mr. Duff said that faculty do have one year continuance of health insurance policy, as for one on leave (cited by Dean Petry), but any succeeding year is at the faculty member's expense, and that of course the University "experience" could result in an adverse effect for all.

It was pointed out that a faculty member leaving could continue his health insurance on an "individual" rate basis, and that it is an advantage to have this available, particularly for older faculty. There was discussion concerning the merits of "group" vs. "individual" coverage in these situations.

Dr. Poston argued that the document under discussion was not in reality concerned with financial exigency, but was more like a contract, and that it was attempting to saddle the University with the same expenses when people were laid off, although the University in such a situation could not continue to meet such expenses.

Mr. Duff said that while everyone would like to see this kind of guarantee, the Board would probably have to reject Section 5. (c) in Article VIII as being excessive. He recommended that the items be re-thought and resubmitted.

Mr. Briner wondered if cost figures were available as to cost per man.

Dr. Poston again questioned, "What is exigency?"

Dr. Fatemi observed that in his opinion if the document went to the Board, the document could speak for itself, and not have partisan representatives present it; or that the Board could consult with the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee, the Academic Vice President and Council, etc.; and noted that the document did not refer to provisions for administrators under financial exigency. He thought if fewer students meant fewer faculty, there should also be fewer administrators.

Dr. Gerlach opined that one aspect had been overlooked, and that was the possibility of renegotiation of salaries for across-the-board cuts to avoid faculty reduction in force. He therefore moved to send the document back to committee to include his and Dr. Fatemi's comments, and then have it re-submitted to Council. Motion was seconded.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

Dr. Jackson said the committee had purposely omitted a renegotiation provision in order to preserve the seniority clause. However, there was no prohibition on reallocation of resources.

The motion to refer to committee was put to a vote and failed.

It was Mr. Davis's observation that the administration would not be affected, and that the students would be the first to suffer.

Dr. Gerlach moved that the following statement of Dr. D. McIntyre be added to the end of the first paragraph introducing the Guidelines for Academic Retrenchment due to Financial Exigency:

"Wisely planned hiring and tenuring actions are the best guarantee against the retrenchment of personnel. Consequently, the Vice President for Academic Affairs will require at all times written and well-reasoned justification for hiring or tenuring from the departmental faculty, Department Head, and College Dean regarding the long range need and impact of any prospective new or tenured faculty."

The motion was seconded.

Following some discussion of the implication that it meant quotas, that it also might restrict academic freedom, and that such a statement (in reality, after the fact) might be more appropriate in other documents, since this one pertains to "how to fire", not "how to hire", the motion was put to a vote and lost.

Dr. Jackson moved that a new Article IX be added to read: "The above sections do not preclude making revisions in salaries to prevent dismissals of faculty due to financial exigency." The motion was seconded.

In response to a question, Dr. Jackson averred that the statement meant all University faculty, with no limitation on faculty or administration.

In reply to Dr. Wilson's query, it was determined that the title of Article IX would be Salary Adjustments.

The motion to add Article IX was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Richardson returned to Article VII, Section (C) and moved to amend by changing the fifth line (new words underscored) to read: "The least senior faculty member by rank and length of academic service...." The motion was seconded.

He explained that often younger men are employed at higher ranks, even department heads, and they should not be penalized.

Dr. Fatemi opposed this on the assumption of correlating rank and quality.

Dean Barker said that if Dr. Fatemi's argument was followed, there would be no logic to seniority.

Dr. Gerlach did not favor the amendment because he thought newer faculty members often don't show as much loyalty to the institution as to their profession and personal interests. He said he would

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

always be a Ph.D., but being a professor required his affiliation at a university. Because the financial exigency guidelines were designed to protect loyal servants of this University, there should be no such qualification to that protection as Dr. Richardson's motion threatened to make.

Dr. Jackson said that this point had been discussed in committee, but he wished that the exception, which Dr. Richardson was citing, could be provided for more logically.

Dr. Van Fleet noted that Section (B) provided for all probationary faculty within the affected program to be released before any tenured faculty. He felt that the profession is to be considered before the University.

Dr. Richardson did not oppose Section (B), and commented that he wasn't as lucky as Dr. Gerlach to have begun his collegiate teaching at this institution. Dr. Gerlach noted that he had not begun his career here.

The motion to amend Article VIII, Section (C) was put to a vote and failed.

Dr. Jackson moved to adopt the Guidelines for Academic Retrenchment due to Financial Exigency, as amended; it was seconded and was put to a vote and carried. (See Appendix, this issue, for complete final statement.)

Dr. Jackson then moved that the Council accept the Recommendations for Changes and Additions to Fringe Benefits and University Policy. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Duff stated that his meeting with the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee had been very fruitful. He suggested that instead of the once a year meeting as recommended in the report, they meet twice a year. He announced that the insurance company is in the process of redrafting the manual on hospitalization benefits. He informed the Council that the University pays between \$800,000 and \$900,000 annually on insurance, which varies with "experience". Currently the charges run some \$64,000 a month, with 106 percent loss ratio in hospitalization, so that there will be additional expense by year's end. The major-medical has a 201 percent loss ratio, and the total package 107 percent loss ratio, currently.

The addition of dental care, as recommended in Article I, Section C, 2.i., would cost some \$150,000 more a year, and while it would be helpful to add, the cost impact must be recognized. Also, the payment for prescription drugs would necessitate vast administrative cost and paper work, some 20 percent cost to the insurance company so that our annual medical budget would approximate \$1,000,000 to Equitable.

Relative to Article II, "Professional Liability Insurance", Mr. Duff agreed that it would be good to have. He recalled that four years ago a company had been prevailed upon to write such a policy. So few signed up for it in the second year that it was withdrawn. Now public institutions have attempted to find a carrier, but have been unsuccessful.

Dr. Barker said that there was more interest now, and more might sign up, but Mr. Duff reminded Council that it was now impossible to find a carrier.

It was suggested that originally the policy might not have covered the things most significant, such as field trips, etc. Dr. Jackson thought that a survey of needs might be helpful.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

Mr. Duff told the Council that he would be happy to meet with members of the faculty individually relative to insurance needs, and he especially hoped to have semi-annual meetings with the Faculty Well-Being Committee on insurance benefits, etc.

Dr. Jackson thought that because of the extent of fringe benefits and their cost, the faculty should be given a choice of accepting these additions and/or salary increases.

Dr. Fatemi considered it incredible that such decisions were made without faculty consultation, and said that the faculty should make these decisions in the future for the administration. The faculty might be willing to pay for their dental coverage or have it deducted from their salary. He thought the faculty should decide what was good for them.

Dr. Van Fleet asked the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee if it had considered alternatives, such as TIAA coverage. Miss Tovey, speaking for the committee, said it had not.

The Chairman summarized the recommendations for changes and additions to fringe benefits and university policy and said that the administration would see what could be done for implementation and report back to Council.

The motion to approve the recommendations was put to a vote and carried. (The document is printed in its entirety in Appendix of this issue.)

Dr. Jackson, as chairman of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee, said that the committee can no longer handle complaints of the faculty. He moved the adoption of the following resolution, which he read, as approved unanimously by the eight members of the committee present on April 21 and amended April 24, 1973:

"Whereas, representatives of The University of Akron administration have, on two occasions, failed to appear at hearings requested of the FWBRR Committee by aggrieved faculty members,

"The FWBRR Committee deplores the lack of cooperation from the University administration with regard to the Committee's attempt to fulfill its obligations as stated in the 'Procedures Followed by FWBRR Committee' approved by the University Council, June 8, 1971.

"The FWBRR further deplores the failure of the Board of Trustees to act upon those 'Procedures.'

"As the Committee is unable to fulfill its obligation as a 'faculty grievance committee', the Committee shall, as of this date, no longer consider grievance cases."

The motion was seconded.

Dr. Fatemi wondered who would hear grievances if this committee did not. He inquired whether this was a protest or a definite intent not to hear cases. If the latter, then Council should set up another avenue.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

Dr. Gerlach asked what administrative representatives had failed to appear, and who had failed to cooperate. He considered that the trouble might not be the committee's but might arise in other places.

Vice President Leathers noted that five members of the committee were present at Council today (Mrs. Clinefelter, Miss Tovey, Dr. Wilson, Dr. Howard Taylor and Dr. Jackson). He considered this Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee one of the most important at the University, and said that it had done fine work in its three years in being. If there were no differences of opinion among people, there would be no grievances. He reviewed the background of its work: the committee had drawn up steps for various procedures; in June 1971 University Council had adopted and forwarded these to the University Trustees, who had referred them back to the committee through the President for clarification. The President had met twice with the committee during 1971-72, and in December 1972 the President and Dr. Leathers had met with the committee and reviewed the document, asking the committee to return with articles for resubmission to the Board. The Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee knows these steps and Dr. Leathers attested to this.

(Note added by Secretary: In the 8 June 1971 meeting of University Council, a Statement of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities was adopted. Part V of that document was entitled "Procedures Followed by Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee", and detailed the procedures for handling faculty grievances by the committee. The Board of Trustees objected to certain statements in earlier portions (Parts I to IV) of this document dealing with tenure procedures, and hence returned it through the President. However, no comments on Part V were offered by the Board of Trustees.)

Dr. Leathers referred to another matter which concerned a particular grievance during the current academic year, and he said that a faculty member had employed an outside attorney so that the University had turned to its University counsel. Under these circumstances, it is improper for the administration to do anything without advice of counsel, hence the "failure" to appear that disappointed the committee. Dr. Leathers could understand the committee's reaction, and stated that the administration does not intend to impede or block hearings. He advocated the continuance of this committee as an avenue of appeal, realizing that this committee gets the difficult cases which are not resolved earlier. He recognized that although the committee and he may not always agree, the committee's function is a vital aspect of the University operations.

Dr. Jackson replied that the committee's resolution represented a revised and tempered statement, and that it was the committee's feeling that it would be a disservice to the University to pretend that the committee can work effectively under the circumstances. He found it difficult to be clear and specific since one important case is still pending, and it was therefore impossible to discuss it in public. He said however that before attorneys were involved, University officials had forbidden a servant of the University to attend a hearing, and he deplored the ineffectiveness of the committee if the University administration refused to turn over information pertinent to the facts. He also noted that University Council had been bypassed when the Board of Trustees had returned the document containing the grievance procedures to the committee. Although the committee had worked under the same rules for nearly three years, these procedures had not been approved or disapproved by the Trustees. Now with a difficult case, the procedures were held to be invalid and this, in the opinion of the committee, made its position untenable. The committee cannot serve its constituents if witnesses don't appear. Perhaps, he concluded, Council could suggest another mechanism to handle grievances. Until two years ago a professional society had served in the capacity of a grievance committee.

Dean Oetjen told the Council that since he had been on campus he had been involved in two cases, as Dr. Gerlach had inquired, in which outside attorneys were concerned, and that he had to accept

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

legal advice not to appear at the committee hearings. He had met with members of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee on several occasions and cooperated, in absence of legal action. His office has cooperated and most cases have been solved, not necessarily to the satisfaction of the faculty member. For the most part he thought the committee very necessary and it has served the University community well, and he hoped it would continue. He would expect to participate when appropriate to do so (different situation when legal counsel is involved), and he would vote against the motion.

Miss Tovey spoke in support of Dr. Jackson's motion. She said that when the document was sent back from the Board of Trustees to the committee, the Board's objections did not relate to grievance procedures. She said, in connection with faculty grievances, that the Deans and department heads had been helpful to a certain degree. However, she wondered if faculty members should not be better advised to hire a lawyer and take their grievances to the courts early.

Dr. Fatemi reported that he had met with President Guzzetta last year when he was the Chairman of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee, and that the President had made no reference to grievance procedure matters, just that the Board did not like the document's wording on tenure, but this has not yet been resolved in Council. He agreed that Dean Oetjen had been cooperative and that legal action made a difference in administrative participation, but did not change the case. He recognized the Board's right, but it had not interfered before. There is now a case before the Civil Rights Commission that might damage the public image of the University; it would have been much better if this problem could have been resolved within the University through a grievance committee.

Dr. Gerlach believed that "silence gives consent", and since the Board had waited all these years to question them, the grievance procedures should have been regarded acceptable after so long, as there had been no specific rejection of them. He thought the proposed amendment to the Council Bylaws (on agenda of today's meeting) relative to Board's reaction within a time limit on Council action would, if adopted, help in the future, and would be the only responsible thing to do.

Dr. Hart lamented the "Catch-22" situation with respect to grievance procedures which seemed to make it impossible for an aggrieved faculty member to hire a lawyer and still work toward an out-of-court resolution of the case.

In response to queries, Dr. Jackson said that in most cases the committee had received administrative cooperation, but in one case upon which presently he could not elaborate because of procedural rules, the committee had to wait through five months of futile efforts only to get the necessary information finally from an outside source, even though the document involved was a University document and was the principal basis for the case against the faculty member.

Dr. Poston said that this proposed committee action presented today was the first he had heard of it. He considered the committee's withdrawal from the responsibility of hearing grievances a very serious step. He reminded the members that there would be new University Council taking office at the May 17 meeting, and this would mean a new membership for the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee. He asked if it wouldn't be fair to let the new committee continue in its expected capacity.

Dean Lively, while having had no direct contact with the committee, realized that the appearance of legal counsel created differences in committee procedures. He had heard nothing but evidence of administrative cooperation with the committee, despite differences of opinion on what should be done in one or two cases. He felt that the University administration should not be condemned for this.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

Dr. Anderson asked at what stage of the deliberations the attorney in question had appeared.

Dr. Jackson commented that he was torn between providing information and working with the committee's procedural rules of confidentiality at this time. Today, he could not report one important case to Council until its probable completion of procedures in another ten days. He admitted that these were exceptional cases, but some affect a faculty member's professional status to the extent of severance from the University. He was not free to give details at this time.

Dr. Poston observed that the committee chairman was asking the Council to vote without giving details, which was the same situation for which the administration had been criticized.

Dean Major interjected that if Council knew what Dr. Jackson knew (paraphrasing an earlier comment), Council could vote. Dr. Major wanted the action on the motion postponed.

Dr. Van Fleet noted that the rules had been adopted by Council for procedures by the committee. If they were not now regarded as valid, he could see no reason for Dr. Jackson to abide by them further, and hence should reveal the details to Council now.

Dr. Fatemi recalled that recently an 11th hour reprieve by President Guzzetta had resolved one case that would have otherwise gone to court. He considered this a different institution from what it was a few years ago and that the faculty are asking for a chance to gain more participation.

Dean Barker declared that Council did not know and could not know all the facts. He deplored pitting administration against the faculty in the vote. He said that both sides had been presented today to indicate their position. He urged that the motion be withdrawn.

The Chair imposed a two-minute limit on debate.

Dr. Gerlach recommended a vote on behalf of the committee, as it could not proceed properly until its rules have been accepted by the Board of Trustees. He thought the Board should take a stand.

Dr. Durst considered the decision difficult, and he agreed that he could not be satisfied with the facts as known at present.

Since Dr. MacGregor also felt it impossible for most Council members to know the facts, he asked that such members abstain from voting at this time.

At Dr. Van Fleet's suggestion, a roll call vote was approved by more than the required one-fifth of members present.

It was explained that a positive vote would affirm the committee's petition to hear no more grievances.

Dr. Lestingi opined that the committee was appointed by Council and is composed of elected faculty representatives, and that a vote against the motion implied a censure for their action. On the other hand, he disliked any implication of indicting the President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs by a vote for the motion.

Offering a point of order, Dr. Gerlach observed that Council members might vote "yes", "no", or "present".

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/3/73

The roll call was concluded with answers in three categories:

<u>Those voting FOR committee request</u>	<u>Those AGAINST</u>	<u>Those PRESENT</u>
L. Anderson	K. Barker	G. Atwood
T. Davis	R. Duff	D. Durst
A. Fatemi	J.W. Dunlap	P. Godfrey
D. Gerlach	R. Hansford	J. Huggins
A. Hart	J. Hedrick	J. Lestingi
W. Heintz	D. Jenkins	E. Naes
D. Jackson	N. Leathers	E. Tovey
R. Keller	E. Lively	A. Voorhees
H. Lijeron	I. MacGregor	
J. Mowery	D. Major	
A. Pollock	R. Oetjen	
J. Richardson	W. Petry	
J. Switzer	C. Poston	
F. Van Fleet	D. Rich	
C. Wilson	R.S. Roberts	
	P. Schrank	
	T. Sumner	

The vote was 17 against the petition of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee to cease hearing grievance cases, 15 in favor, and eight voting simply "Present".

There will be no further meetings of Council until the regularly scheduled meeting on May 17, 1973.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 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 REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, May 17, 1973

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, May 17, 1973, in Business Administration-Law Building 307.

Fifty-six of the 64 members of the new 1973-74 Council were present. Since Day and Evening student elections had not been completed, the six students currently serving were considered in today's membership. Those members of Council who were absent with notice were Dr. H. K. Barker, Dr. Thomas Sumner and Mr. Frank Williams. Others absent were Dr. L. Anderson, Mr. Al Farris, Mrs. Leona Farris, Mr. Frank Rogacs and Mr. John Thatcher.

Since this was the first meeting of the Council as constituted for the new academic year, Dr. Leathers introduced and identified all new members. He said that according to the Bylaws the President may name three of his choosing each year to serve on Council. President Guzzetta reappointed Dr. Ian MacGregor and Dr. Charles Poston. He has named Dr. John Watt, Assistant to the Vice President for Academic Affairs, to serve vice Mr. R. W. Duff. Dr. Ferguson continues, ex officio, in his capacity as the chairman of the Committee of Department Heads. The elected collegiate representatives, 1973-75 and their constituency are: Buchtel College—Dr. Don Gerlach*, Dr. Dale Jackson* and Dr. Allen Noble (At-Large), Dr. Phillip Stuyvesant (Humanities), Dr. William Beyer (Natural Sciences), Dr. Robert Zangrando (Social Sciences); Engineering—Dr. Thomas Brittain, and Mr. Joseph Edminister (for 1973-74 vice Dr. Lestingi); Education—Dr. Isobel Pfeiffer and Dr. Frederick Schultz; Business Administration—Mr. Michael d'Amico, Mrs. Linda Sugarman, and Dr. Howard Taylor (for 1973-74, vice Dr. David Van Fleet); Fine and Applied Arts—Dr. Benoyd Bayless, Jr. and Mr. David Jamison; Nursing—Miss Dorothy Dobrindt; Law—Mr. Donald Jenkins*; Community and Technical—Mr. Ronnie Adams; Library—Mr. Neil Yerkey; Graduate Student Council—Mr. Al Farris; Student Bar Association—Mr. John W. Thatcher, Jr.

Since there were no corrections or additions to the minutes of the University Council of the regular meeting of April 19, 1973, and the adjourned regular meeting of April 26, 1973, they were approved as printed in the AU Chronicle of May 3, 1973.

Dr. Leathers then called upon Dr. D. J. Guzzetta for the "Remarks of the President". He said that he would touch briefly on three subjects. The first was to transmit to Council the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on University Fee Waiver Policy chaired by Dr. Joyce Sullivan and consisting of Mrs. Ruth Cates, Dr. William Fleming, Dr. Joseph Lestingi, Dr. Allen Noble, Dr. Charles Poston, Mr. Harry Robinett, Mrs. Esther Ward, and which recommended:

"That the existing fee waiver policy at The University of Akron be retained.

"That the Ad Hoc Committee on Fee Waiver Policy remain in existence to stand ready to review additional or supplementary data pertaining to the above policy at such time as designated by the President of the University."

Since there was no urgency to change the present setup, he would accept the report and would ask the committee to stand by for any future charge.

Dr. Guzzetta said that the second item he wished to discuss pertained to the budget. He had met with the eight college faculties, the General Faculty and today with the faculty at Wayne General and Technical College. He felt that there was much more faculty discussion in this technique as compared with a single University budget meeting and he was pleased with the results. He expects to continue this

*Reelected

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 5/17/73

policy. Including the other meetings, this today was the tenth group he had met with on the budget. Dr. Guzzetta commented that the current appropriation bill in the Senate provided for a 5 percent increase, and he had been the first of the state university presidents to testify last Monday night in Columbus before the Senate Finance Committee. They are asking for 6.5 percent. He had also presided at the meeting of the Inter-University Council in Columbus on Friday. This is a group composed of the university presidents and one trustee of each of the state universities, and he officially takes over as its president in July. He is optimistic that the budget will be settled in Columbus before the legislature adjourns near the end of June and that the increase will be above 5 percent. Included in this bill is \$250,000 for MEDCO, although the original request had been \$790,000. It is hoped that our friends in the Ohio General Assembly will restore the request money, and he is pleased at the progress of support to date. If it is not included in the first year of the biennium, he trusts there will be provision in the second year, and he will keep the Council informed.

The third comment concerned the Faculty Forums. The President said that he had expected to continue them in May. However, he had just met with all of the individual faculties, and he had also requested the faculty to send him a listing of any of their major concerns. At first he had received a number, but had finally only received a total of 16. He therefore hoped that they would consider these possibilities over the summer and he would start with that subject when he resumed the Faculty Forums in the fall.

The next item on the agenda was the elections. Dr. Leathers declared the meeting open for nominations for the office of President Pro Tempore of University Council. Dr. Fatemi nominated Dr. Gerlach who had served in that capacity this year. After a suitable pause, Dr. Poston moved that the nominations be closed. The motion was seconded and carried. Dr. Gerlach was congratulated on his reelection.

Nominations were then entertained for the office of Secretary of the University Council. Dr. Hart nominated Dr. Coe. Mr. Huggins nominated Dr. Keller. Dr. Fatemi moved that the nominations be closed. The motion was seconded and carried. The Chair asked Dr. Gerlach and Dean Hansford to serve as tellers. Dr. Wilson assisted at the blackboard.

While the tellers were counting the ballots, Dr. Leathers informed Council that the Faculty Advisory Committee to the President had been constituted for 1973-74 by the elections within each College, with the exception of Community and Technical College which is not yet completed. The new members are: Buchtel College—Dr. Dale Jackson; Engineering—Dr. Howard Greene; Education—Dr. Walter Arms; Business Administration—Dr. Thomas Coyne; Fine and Applied Arts—Mr. Ronald Taylor; Nursing—Miss Edna Grist, and Law—Mr. Hamilton DeSaussure.

The vote for Secretary of Council was then announced, with Dr. Keller having 31 votes and Dr. Coe 23. Dr. Keller then came forward to receive the official papers from Dr. Wilson who left the meeting following commendation from the Chair and applause from Council for his work during the year.

Nominations were then open for the two members of the Procedural Committee.

Mr. Moldea nominated Mr. Tim Davis.

Dr. MacGregor asked about the requirements for election to the Procedural Committee (see Article III, Section d.), and Dr. Leathers read from the Council Bylaws, Article VI, Section b: "This committee shall consist of the Vice President for Academic Affairs as Chairman, the elected Secretary of Council and three other members elected by Council at the May meeting from the elected members

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 5/17/73

of Council." Dr. Leathers said that the new student members of Day and Evening Government have not yet been determined as their elections are incomplete.

Dr. Howard Taylor was nominated for the Procedural Committee, as were Dr. Gerlach and Mrs. Linda Sugarman. Dr. Stuyvesant moved that the nominations be closed.

Dean Samad questioned whether Mr. Davis was eligible before the elections were completed by ASG.

Mr. Moldea admitted that Mr. Davis probably couldn't be considered until the counting of the ASG ballots was completed (it was to start at 4 p. m. that day), but he felt a student should be on the Procedural Committee and that Mr. Davis would be a fine member and he was sure he would be elected to the Council. Dr. Gerlach pointed out that Council Bylaws did not require student members of Council to be elected at any particular date, but that they must be deemed as members (and therefore eligible for election to Council office) until such time as their successors were chosen, that previous amendment of the Bylaws had been specifically made to make students eligible for the Procedural Committee, and that if Mr. Davis were elected to the Committee, and subsequently was not elected to the Council, then his Committee seat would be vacated, and Council must elect a replacement.

Dr. Leathers ruled that a student would not be eligible at this time. Dr. Poston observed that students could conform with this May date in the Council Bylaws by holding their elections earlier.

Following a discussion of whether the student should be elected on the basis of possible later disqualification if ASG hadn't elected him, and whether in fact a student was elected or appointed by the student government for its representative on University Council (since the Council Bylaws stipulate "elected"), and there was some question whether Mr. Davis was in fact elected since he had been appointed to fill a vacancy in an elected office, and whether the Procedural Committee elections should be postponed (contrary to Bylaws), Dr. Fatemi moved that this Item 6 be moved to follow Item 13 on the agenda, in hopes it would not come up today, and by a later date the elections in ASG would be known. The motion to change the agenda was seconded. Since it was suggested that a change of agenda constituted a suspension of the rules, it would require a two-thirds vote. The vote being 25 in favor of changing the agenda and 22 against, the motion was lost because it did not achieve the two-thirds required. The Chair asked counsel from a former University member, Dr. Bee, a parliamentarian, prior to his decision that a two-thirds vote was required.

The Chair at this time emphasized that this discussion was entirely an impersonal one and was in no way to be construed as any reflection on Mr. Davis himself. However, the Chair ruled that Mr. Davis was not eligible for election to the Procedural Committee since he had not been elected for the 1973-74 academic year. Dr. Gerlach moved to appeal the decision of the Chair. A vote was taken, 24 supporting the appeal and 22 opposed to the appeal. Accordingly, Mr. Davis was retained for nomination.

Dr. Gerlach moved to close the nominations (Dr. Stuyvesant had previously moved but it was not seconded), which was seconded and carried.

Since there were two members of the Procedural Committee to be elected it was agreed that the two receiving the highest votes on the first ballot would be subject to run-off, if no majority for one position, and the three who were left would go through the same procedure for election to the second position. The tellers were Dean Hansford and Dr. Keller.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 5/17/73

The result of balloting for the first member of the Procedural Committee was as follows:

<u>Nominee</u>	<u>First Vote</u>	<u>Final Vote</u>	
T. Davis	8		
H. Taylor	18	33	(elected)
L. Sugarman	11		
D. Gerlach	16	21	

The balloting for the second position resulted as follows:

T. Davis	9		
L. Sugarman	25	29	(elected)
D. Gerlach	20	25	

Dr. Leathers then announced that the Procedural Committee for 1973-74 would consist of Dr. Keller (secretary), Dr. Dick Rich (who continues), Dr. Howard Taylor, Mrs. Linda Sugarman, the Vice President for Academic Affairs (chairman), and Dr. D. J. Guzzetta (President of the University, as ex officio member).

The Council then proceeded to the election of the Akron representative and alternate on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. Dr. Fatemi has been the representative and Mr. Blin Scatterday as alternate this year. Dr. Fatemi was nominated and Mr. Scatterday was nominated. It was moved that the nominations be closed. The motion was seconded and carried. It was pointed out that the balloting for these two offices would be by faculty members of Council only. The Chair ruled that in the voting the highest number of votes would determine the representative and the next highest would designate the alternate. In the results, Dr. Fatemi was elected representative, with 23 votes, and Mr. Scatterday was elected alternate with 10 votes.

The Council then turned to the election of the Akron representative and alternate to the Ohio Faculty Senate. Dr. Merrix, the current representative, nominated Mr. Pollock. Dr. Gerlach and Mrs. Alice McDonald were nominated and their names removed since Dr. Gerlach declined, and it was not known whether Mrs. McDonald would consent to serve. Dr. Coe was nominated. It was moved, seconded and carried that the nominations be closed.

While Dean Hansford and Dr. Keller counted the ballots, the Chair asked Dr. Poston, under Item 9, to present the list of prospective June 1973 graduates. Dr. Poston moved that the list of all candidates, now before Council, for degrees at the June 1973 Commencement be approved pending completion of all requirements, approval by their respective collegiate faculties, and approval by the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Fatemi wanted to add a phrase, "It is understood that no names be added."

Dr. Poston reminded him that a typographical or other unintentional error could always happen, and that the motion stipulated that in any case "all requirements had to be completed."

Dr. Gerlach urged opposition to the original motion unless due authority such as the Executive Committee sanctioned additions, otherwise he felt there was no purpose served in University Council approving the list.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 5/17/73

Dean Oetjen pointed out that already one error had been found in his College and that there was one addition to the list, but this was being considered by his College Council and the person is unquestionably eligible and qualified. Buchtel College has the mechanism to handle such a situation, and he believed it would be a grave injustice to deny such a person due consideration.

Dr. Poston reiterated the safeguards in the original motion. He also asked how anyone could expect to pass on the credentials of every person named on the list originally, and that a deserving candidate should not be penalized.

Dr. Leathers reminded the Council that they are to vote on the motion to approve the list, and that Dr. Gerlach was only expressing concern. If there are additions later, they could be reported to a meeting of University Council as corrections for the record. The motion to approve the list of proposed June 1973 degree recipients was put to a vote and carried.

The tellers reported the results of the vote for Akron representatives on the Ohio Faculty Senate: Dr. Coe was elected representative, with 18 votes, and Mr. Pollock was named alternate, with 15 votes.

Proceeding to the reports of the Standing Committees, the Chair called upon Dr. Rich to speak for the Procedural Committee. Dr. Rich referred to the statement of two recommendations adopted at the Procedural Committee of May 7, 1973 and which had been distributed to the Council at the beginning of the meeting. The first item pertained to the elections which had already been held earlier in today's meeting. It had read:

"In connection with the election of new members to the Procedural Committee, a new Secretary, and a new President Pro Tempore at the May 17 meeting of University Council, it should be noted that the person elected President Pro Tempore is also eligible to be elected to the Procedural Committee. There may be some advantage in having the President Pro Tempore on the Procedural Committee, although this is not required by the present Bylaws."

Dr. Rich then moved that the second item—a proposal adopted by the Procedural Committee on May 7—be approved. The motion was seconded. It read as follows:

"University Council, when acting upon a report of any of its standing or ad hoc committees, shall henceforth limit itself to the following possible actions:

- a. Adopt the report; or
- b. Reject the report; or
- c. Refer the report to committee; or
- d. Immediately form a Committee of the Whole to hold limited discussions of the matter."

Dr. Fatemi opposed the proposal if its intent was to limit consideration of committee reports and reduce opportunity to amend, etc. Dr. Gerlach, as a former member of the Procedural Committee, said he was one who objected also, as he thought each issue should be decided in Council as it arises, and that if Council could not amend a proposal it would be donning both a muzzle and a straightjacket.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 5/17/73

Dr. Rich, not claiming necessarily to speak for all the Procedural Committee, said that the Committee was on the horns of a dilemma, with the necessity to expedite the business of Council without going over every statement word by word. He stated that there was no intention to muzzle, but to confine the business of Council to substantive matters without getting bogged down in the "shall and will" bit. He reminded Council that the agenda every month repeats "Old Business" items which are never completed.

Further opinions included the advocating of having democratic interchange of ideas and statements on the floor of Council, and the opposite view of the importance of refashioning statements in the Committee of the Whole so that they could be more readily adopted by Council, the Chair reaffirming this latter interpretation. Dr. Coe argued that no legislative body could abandon its right to amend proposals and retain its responsible power and duties.

In response to Dr. Jackson's query as to whether this ought to be a Bylaw change, the Vice President for Academic Affairs stated that it was not, and could be only a matter of procedure.

The motion to adopt the proposal on procedure for considering reports of standing or ad hoc committees was put to a vote and failed.

Mr. Moldea then asked for a clarification of the action of the Procedural Committee in naming only two of the list of students he had submitted on the Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Concept of a University Ombudsman, particularly since the other two students (four students and four faculty were named to the committee) had not been cleared with him. He went into considerable detail regarding his interpretation of his responsibility in this regard, and referred to the "Amended Report of the Procedural Committee" which was circulated to Council on April 26 and which he read as follows:

"The Procedural Committee met on Tuesday, April 24, 1973 at 8:00 a. m. in President Guzzetta's office. Present were: Elizabeth Hittle, Dick Rich, Charles Wilson, Noel Leathers, and D. J. Guzzetta.

"In accordance with University Council action of March 15, 1973(AU Chronicle, April 2, 1973, pp. 14-15) the following appointments to the ad hoc Committee for the University Ombudsmen:

Faculty:	John P. Finan Allen G. Noble Isobel Pfeiffer Howard Taylor
Students:	Kathy Kozar Jim Macak Beverly Tucker [later declined] Tramontte Watts
Resource Person:	C. V. Blair (ex officio)"

When Mr. Moldea challenged the report, Dr. Leathers told Council that it was circulated to bring Council up to date on Procedural Committee actions. Mr. Switzer called the students' attention to the fact that the original motion in Council on March 15 had provided for an ad hoc committee "with equal

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, REGULAR MEETING, 5/17/73

number of faculty and student members." Dr. Leathers said that the Procedural Committee had acted in accordance with its mandate and Mr. Moldea's objections would be noted.

Dr. Gerlach asked Dr. Rich to move that Council accept the report since it had never been accepted, only distributed.

Dr. Leathers added that some people were not available to serve when the Procedural Committee had checked the ASG suggestions. He also responded to Mr. Davis' allegation that students on Council were bypassed by reminding him that the elected student members of Council had had no say in this, since Mr. Moldea had acted on his own, yet was questioning the judgment of the Procedural Committee which was not obligated to simply accept suggested nominees from any group or individual.

At this juncture Mr. Moldea implied that the Procedural Committee should not have chosen as a substitute (vice Miss Tucker who had declined) member of the ad hoc Committee, a cheerleader since in his opinion she might not have any background for this committee role. His implied criticism was not well received by Council members. Dr. Leathers noted that Mr. Moldea had voiced his personal concerns, and that it would be unnecessary for him to continue.

When Mr. Kerr inquired about the source of the other additional names, the Chair ruled the question out of order with the suggestion that he could request to attend a Procedural Committee meeting and ask.

Because of the lateness of the hour the Chair entertained a motion to adjourn.

Dr. Jackson moved that the meeting be adjourned until next Thursday, May 24, 1973 at 3 p. m. in Business Administration-Law 307, and that Council continue to meet each Thursday for the rest of the quarter until all outstanding business is completed. The motion was seconded and put to a vote and carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p. m.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, May 24, 1973

The adjourned regular meeting of the University Council (from May 17, 1973) was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, May 24, 1973, in Business Administration-Law Building 307.

Fifty of the 64 members of Council were present. Those who were absent with notice were Dr. G. Atwood, Dr. H. K. Barker, Dean R. L. Hansford, Dr. Paul Hayes, Mr. Frank Rogacs, and Mr. J. Switzer. Others absent were Dr. L. Anderson, Mr. M. Briner, Mr. Al Farris, Mr. Don Jenkins, Dr. C. J. Major, Dr. R. P. Merrix, Mr. A. R. Pollock and Dean S. A. Samad.

Since the Day and Evening Student Government elections had been completed since last Thursday, Dr. Leathers introduced all eight new student members of Council: from day Associated Student Government—Mr. Earl Kerr, Mr. Eddy Corneille, Miss Sue Traub, Mr. Bill Rostan; from Evening Student Council—Mr. Frank Rogacs (continuing member, and who was absent due to an industrial accident today) and Mr. Leon Ridley; Student Bar Association—Mr. John Thatcher; Graduate Student Council—Mr. Al Farris (absent).

Dr. Leathers announced that this meeting was to continue, as stipulated at the conclusion of the May 17 session, with the unfinished agenda, specifically the Reports of the Standing Committees.

Dr. Rich moved that the report of the Procedural Committee previously given be adopted. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach took exception to this motion as being premature. He said that the second half of the Procedural Committee Amended Report of April 26, 1973 had not been considered by Council, which he read as follows:

"The Procedural Committee also considered (at its meeting of April 24, 1973) a complaint from the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences concerning the eligibility for nomination to University Council. It was the Procedural Committee's decision that faculty members who are not to be present for the 1973-74 academic year are not eligible for nomination to University Council, but that they are entitled to vote in elections. The Election Tellers Chairperson of the Buchtel College was no notified on April 24, 1973."

He advocated the Council's rejection of this statement as he felt it did not coincide with the Bylaws, Article IV. Section c, and that furthermore there was no provision for absence or illness next fall of those elected now for the ensuing academic year.

Dr. Fatemi speaking in opposition to the Committee action referred to Bylaws Article VI. Section e, which he said stated that the Procedural Committee "shall listen to any complaints regarding election of members to Council and may make any recommendation concerning these complaints to Council." This indicated that the Procedural Committee, in his judgment, was not a governing body, but a referral agency to Council, and this action of the Committee on April 24 exceeded its authority.

The motion to accept the report of the Procedural Committee of April 26, 1973 was put to a vote and failed.

There was no report for the Executive Committee.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

Speaking for the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee, Dr. Poston presented the report presently circulated to Council, dated May 17, 1973. He suggested that the first two items did not require action, but were presented for information. They were:

1. It is suggested that there be an increase in the production budget, and an increase in the number of personnel involved in TV production, as well as the hiring and training of qualified proctors.
2. If we are to continue closed-circuit television instruction, we should go to color production, insofar as budgetary conditions will permit.

The third recommendation would require action, and he moved that Council approve it, to be effective immediately (for implementation in summer 1973):

3. The following substitutes to be accepted as fulfilling The University of Akron English course requirements for students transferring to the University from other institutions, effective immediately upon adoption by University Council:

<u>Quarter System Transfer</u>	<u>Remaining University of Akron English Requirement (s)</u>
3 three credit courses	Completed
2 three credit courses	Must take 110:205
1 three credit course	Must take 110:112, 205
<u>Semester System Transfer</u>	<u>Remaining University of Akron English Requirements (2)</u>
2 three credit courses	Completed
1 three credit course	Must take 110:112, 205

The motion to accept part three was seconded and carried.

Dr. Zangrando asked for additional information about Items 1 and 2. Dr. Poston explained that they represented the Committee's endorsement of upgrading the quality of the television courses, as well as the necessity to have more proctors provided and the apparent advantages of color television, especially for certain science courses.

Because he was a new member of Council, Dr. Zangrando inquired what the powers of Council are concerning such recommendations. Dr. Leathers replied that the Council was considering reports of its Standing Committees and could discuss, ratify as well as make suggestions if it appeared desirable. In the instance of the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee, the group had held hearings and made studies of the TV situation and spent long hours in its deliberations prior to making the report.

Dr. Jackson thought that the reason for referring this matter to the Academic Policies Committee was for assembling data, and he thought the Council should be provided with the details about color TV, and live TV presentations, etc., before being expected to make a decision concerning implementation of the recommendation.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

Dr. Poston said it was estimated that it would cost in the neighborhood of \$500,000 to install color television on campus. The present equipment is considered obsolete and could cost as much as \$100,000 to replace in black and white. He said the students deserve quality productions, but there are also budgetary considerations in the decision. Studies of costs in 1971-72 indicated that direct classroom instruction cost ratio to TV instruction was 1 to 7. The savings are significant enough to encourage a quality TV presentation.

In response to a question, the Chair responded that Council's approval of these items would not authorize the expenditure. Curriculum, teaching methodology and academic matters, etc., are within the Council's purview he observed but not the budgetary decisions. He said that if the University continues with TV as a method of instruction, we must expect to improve its quality. If Council endorses this report, it would indicate support of the committee's recommendation to upgrade the operation, and then the administration should look into these aspects and seek to implement the decisions of Council. He mentioned that installation of color would necessitate a new color studio, new receiver sets over the campus, etc. Carrels in the new Library are presently planned for color. In addition some provision should be made on campus in buildings where science courses are especially benefited by color presentation for such reception as well as transmission. In some other instances black and white receivers might be continued.

Dr. Noble observed that although it had been indicated that no vote was necessary on Items 1 and 2, he advocated a thorough study of facts and figures be made relative to color versus black and white TV, both financial and teaching efficiency.

Mr. Jamison moved that Items 1 and 2 be referred back to committee. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Poston asked what information Council expected further, as the committee had such extensive material it would be helpful to know specifically what Council wished to have.

Mr. Kerr thought that these items were part of the General Studies report, and he wondered why they had been excerpted and the large report hadn't been considered yet.

Dr. Poston and the Chair agreed that the reason was that the University Council had recommended that the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee pay immediate attention to seven items from the General Studies Report, and six of these are included here. The seventh is not yet ready for presentation.

Dr. Gerlach urged that the report not be sent back to committee as he said he had been on the committee and they had not been told any more than Council, and there were no more concrete figures than those already presented today. He felt that the committee could not try any harder.

Dr. Hart said he believed that the Council had all the general facts that the Committee had, and the Committee cannot decide about color as it is a financial decision, and it cannot know whether the money would be better allocated to color TV, or TV, or for money for the Library for that matter.

Dr. Brittain asked on what basis the Committee made these suggestions if no budget figures were available to them.

Dr. Poston reiterated the 7 to 1 ratio he had explained before and said the committee had made a lengthy study of TV costs and comparative savings. The significant savings of TV instruction over classroom instruction had been passed back to departmental budgets. He said, however, there was a strong recommendation for improvement in the quality of TV instruction.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

The motion to refer Items 1 and 2 back to committee was put to a vote and failed 15 to 25.

Dr. Poston then moved that Item 4 be approved. It was seconded. This item provided that The Introduction to Ballet, 780:124 not be accepted as a substitute for Physical Education. He stated the recommendation had the approval of both of the departments concerned. Item 4 was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Poston moved the acceptance of Item 5: "Any one quarter of mathematics or logic course to be considered as a suitable option for Numbers Communication, effective with fall quarter 1973." The motion was seconded.

Dr. Beyer asked why there was such looseness in the option, with no specification as to hours, and what was meant by "logic".

The President left the Council at this point, 3:30 p. m. , for another meeting.

Dr. Poston said that "logic" had been added in a subcommittee and accepted by the parent committee later. Originally the recommendation had said, "any one quarter of mathematics".

Dean Rogers added that the purpose was to give more latitude and to satisfy the members of the Department of Philosophy.

Dr. Beyer pointed out that even if this would be a four hour replacement, there were math courses at various levels, including C & T, Developmental Studies, etc. , as well as in Arts and Sciences. Dr. Oetjen observed that in addition there were new programs being developed, all of which would require further consideration, he therefore moved to refer Item 5 back to committee so that these problems and others may be faced and resolved. The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Poston moved that Item 6 be approved. It read: "Instead of a letter grade, Senior Seminar students to be awarded a 'credit' or 'no credit' grade, effective with fall quarter 1973." The motion was seconded.

It was noted that no option was provided. If credit is given it means a minimum of "C", otherwise the course would have to be repeated. Opinions differed as to the demand for this "credit" "no credit" provision, with Mr. Kerr stating that he believed that many students wanted the two-hour "A". Dean Dunlap observed that many students decry the prevalence of Cs and Ds in the course, and suggested that Senior Seminar was not an automatic A grade.

Dr. Taylor wondered if the committee had considered an option in this case. Mr. Kerr felt this suggestion had merit, as did Mr. Rostan.

Dr. Lively strongly opposed the proposal of "credit" "no credit" as having no justification in what was supposedly the capstone course in General Studies. He felt that it was common supposition that students enrolled with that proviso do not do as good work, in fact it is routinely one letter grade below their usual performance. It is also difficult to evaluate transcripts, he stated, and these are automatically classified as "C" by his office, which is a disservice to those entering Graduate School.

Dr. Sumner presented some background for the discussion and commented that he thought it difficult to grade the Senior Seminar courses because of the latitude given to the instructors and the student leaders and in presentation of varied course content.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

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

Dr. Poston then presented the recommendation on Transfer Credit which had been approved in concept earlier this spring and referred to the Reference Committee for editing and clarification of wording. He moved the acceptance of the present wording. The motion was seconded and carried. It reads as follows:

Transfer Credit

Course work taken at an institution of higher education in the United States of America which:

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

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, other than General Studies, 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 which has a "B", "C", or "I" listing in the AACRAO Report of Credit Given, 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. Zangrando asked that Council business be returned to Items 1 and 2, moving that they be approved since he felt that there had been no substantive action taken. Although he confessed real reservations about the \$500,000 cost, he stated that he realized that Council could not act on the budget, but that it could endorse the recommendation.

Dr. Noble considered this recommendation an excellent example of the point made earlier that budget decisions cannot be separated from those that are academic. He said that when graduate faculty had met earlier today, there was discussion of earlier Council action, concerning the moratorium

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

on curricular changes. He suggested that the Council look at the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee's responsibilities to ascertain if they had too much work and too little time to do it in. He observed that perhaps specialized committees might be ineffective. He thought also that the Committee should work more closely with the budget-making policy body.

Dr. Hart observed that budgetary concerns had come up at the meeting of the Academic Policies Committee, but they had decided to make only academic recommendations to Council. He felt that Council should have a budget committee or perhaps the present Budget Committee should be stronger than it is.

Mr. Rostan questioned the concept of color versus black and white TV. It was his belief that attendance at TV classes was low, and he thought it would be a wasteful investment to install color.

It was Dr. Fatemi's suggestion that Council would approve Item 1, but he thought Item 2 might be divided, to determine if Council wanted to continue TV, and then vote regarding installation of color. He thought the Budget Committee should implement priorities assigned by the Academic Policies Committee. He thought it meaningless to vote when there seemed to be no documentation as to costs.

The motion to approve Items 1 and 2 was put to a vote and failed 17 to 19.

There was no report from the Athletics Committee. The Secretary of Council stated that Dr. Crabtree, Chairman of the Campus Facilities and Planning Committee, had sent his report to him by campus mail, but it had not yet arrived and could not be reported. There were no specific recommendations however.

As chairman of the Committee on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities, Dr. Jackson read the following report: "The Committee recommends that all department or division Guidelines for Promotion, Tenure, Retention and Initial Appointments be revised, wherever necessary, so that they at least meet the minimum standards adopted by University Council on April 26, 1973. Copies of the revised documents should be forwarded to the Vice President for Academic Affairs no later than October 31, 1973." He moved adoption of the statement. The motion was seconded.

For the benefit of newcomers, Dr. Leathers explained that a year ago the Committee had been requested by Council to draw up such guidelines and all departments and collegiate units had been asked to draw theirs up in conformity. When he was asked when these would be in effect, the Chair replied, "I'd hope as soon as possible. They would really be in effect when submitted."

The motion to adopt the above recommendation was put to a vote and carried.

In response to a question from Dr. Stuyvesant the Secretary of Council, Dr. Roger Keller, read a communication dated May 9, 1973 to President Guzzetta, from the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee and signed by the Chairman, D. L. Jackson, with copies to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Secretary of Council, on the subject of "Case of Complaint by Dr. Zecchini." It read: "Following the procedures adopted by University Council the Committee held a Hearing on April 21, 1973 and forwarded recommendations to the parties concerned. Since the stated period of two weeks has elapsed and the recommendations of the Committee have not been adopted, the Committee has, at its meeting of May 8, 1973, instructed me to follow the procedures and send copies of the recommendations to you, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Secretary of University Council."

Dr. Stuyvesant asked the Chair if the report could be read to Council.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

Dr. Fatemi asked if the faculty member concerned had agreed to the publication of the report, and Dr. Stuyvesant said that he had his consent in written form.

In answer to a query concerning procedures, the Chair said that as a Standing Committee, the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee can report to Council.

Dr. Jackson averred that the Committee had followed the procedures and now the report was in the hands of the Council Secretary.

Dr. Gerlach said the report in his opinion could be filed, could be read, or included in the minutes or passed over, at the will of Council.

Dr. Stuyvesant moved that the entire report be read. The motion was seconded.

Dr. Poston asked that the written statement of permission by the faculty member be sent to the Chair.

The Chair then read the following statement dated May 23, 1973: "TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I hereby authorize the University Council to consider the written report dated April 24, 1973 of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights, and Responsibilities Committee of the University Council", signed by Giorgio Zecchini, Department of Modern Languages, University of Akron.

Vice President Leathers cautioned the Council that it is a very serious situation and that the grievance had been heard by the Faculty Well-Being Committee, but that by filing, confidentiality could be maintained. He asked, "Do you as members of University Council want to hear details of grievances of faculty members?"

Miss Tovey inquired whether the signature on the permission statement had been witnessed. It had not.

Dr. Keller stated that he was reluctant to read the report as he had been given only a xerox copy of the report and it was not signed by anyone.

Dr. Fatemi observed that details of such cases usually appear in the Buchtelite as well as the Beacon Journal, and he felt that Council should be privy to such details also. He deplored what he called the "lack of cooperation" from the administration on the matter. To have an effective grievance committee, he observed, Council must take responsibility to consider cases of its committee. Situations should be settled on the campus without the need of expensive court costs he felt. He said many people voted against the committee action earlier on the basis of insufficient information but now they can have the facts, and they should hear them.

Dr. Poston told Council that it was his understanding that the case has now been filed for legal proceedings, and that Council should be sure of its stand, and should have a witnessed signature of the faculty member and a signed committee report.

Dr. Gerlach doubted any need to be fearful or that Council had any legal responsibility.

Dr. Poston insisted that there could be instances for legal recourse.

Dr. Hart agreed with Dr. Gerlach and thought that Council just wanted evidence.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

With the hour getting late, Dr. Leathers asked Council if they wanted to hear the report or not. The vote to hear the report was 21 in favor and 11 opposed.

Dr. MacGregor wanted Dr. Jackson to sign the report in front of Council, as Chairman of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Dr. Fatemi said there was no need for him to sign, and his voice of approval could be on the tape recording Council minutes. Dr. Leathers asked Dr. Jackson if he verified the report which Dr. Keller had. He said he did.

The Secretary of Council then read the report. (It is printed in the Appendix of these minutes elsewhere in this issue of AU Chronicle.)

At the conclusion, the Chair announced that Council had heard the report and asked, "Does Council accept it?"

In answer to Dr. Hart's query as to what "acceptance" meant, Dr. Leathers said that Council could accept it and recommend its acceptance by the administration.

Dr. Stuyvesant wondered what Council would do with the report.

Dr. Gerlach thought that if Council approved, it would indicate that the Committee was correct and that the Administration had erred. It would test what response Council would get and show the strength of Council on the campus.

Dr. Zangrando asked that the vote be by secret ballot.

Dr. Fatemi noted that Dr. Zecchini has already received a letter from the Board that his contract is terminated this June.

Dr. Leathers confirmed that the Board had acted and that there is legal suit pending and Dr. Zecchini has employed legal counsel.

Dr. Fatemi asked if there was no room for change by the administration. Otherwise why vote.

Mr. Edminister took issue with Dr. Gerlach on his interpretation that the vote would make the Committee's report correct. The vote is only to accept the report or not. But Dr. Fatemi thought it should mean to endorse.

Dr. Gerlach expressed his philosophy that they should deal with optimism as human beings and that they might change, even the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Poston pointed out that in his opinion, during litigation the administration could not change.

The Chair announced that on the secret ballot, a vote "yes" meant to accept the report. Dr. Gerlach and Dr. Keller counted the votes which resulted in 24 "yes", 17 "no", and 3 abstentions.

Dr. Lively, as chairman of the Library and Learning Resources Committee, reported two items from their last meeting. The committee had supported the stand of the University Librarian in maintaining the regulations for the use of the third floor lounge and graduate study area rejecting a petition

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

from law students for permission to use the graduate faculty study area of the new Library. The Committee had broadened its statement about the use of the Lucius Bierce name in the new Library by revising "the earlier resolution to indicate that Mr. Bierce's name should be used in the new Library, at least for the Archives, but in another way if desired. It was understood that if the Bierce name is used for a larger area designation or the Library as a whole, then it will not be used for the Archives." He moved the acceptance of the report.

Mr. Thatcher, president of the Student Bar Association, asked about the ruling. Dr. Lively explained that the law students have their own law library and study areas and that there are only 36 seats in the new Library for 2,100 graduate students plus faculty on the campus, and that the University Librarian saw no merit in adding 600 more possible applicants for the area. If this were done he observed then there would be no reason to maintain any of the specially assigned facilities which are important to particular programs. Mr. Thatcher threatened to appeal the ruling, claiming he was a graduate student. Dr. Lively reminded him that the Ohio Board of Regents distinguishes between graduate and professional students.

The motion to approve the report of the Library and Learning Resources Committee was put to a vote and carried.

On behalf of the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee, Dr. Lively reported to Council that "it held its third allocation session during the 1972-73 year on May 4, 1973, hearing 23 requests for support for research projects for the summer 1973. Two proposals were considered as beyond the province of the Committee and three were not supported for various reasons. The 18 which received funding are identified by name of proposer and amount of dollars awarded. A total of \$2,184.25 remains in the Committee's budget and will be carried over to next year." (The report is included in the Appendix to these minutes elsewhere in the same issue of the AU Chronicle.) He moved the adoption of report of the committee, with the understanding that the research funding section of the report was by title only. The motion was seconded and carried.

In the absence of Dean Hansford, Dr. Keller read the report of the Student Affairs Committee as follows:

"The Student Affairs Committee met on Friday, May 11, 1973.

"The committee accepted the report of the chairman of the Awards, Scholarships, Grants and Loans Subcommittee, who informed the group that a supplemental allocation of \$60,000 for the College Work Study Program had been received, which made it possible to restore the program to the place it was in January when it had to be suspended; that this year 1350 students have benefited through the Ohio Instructional Grant Program in the amount of \$475,000; and the 1973-74 guidelines for this program have been relaxed so that students whose families have a gross income of \$14,000 after taxes could qualify, and the maximum grant per student has been increased from \$510 to \$570. He also reported that the total financial aid for 5200 students for 1972-73 through Federal, State and local programs including campus employment amounts to better than \$3 million, and that the University had not been notified as yet of the 1973-74 allocations for Federal aid programs to students.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/24/73

"The committee accepted the report of the chairman of the Extracurricular Activities Subcommittee, which included recommending recognition of three groups: Young, Gifted and Black, a choral group; The Black Scholar, the principal purpose of which is to assist Black students to gain an education that will provide a meaningful definition of Black existence; and the Residence Hall Program Board.

"I recommend acceptance of this report and the granting of University recognition to the groups referred to above."

The motion, as put by Dr. Keller for Dean Hansford, was seconded and carried.

Dr. Jackson asked for a report on the Task Force Committee, and the Chair called Upon Dr. Watt, who said that Mr. Blair had attended a meeting of the Personnel Task Force in Columbus the day before. The new Ad Hoc Committee appointed by President Guzzetta, under Dr. Watt's chairmanship, could not meet before this state meeting. Dr. Watt said that the deadline for the end of June for the statewide report will probably remain. However, he expects that the Ad Hoc Committee will meet before next Thursday, and a report can be made to Council.

The next item on the agenda was the Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. The Chair, because of the lateness of the hour, asked Council whether it wished to hear it that day or to meet the following Thursday to continue the agenda. Dr. Fatemi suggested that he not give his report today, as it was duplicated and had been passed out to Council and could appear in the AU Chronicle.

The Council vote to continue the agenda of the May 17, 1973 meeting from today to Thursday, May 31, 1973, at 3 p. m. in Business Administration-Law 307.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p. m.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, May 31, 1973

The adjourned regular meeting of the University Council (from May 17 and 24, 1973) was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:05 p. m. on Thursday, May 31, 1973, in Business Administration-Law Building 307.

Fifty-two of the 64 members of Council were present. Those who were absent with notice were Dr. D. J. Guzzetta and Mr. J. Switzer. Others absent were Mr. R. Adams, Mr. E. Corneille, Mr. A. Farris, Mrs. L. Farris, Dr. R. P. Merrix, Dr. Al Noble, Mr. A. Pollock, Mr. R. Rogacs, and Mr. J. Thatcher. [Buchtel College today voted to hold another election for one of its representatives.]

As determined at the May 24 meeting, the business on May 31 would continue with Item 11 of the May 17 agenda. Accordingly, Dr. Leathers called upon the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, Dr. Fatemi. He stated that last week he had circulated copies of the report of the meeting of May 17 in Columbus, and today he circulated copies of the report of the meeting on May 24, 1973 attended by the Akron alternate, Professor Blin Scatterday. Although both reports will be included in the June issue of the AU Chronicle, he touched on several items and read the following from the section on "Task Forces":

1. The campus representatives on the Task Force (Mangement Improvement) would seek reactions to the manual by meetings with the faculty on the respective campuses, with June 30 draft of the manual.
2. A copy of the manual would be supplied to all presidents for their reaction.
3. Copies of the manual would be supplied to all members of the Advisory Committee to the Chancellor for their reactions.

Dr. Fatemi said that Dr. Watt, as chairman of the Akron campus coordinating committee (of the five Task Forces), was in the process of drafting a statement and he urged the faculty to read copies of the manual and forward any comments or suggestions to the committee. The Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor will meet again with Mr. Coulter on June 24, and with Dr. Norton, the new Chancellor shortly after he takes office July 1. He directed attention to ramifications and possible dangers to retirement and sick benefits in some of the provisions of the pending H.B. 86. Any reactions should be communicated to him by June 15.

Dr. Leathers added that he had been reading this manual, and that Dr. Watt would send notices out that copies would be available for perusing in the Deans' offices, and in the Library (per Mr. Schrank). He said that it is the purpose of our Coordinating Committee to consolidate the University's position and to be consistent and uniform for all our agencies. There can be serious implications in the provisions.

The next item on the agenda was the report of the Akron Representative on the Ohio Faculty Senate. Since Dr. Merrix was not present, in his behalf Dr. Hart noted that Ohio State University has recently joined the Senate, following Cincinnati which had been among the last to affiliate earlier this year. The Chair thanked him for the information.

The Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider a University Faculty Senate was designated for next consideration. Dr. James Richardson, former member of Council and at that time authorized to make the report, is now no longer a member of that body, and had not been specifically sanctioned by the Procedural Committee to speak today. Following a discussion as to the legality of the assignment

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/31/73

Dr. Gerlach thought that the phrase, "representing each degree-granting College" should be deleted since it does not appear in Article VI of the Bylaws stipulating membership requirements, as pointed out by Dr. Jackson. Dr. Leathers felt that the phrase could be enclosed in brackets and he expressed doubt as to whether this would be "legislating" a bylaw or stating a policy.

Dean Dunlap in an effort to add clarity for future interpretation, moved to add the word, "policy", after the word, "initiate" in the second sentence of the statement on Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee. The motion was seconded. Dr. Jackson took exception as eliminating reference to fact. Dr. Fatemi also objected on the basis of confusion and weakening the assumption of procedures which have been employed.

Dr. Leathers expressed the view that the first two sentences are specific while the third is broad. Dr. Jackson opined that the original provision was specific.

In a compromise move, Dr. Dunlap accepted the addition of "and procedural", and the amended phrase was put to a vote and carried. The statement describing the functions of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee now reads:

"Reviews grievances of faculty members after the normal channels have been exhausted. After review, makes recommendations to University Council. May also initiate policy and procedural recommendations concerning faculty assessment or evaluation, appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, and matters of faculty well-being (insurance, pensions, leaves, rights and responsibilities).

"[Membership is limited to tenured teaching faculty (representing each degree-granting College) and tenured librarians.]"

Regarding the Athletics Committee, Mr. Rostan felt that many athletes consider that minor sports are overlooked on this campus while the larger sports receive a disproportionate amount of financial support. He moved that the following sentence be added to the end of the last paragraph describing the functions of the Athletics Committee: "Review the allocation of funds to each of the various sports and other athletic programs." The motion was seconded.

Dean Petry, who has served on the Athletics Committee for 20 years, said that for the last few years the budget has been part of the College of Education budget and not of the Department of Athletics, and therefore the Athletics Committee has not been involved.

The motion was put to a vote and carried.

The Chair then asked if Council was ready to vote on the total Statement on Functions of Council Standing Committees. Dr. Gerlach inquired whether their approval should await the adoption of the Faculty Manual, for ensuring conformity, or whether it should be vice versa.

Advocating the passage of the Statement and then its incorporation in the Faculty Manual, Dr. Fatemi asked the Chair if these functions would have to go to the Trustees. It was Dr. Leathers' assumption that there was here no conflict with Board Bylaws, and that it would be helpful to have the Functions Statement available when the standing committees are appointed for the ensuing academic year.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING, 5/31/73

Dr. Fatemi moved the immediate adoption of the Statement of Functions of the Standing Committees of University Council subject to resolution of any legal conflict. The motion was seconded and carried. (This Statement appears elsewhere in this issue of the AU Chronicle.)

The Chair then turned to the last item under "Old Business"—the Faculty Manual. He informed the Council's new members that this document had been completed last November by a hard-working committee chaired by Dr. E. W. Hanten, and consisting of Mr. Donald Becker, Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter, Dr. Walden Crabtree, Dr. Carl Lieberman, Dean W. A. Rogers and Dr. Donald Thorn. At the last consideration, the Council had finished page 3 of the document.

Dr. Poston reminded the Council that its new members might not have received the document. The Academic Vice President promised to get copies for distribution, and that some would be available in his office by next Tuesday.

If this subject could not therefore be discussed today, Dr. Hart asked that Council proceed with "New Business".

Dr. Gerlach asked for the floor and moved that the Faculty Manual consideration be postponed to another meeting to be called by the Procedural Committee, after the new members of Council had received their copies, to consider the Faculty Manual and any other business which may come before the Council.

The Chair asked when the intent was to have such a meeting. Dr. Gerlach said that unless it was the desire of the body to specify he thought it best to leave room for the Procedural Committee to act. His reason, he stated, was that he assumed that copies would be available somewhere.

The Chair said he would direct that copies be duplicated and be made available since additional copies were not presently available.

Dean Lively said that in response to Dr. Gerlach's specification he wished to test the sentiment of Council by moving that Council adjourn until the regular meeting in October. The motion to adjourn was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach questioned whether the motion of Dean Lively was out of order since the body might be called into special session during the summer by the duly constituted authorities.

The Chair replied that there was nothing in the motion specifying that a special call would not be made.

Dr. Jackson asked for a point of information, and wondered whether Dr. Gerlach had intended to specify that a meeting be held Thursday, June 7, 1973.

Dr. Fatemi raised a point of order and stated that Dr. Lively's motion to adjourn could not be considered an amendment to Dr. Gerlach's motion since Dr. Jackson's motion only dealt with one particular item on the agenda.

The Chair replied that Dr. Gerlach's motion was not seconded, and therefore Dean Lively's motion to adjourn took precedence, and he called the question to settle the issue. The (vote) motion to adjourn passed. The Secretary and the Chair differed on counts of hands, one reporting 23, and the other 25 in favor of adjournment, with an agreement of 17 opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p. m.

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTESREPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
Approved by University Council, May 3, 1973Guidelines for Academic Retrenchment Due to Financial Exigency

The University of Akron should dedicate all of its resources to the greatest possible achievement of its educational goals and purposes. Fiscal policy should reflect this commitment. In meeting this commitment, economic conditions may require the University to re-evaluate its priorities and re-allocate limited financial resources.

In situations where curtailment or elimination of educational programs may be necessary for reasons of financial exigency, the following guidelines should be followed:

I. Consultation

Early in the process of making recommendations concerning program reduction, the University President, the Academic Vice President and other appropriate administrators should consult widely with faculty, students and others in the university community. It is especially important that faculty members whose educational programs or positions may be adversely affected have an opportunity to be heard by those who will make the decision.

II. Data and Documentation

The University administration must make every effort to determine and to explain clearly the nature of the fiscal limitations, and within these constraints to establish appropriate educational priorities. Careful documentation of the evidence supporting a faculty reduction recommendation is essential. Appropriate, detailed financial information, student faculty ratios, qualitative program and course evaluations, enrollment data, and other pertinent information should be used to make it clear that there is, in fact, a financial exigency. Except for financial material of a personal nature, this information should be widely shared among the university community.

III. Procedures for Faculty Advice and Review: The Faculty Review Committee

There shall be a Faculty Review Committee to consider, to offer advice and constructive criticism about, and finally to support or oppose, proposals from the University administration concerning academic retrenchment due to financial exigency.

The Faculty Review Committee shall consist of all the elected faculty members then serving on University Council. When there is need for this committee, it may be assembled upon the call of either the University President or any three of its members; when assembled, the Committee will proceed to elect its own Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary. These three Committee officers shall be from three different academic colleges (with the University Library and also each of the three academic divisions of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences being regarded or defined as separate academic colleges for these purposes).

The Advisory Subcommittee will consist of eleven members (with one representative from each academic college, according to the special definition given in the previous paragraph); in addition to the three elected officers of the Faculty Review Committee, eight other persons will be elected from and by the membership of the Faculty Review Committee to serve on this subcommittee. The Advisory Subcommittee as a group may be called upon by the University President for advice and consultation during the formulation of proposals involving academic retrenchment due to financial exigency.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

The Grievance Subcommittee will consist of an appropriate number of members (usually eleven) elected by and from the membership of the Faculty Review Committee; these subcommittee members will elect their own Chairman and Recorder. The Grievance Subcommittee will consider, and may make recommendations to the University President regarding, faculty grievances arising from financial exigency decisions. In times of urgent need, the Grievance Subcommittee may call upon all other members of the Faculty Review Committee for service on the Grievance Subcommittee so that complaints can be considered and dealt with without excessive delay.

IV. Administrative Recommendation and Faculty Review

After the University administration has assembled the pertinent data and documentation, and has prepared its specific recommendation for program reduction, but before it has taken any further action on the matter, it must present its recommendation to the Faculty Review Committee for its consideration.

The Faculty Review Committee, following receipt of the specific recommendation for program reduction from the University President, will consider the matter in the manner it deems most appropriate. It may request of the University administration whatever additional financial and other information it may need, and may hold such hearings as it believes necessary; it must have the full cooperation and support of the University administration in its work.

Within 30 days of the presentation of the recommendation by the University President to the Faculty Review Committee, a full report of the findings of the Committee (including advice, procedural suggestions and general commentary) must be prepared and transmitted to the University President, and also to University Council for information purposes. No final decision in the matter may be made by the University President prior to his receipt of this report from the Faculty Review Committee.

During the regular academic year (from September 16 through the following June 15) the 30 day maximum time interval for preparation of the Committee report must be strictly observed, unless waived by the University President. However, during the summer term (June 16 to September 15), the preparation of the Committee report may require more time but may not be delayed more than 60 days.

If the final decision by the University President is contrary to the advice given him in the report of the Faculty Review Committee, the University President has the obligation to state in detail to University Council the reasons for his actions; he should, in any case, transmit the report of the Faculty Review Committee to the Board of Trustees for its information and consideration.

V. Timing

The University President should provide as much advance notice as possible in making financial exigency decisions. In cases where faculty appointments are to be terminated, timely notice of termination or non-reappointment must be given. In extreme situations, if timely notice cannot be given, financial compensation to the faculty member proportional to the lateness of the notice may be an appropriate substitute for full notice.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

The Advisory Subcommittee may consult with and make appropriate recommendations to the University President regarding items indicated in the preceding paragraph. The Grievance Subcommittee shall consider grievances from those faculty members affected by financial exigency decisions.

VI. Academic Due Process

When program reductions in response to financial exigency involve termination of faculty appointments, special care must be taken to insure fairness and to protect and honor accepted procedures and rights appropriate to a faculty member's tenured or probationary status. Faculty members must have an opportunity to be heard by those who will make the faculty reduction decisions and those decisions must be subject to review by the Academic Vice President, and (upon appeal) by the Grievance Subcommittee, the Faculty Review Committee and the University President. Care should be taken not to confuse termination because of financial exigency with a proceeding that might lead to dismissal for cause.

VII. Procedures for Faculty Reduction in Force (Faculty Release)

A faculty reduction in force (release) should, whenever possible, be treated as a layoff—temporary in nature—not as a termination. However, if an appointment is terminated before the end of the period of appointment, because of financial exigency, or because of the discontinuance of a program of instruction, the released faculty member's place will not be filled by a replacement within a period of two years, unless the released faculty member has been offered reappointment and a reasonable time within which to accept or decline.

Tenured members of the faculty should normally be retained in preference to probationary appointees. This preferential status should include wherever possible an opportunity to transfer or re-adapt to other programs within the department or university. If retention is not possible the university should assume responsibility for assisting the faculty member in securing other employment.

If a faculty member wishes, he may accept early retirement or transfer from full-time to part-time service as an alternative to release in some situations of financial exigency. However, such decisions should be governed by the same guidelines and procedural safeguards as those which result in release.

The following objective criteria shall determine the order in which faculty members are to be released in the event of a necessary faculty reduction in force:

- A. All temporary or part-time faculty within the affected program shall be released before any probationary faculty.
- B. All probationary faculty within the affected program shall be released before any tenured faculty.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

- C. Within any academic program, discipline or other appropriate administrative division, faculty reduction in force (release) should proceed according to seniority within each classification of faculty status (tenured, probationary, temporary, part-time, etc.): The least senior faculty member in terms of length of academic service at the university first, followed by the next least senior, and so on until the most senior faculty member is reached.

In computing seniority, the most pertinent point is the total time of academic service in a full-time faculty capacity at the University of Akron (in any of the ranks of Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor or Professor). Time of service in a particular academic rank, or following tenure, etc., are less important considerations.

- D. 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.

The Faculty Review Committee shall verify that these objective criteria are followed, and shall also consider, through its Grievance Subcommittee, any affected faculty who take exception to the procedures followed in cases involving themselves. The Committee may present its objections, complaints or valid grievances to the University President or University Council for appropriate action.

VIII. Rights and Benefits for Full-time Faculty Members Released Because of Financial Exigency

- A. Before being released from the University, the faculty member should have the right to fill any existing vacancy for which he is qualified, or to transfer to any other college or division or department, or to another branch campus of the University, and to fill any vacancy therein for which he may be qualified. Whenever such a transfer is made, the person would retain any accumulated seniority.
- B. The University should provide retraining possibilities within existing programs to assist any faculty member to meet the necessary qualifications to fill any such vacancy to which he wishes to transfer.
- C. The right to recall to any position (whether a newly created one or a vacancy) for which the individual is qualified must be provided. Recall should be according to seniority—the most senior first, the next most senior next, and so on.
- D. Faculty members who have been released and later recalled should, unless expressly prohibited by law, suffer no loss of benefits (such as annual increments, retirement benefits, sick leave, tenure, etc.), and should be given a reasonable salary increase upon recall.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

E. A faculty member released due to financial exigency should typically receive from the University each of the following, to commence at the time of release:

1. Unemployment benefits, where available;
2. A one-year continuance of his/her University health insurance policy without charge, with the option to continue that policy for an additional year by his/her payment of the University of Akron group rate; and,
3. Supplemental financial awards according to the following scale:

For up to two years of full-time faculty service—
a total of one-half of annual salary.

For two to five years of full-time faculty service—
a total of three-quarters of annual salary.

For five or more years of full-time faculty service—
a total of one full year's salary.

The Faculty Review Committee should verify and oversee these rights and benefits, and, acting through its Grievance Subcommittee, should hear and act upon faculty complaints regarding the availability of these rights and benefits. This Committee should bring valid complaints to the attention of the University Council or the University President for appropriate action.

IX. Salary Adjustments

The above sections do not preclude making revisions in salaries to prevent dismissals of faculty due to financial exigency.

Recommendations for Changes and Additions to Fringe Benefits and University Policy

I. Faculty and Staff Insurance Plan

- A. The Committee urges that the following recommendations be implemented. They have been recommended to the Committee by the faculty both as single items and in response to a questionnaire sent to all faculty members in April 1972. These items have been studied by the Committee and discussed with the appropriate administrative officers during the current year and the two previous years.
- B. The Committee further urges that in the fall quarter of each year representatives of the faculty and administration review fringe benefits, especially those benefits related to medical and major medical insurance.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

C. Items

1. Clarification:

- a. The entire section on faculty insurance in the Faculty Manual should be re-written in order to obtain clarity of information on the entire benefit program, life insurance, liability insurance, long term disability insurance, schedule of benefits in basic hospitalization, eligibility for and coverage of major medical insurance, and emeritus* faculty benefits. Information in tabular form whenever possible or appropriate might aid in clarification.
- b. The office in charge of administering the insurance program and retirement benefits should be named in the manual at the beginning of the appropriate section.
- c. Procedures for filing claims for hospitalization and major medical benefits should be stated in full. If filing procedures change, the faculty and staff should receive written notice.
- d. Coverage for suicide should be specified under the life insurance section. Coverage is expressly forbidden under accidental death and dismemberment insurance.
- e. Surgical benefits shown in the present policy should be brought up to date and should be clearly stated.

2. Additions:

- a. Long term disability coverage should be provided for faculty who have been employed for less than one year. Other faculty are covered by our insurance plan if they have less than five years service, and by the state disability coverage after five or more years of service.
- b. The coverage for out patient laboratory tests should be the same as is provided for X-rays. This would extend coverage to tests performed in doctor's offices and clinics.
- c. Clarification of coverage in emergency rooms and intensive care is needed. These services should be fully covered by insurance.
- d. Therapy should be covered by insurance as long as it is prescribed and supervised by a physician.

*The terms "retired" and "emeritus" need defining.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

- e. Therapy should cover Visual Motor Training when prescribed and supervised by a physician. This type of therapy should be specified in the policy as covered.
- f. Maternity and obstetrical benefits should be extended to cover for single dependents, premature birth, interrupted pregnancies and sterilization.
- g. Adopted children (including those with disabilities present before adoption) should be covered by insurance as is a natural child.
- h. Life insurance coverage should be reduced according to schedule starting on the date of retirement and not on the 65th birthday. Faculty members do not retire on the 65th birthday.
- i. Coverage of dental care and surgery performed in dentists' offices and clinics and prescription drugs should be implemented as soon as possible.

II. Professional Liability Insurance

This coverage was also requested by the faculty in April 1972. Revised information should be obtained to draw up a draft policy and the Committee will circularize the faculty to ascertain their needs in this area.

III. Sick Leave Policy

- A. The University should assume the responsibility of furnishing and scheduling a substitute and paying this person directly so that an ill or disabled faculty member no longer has the responsibility to arrange such matters. The salary of a substitute should be entirely separate from the salary paid to the ill or disabled faculty member.
- B. The University should investigate the feasibility of obtaining insurance coverage to provide 78 percent of salary for a three month period for faculty in the first year of service, and after one year of service, for a maximum of twelve months. Retirement and health insurance benefits should be maintained during this period.

IV. Leave Policy

The present University policy on study leaves, or reassignment, should be clarified and included in the Faculty Manual.

V. Tenure

University tenure policies should be clarified in regard to the probationary period and prior service at other institutions; such service should be evaluated at the discretion of the department.

VI. Summer Session

A statement about the policy, class schedules, salary schedule, and other operations for Summer Sessions should be included in the Faculty Manual.

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

VII. Overload

The practice of overload should be reviewed and a firm policy established.

Submitted by the:

19 April 1973

Faculty Wellbeing, Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Ruth Clinefelter
Joseph Edminister
Paul Hayes
Dale Jackson, Chairman
Joseph Lentini

Marvin Moore
Howard Taylor
Evelyn Tovey
Wallace Sterling
Charles Wilson

APPENDIX, continued

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELL-BEING, RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES CONCERNING GRIEVANCE CASE OF DR. GIORGIO ZECCHINI, as read at meeting of University Council on May 24, 1973:

May 23, 1973

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

I hereby authorize the University Council to consider the written report dated April 24, 1973 of the Faculty Well-being, Rights, and Responsibilities Committee of the University Council.

/s/
Giorgio Zecchini
Department of Modern Languages
University of Akron

To: Dr. Noel Leathers
Vice President for Academic Affairs

Date: Feb. 14, 1973

From: Dale Jackson
Chairman, FWRR Committee

Subject: Zecchini case

The Committee has discussed this case and, in an attempt at conciliation, makes suggestions as attached.

Faculty Rights, Responsibilities and Well Being Committee:
Recommendation Concerning Dr. Giorgio Zecchini

In February 1972, Dr. Zecchini was involved in an incident which led to the preparation of a University police report, and Dr. Zecchini was called to a meeting with his college dean and the interim Academic Vice President. Shortly thereafter and not entirely voluntarily, he submitted a resignation from his position at the University. Subsequently, he asked that the resignation be withdrawn, and the FRWR Committee was asked to support that request.

After interviewing the parties concerned it appears to the Committee that at the time of the initial interview with Zecchini and the Administrative Officers, it may have appeared appropriate to suggest his eventual resignation. In retrospect, however, the fact that the woman involved was of mature years, and is now his wife, and that it is not entirely clear what actions took place at the time that the action was not viewed so serious to demand immediate severance from the University, and that he has a good academic reputation among his colleagues and students, appear to mitigate the behavior. Disregarding questions of the actual details, Zecchini is clearly guilty of extremely poor judgement, but the Committee does not consider that the incident requires severance from the University. We do, nevertheless, consider that other sanctions are appropriate in this case and recommend the following:

1. that he be advised that he will receive no increase in salary for a period of two years.
2. that he be advised that he shall not be eligible for promotion in rank for a period of five years.

APPENDIX, continued

FACULTY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE, ZECCHINI CASE - continued

To: Dr. Giorgio Zecchini, Asst. Prof. of Modern Lang. Date: April 24, 1973
Dr. Noel Leathers, Vice President for Academic Affairs

From: Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee of University Council

Subject: Grievance concerning Dr. Giorgio Zecchini and the Administration of The University of Akron: Recommendations following Formal Hearing of April 21, 1973.

Dr. Zecchini was involved in an alleged incident in February 1972 which led to the preparation of a University Security Police report. On the basis of the report, Dr. Zecchini was called to a meeting with his College Dean and the then interim Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

At this meeting Dr. Zecchini was asked to resign. On February 18, 1972 Dr. Zecchini submitted his resignation to be effective June 1973. And on October 1, 1972 he asked to withdraw the resignation (before it was acted upon by the Board of Trustees). On November 15, Dr. Zecchini asked that the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee review the matter and offer what help they could in resolving the problem.

On February 8, 1973, the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee, after interviewing the parties concerned and discussing the problem, issued a preliminary recommendation* and saw that it was transmitted to the University Administration and to Dr. Zecchini. The recommendations were an informal attempt at conciliation between the parties. The recommendations of the Committee were not followed. The President met with the Committee and explained his reasons for submitting Dr. Zecchini's resignation to the Board of Trustees. The resignation was submitted to the Board of Trustees at the March meeting and acted upon although the matter was still pending before the Committee. This was contrary to the grievance procedures passed by University Council under which the Committee operates. Dr. Zecchini asked for a formal hearing. Such a hearing was held April 21 in conformity with Part Four of the Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee procedures as amended and adopted by the University Council on June 8, 1971.

At the hearing of April 21, nine of the ten Committee members attended. Only Dr. Zecchini, his attorney and one witness on his behalf appeared.

Two issues were brought forth during deliberations: 1) Has an employee the right to withdraw a resignation before it is acted upon by the Board of Trustees of the University? 2) Was the alleged conduct of Dr. Zecchini and his fiance (now his wife) so flagrant as to warrant severance or dismissal from the University.

Concerning the first issue, the Committee feels that this is a legal question and one that cannot be answered by the Committee. However, this is not merely an issue of the legality of a resignation. The University has implied certain specific behavior by Dr. Zecchini.

*Two Committee members submitted minority statements.

APPENDIX, continued

FACULTY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE, ZECCHINI CASE - continued

However, during the formal hearing a portion of a medical statement was offered that seemed to refute the most serious allegation that has been implied by an officer of the Administration. At the hearing the Committee members saw for the first time the security report, made available to the Committee by Dr. Zecchini's attorney. Dr. Zecchini disputed the allegations in the security report. As no Administration representatives were present there was no way for the Committee to affirm or deny that report. A copy of a letter from a physician to Dr. Zecchini's wife was made available to the Committee upon request, by his attorney on April 24, 1973.

Since only one side appeared at the hearing although due notices were given and since no evidence was introduced that could cause the Committee to change its position it had taken earlier, it is the judgment of this Committee that the recommendations regarding this case that were made on February 8, 1973 and transmitted to the parties concerned be affirmed.

Approved by the Committee
with two abstentions.
April 24, 1973

To: President Guzzetta Date: May 9, 1973

From: Faculty Wellbeing, Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Subject: Case of Complaint by Dr. Zecchini

Following the procedures adopted by University Council the Committee held a Hearing on April 21, 1973 and forwarded recommendations to the parties concerned. Since the stated period of two weeks has elapsed and the recommendations of the Committee have not been adopted, the Committee has, at its meeting of May 8, 1973, instructed me to follow the procedures and send copies of the recommendations to you, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Secretary of University Council.

For the Committee
/S/
D. L. Jackson, Chairman

cc: Dr. Noel Leathers, Vice President for Academic Affairs
Dr. Charles Wilson, Secretary of University Council

May 14, 1973

To: Dr. Dale Jackson, Chairman, Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities Committee

From: D. J. Guzzetta

This will acknowledge receipt of your memorandum of May 9, 1973 along with a copy of your April 24, 1973 Grievance Memorandum to Dr. Giorgio Zecchini and Dr. Noel Leathers and another copy of an earlier memorandum dated February 14, 1973 to Dr. Noel Leathers on the "Zecchini Case".

As you know, this matter is now in the hands of counsel.

cc: Dr. Noel Leathers, Dr. Charles W. Wilson

APPENDIX, continued

FUNCTIONS OF STANDING (PERMANENT) COMMITTEES* OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL
(As Approved by the University Council, May 31, 1973)Procedural

The functions of this Committee are delineated in the Bylaws of University Council.

Executive

Functions for University Council as necessary. [Members selected by the President in any manner he chooses and as many members as he wishes.]

Meets at the call of the President for consultation, especially at times when it is not possible or feasible to obtain a quorum at a special meeting of University Council, or inconvenient to call the entire Council into session.

Reports at the next regular meeting of Council any major actions taken between meetings.

Appoints a Secretary to keep and distribute minutes and to perform such other tasks as the Committee may designate.

Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar

Reviews curricula and course recommendations of the several Colleges and Divisions and submits them, with recommendations, to University Council for action.

Establishes and interprets policy on various academic matters such as admission, retention, and graduation requirements, etc., when the legislative action of University Council empowers it to do so.

Recommends to University Council changes for the improvement of the academic program of the University.

Considers such items as the mechanics of the academic program, adjustments in admission, retention, and dismissal requirements, changes in the General Bulletin description of academic procedures.

Reviews course changes, proposals, new programs, and recommends such changes and revisions for inclusion in the General Bulletin.

Proposes a calendar for each academic year beginning with the first Summer Session and concluding with the following June Commencement.

*Each Committee has, under Robert's Rules of Order, the discretion to establish and abolish whatever subcommittees it sees fit, and no person who is not a member of a Standing (Permanent) Committee may serve as a member of a subcommittee. It is each Committee Chairman's responsibility to maintain minutes and pass them on to the incoming Chairman.

APPENDIX, continued

FUNCTIONS OF STANDING (PERMANENT) COMMITTEES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, continuedAthletics

Advises on all University activities relating to intercollegiate Athletics. Insures that participants in intercollegiate activities fulfill the academic objectives of the University. Approves team game schedules, participation in postseason events, individual player eligibility, general eligibility rules and seasonal game limitation.

Provides advice and counsel to the Director of Athletics on interpretation of policy and other matters.

Recommends to University Council policy concerning national association and conference affiliations, and other athletic matters.

Makes recommendation to the Dean of the College of Education concerning the employment of coaching personnel.

Coordinates with other Council Committees wherein a joint concern is involved relating to intercollegiate athletics. Reviews the allocation of funds to each of the various sports and other athletic programs.

Campus Facilities Planning

Reviews the construction needs of the University.

Provides faculty and student advice and information for the Planning Department to assist in the establishment of priorities in space needs, to approve changes in present space utilization, and to make recommendations for the use of all facilities.

Reports to University Council and to the President for transmission of recommendations as necessary and appropriate to the Buildings and Grounds Committee of the Board of Trustees.

Faculty Well-Being, Rights and Responsibilities

Reviews grievances of faculty members after the normal channels have been exhausted. After review, makes recommendations to University Council. May also initiate policy and procedural recommendations concerning faculty assessment or evaluation, appointment, retention, tenure, promotion, and matters of faculty well-being (insurance, pensions, leaves, rights and responsibilities).

[Membership is limited to tenured teaching faculty (representing each degree-granting College) and tenured librarians.]

Library and Learning Resources

Serves as an advisory group to the University Librarian to express the faculty will in the growth and development of the academic support which the Library supplies.

Provides the Librarian with guidelines and advice on acquisitions, budget, policy and other matters affecting academic areas.

APPENDIX, continued

FUNCTIONS OF STANDING (PERMANENT) COMMITTEES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, continuedReference

Reviews legislation referred to it by University Council to ascertain if it is drafted properly and does not conflict with existing rules and regulations or practices.

Research (Faculty Projects)

Reviews research proposals submitted by faculty members and grants University funds in support of those proposals deemed worthy.

Recommends the budgeting of sums for the University's support of faculty research proposals to be funded by this Committee.

Establishes policies for funding proposals and guidelines for expenditures of those funded.

Student Affairs

Plans and executes all University assemblies and convocations.

Makes policy, subject to approval of University Council, regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants, and loans to University students.

Proposes regulations concerning all extracurricular activities (except Athletics) to University Council. Recommends to Council the extension of official recognition of student organizations.

APPENDIX, continued

STATEMENT OF STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
(As Approved by the University Council, May 31, 1973)Preamble

The University of Akron exists for the discovery, preservation, transmission and enlargement of knowledge, the pursuit of truth, and the encouragement of intellectual curiosity. Free inquiry and free expression are indispensable to the attainment of these goals. As members of the academic community, students are encouraged to develop the capacity for critical judgment and to engage in the sustained and independent search for truth.

Freedom to teach and freedom to learn are inseparable facets of academic freedom. These freedoms depend upon appropriate opportunities and conditions in the classroom, on the campus and in the larger community. All members of the University community share the right and responsibility to secure and to respect general conditions conducive to enjoyment of these freedoms which are inalienable.

As members of the academic community, students in exercising their freedom have the responsibility of preserving the freedom of others and working for the good of the entire community. The following standards of academic freedom are essential to any community of scholars.

I. Freedom of Access to Education

Within the limits of its facilities, The University of Akron shall be open to all applicants who meet its admission requirements. No applicant will be denied admission on the basis of age, race, creed, sex, national origin or political beliefs. The University of Akron and its colleges shall publish and make available their admission, enrollment, retention, transfer and degree requirements. By enrolling at The University of Akron, the student signifies his willingness to adhere to University rules and regulations pertinent to his status as a student at the University. However, the student shall be free as possible from imposed limitations that have no direct relevance to his education. The University has an obligation to promote the welfare of each of its students and each student has an obligation to promote the welfare of the University.

II. In Academic Matters

At The University of Akron students have both the right and the responsibility to engage in free inquiry and expression when relevant to the subject under discussion. Students are responsible for learning the content of any course of study for which they are enrolled and they shall comport themselves in a mature responsible manner and shall be held responsible for maintaining established standards of academic performance.

Students have the right to expect effective instruction and to have their performance evaluated solely on an academic basis. Students should be informed by each instructor at the beginning of each course of the procedures and standards by which they will be graded. Any student who believes he has been the subject of unfair treatment in the classroom has the right to seek and receive from the instructor the reason for the instructor's action. If the student still questions the fairness of the instructor's action he has the right to appeal in turn to the Head of the Department or Division, and the Dean of the College in which the course is given.

APPENDIX, continued

STATEMENT OF STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

A student should avoid plagiarizing the words or ideas of another; that is, he should not in any written assignment intentionally pass off as his own the words or ideas of another. A student should familiarize himself with the rules for the form of citation applicable to the discipline in which he is writing. A student should avoid aiding or abetting the commission of plagiarism by another student.

The faculty have a responsibility to students that transcends the classroom. Students have a right to expect reasonable access to members of the faculty. Faculty members shall maintain office hours and establish alternate means of communication which are reasonable and convenient both for themselves and for the students whom they teach. Students shall be informed of these arrangements at the beginning of each course of study.

All students are entitled to sound academic advisement and should be provided with competent academic counseling whenever the need arises.

Academic advisement and counseling for the General College and Community and Technical College students shall be conducted by trained counselors in the Office of Student Services and the Evening College Office. Referral will be made to a faculty member for advice in the area of the student's intended major when requested by the student or suggested by the adviser.

Each student in an Upper College or the Graduate School or a Professional School has the right to have an academic adviser who is a faculty member of the Department or School in which the student is enrolled. The student may, upon request, be assigned another adviser by the Head of the Department or by the Dean of the College or School.

The student shall periodically confer with the adviser to review his academic progress and to be informed of those courses which he must complete in order to fulfill the collegiate or school degree requirements. The College or School shall publish and make available its specific requirements.

The advisor or department shall provide information about requirements for graduation and shall advise the student with regard to electives and number of credit hours carried per quarter. With regard to free electives, not stipulated in the degree program, the student shall have freedom of choice.

III. Student Records

The Registrar's Office maintains the official record of the student's academic performance. To minimize the risk of improper disclosure, academic and disciplinary records should be separate, and the conditions of access to each should be set forth in explicit policy statement. Transcripts of academic records shall contain only information about grades and notations of academic status. These statements shall reflect only the student's academic performance and academic action taken by the University. Only when required by law shall a notation of disciplinary action appear on the academic record. These academic records may be examined by the student in the office of the Registrar in the presence of an authorized official of the University.

Copies of the official and unofficial academic records may not be released to persons or organizations outside the University except upon written request of the student. Under exceptional circumstances where the permission of the student cannot be secured, the appropriate University authorities may exercise their discretion in the release of this information.

APPENDIX, continued

STATEMENT OF STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

Information from disciplinary records may be released only upon the written request of the student. Where there is clear and probable danger which might result in loss of life, personal injury or property damage, the appropriate University officers may release this information upon receipt of proper justification from legal or medical authorities without the consent of the student. Provisions shall be made for the periodic destruction of disciplinary records.

Counseling and medical records in the divisions of the Office of Student Services, in the offices of the academic deans and heads of departments may contain applications for admission, records of interview and counseling sessions, psychological test results and evaluations, medical and psychiatric evaluations, copies of correspondence and other data necessary for effective counseling. These records are the property of the University and the information contained therein is held in confidence. No record of conviction in a court of law shall be noted in a student's file unless it is reasonably related to the purposes and necessities of the University.

Except in the case of membership in University-recognized student organizations, no written records shall be kept which reflect the political activities or beliefs of the student. Faculty members and University officials should treat as confidential the information about student views, beliefs and political associations acquired in the course of their work; unless otherwise directed by the student. Where there is clear and probable danger which might result in loss of life, personal injury or property damage, the appropriate University officers may release this information upon receipt of proper justification from legal or medical authorities without the consent of the student.

When faculty members or University officials are asked to evaluate students and alumni in connection with application for employment, admission to graduate and professional schools and for other reasons, they are responsible to the recipient and to the student to be scrupulously honest and fair in their judgment. The listing by a student or alumnus of an office, officer or another member of the University community as a reference is regarded as authorization to furnish a full and frank evaluation.

IV. Student Affairs

A. Freedom of Association, Inquiry, and Expression.

Students are free to organize and join associations to promote their common interest. A student organization which seeks University recognition shall petition the Student Affairs Committee of University Council, whose recommendation shall be voted upon by University Council, by submitting a constitution, bylaws, a statement of purpose, and criteria for membership. Recognition may be granted by the University Council; however, University recognition does not necessarily constitute an endorsement of the expressions of the organization by the University. It should be noted that day undergraduate student organizations shall first petition the Student Senate of the Associated Student Government.

The terms for recognition of a student organization shall include the following:

1. The purpose, objectives, and activities of the proposed organization shall be consistent with the objectives, rules and regulations of the University and with municipal, state and federal law.
2. The organization shall not discriminate on the basis of race, creed, or national origin in the selection of its members or in its programs. Further, there shall not be any discrimination on the basis of sex unless some compelling interest related to the object of the organization can be demonstrated.

APPENDIX, continued

STATEMENT OF STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

3. Each organization shall manage its own finances but shall do so according to the rules and regulations of the University.

4. The organization shall file a list of current officers with Vice President and Dean of Student Services. Membership lists shall not be required.

Upon receiving University recognition, the organization shall seek the consent of a full-time faculty member to serve as its adviser and shall recommend the appointment by the President of the University.

The University Council may suspend or terminate its recognition of a student organization upon evidence of violation of the terms of its recognition, or upon failure of the student organization to adhere to its constitution or bylaws, or upon the recommendation of the appropriate student government unit.

Students and student organizations are free to examine all questions of interest to them and to express opinion publicly and privately. They are free to support causes of their choosing by lawful and orderly means, including peaceful assembly and advocacy. In their public expressions and demonstrations, the students or student organizations have a responsibility to make it known that they do not necessarily speak for or act on behalf of the University. The University has the inherent right and responsibility to protect individuals and property and to assure the continuity of the educational process.

All student organizations may invite and hear speakers of their choosing. Students are expected to follow procedures prescribed by the University in requesting and using University facilities for their programs. These procedures shall be designed to insure that there is orderly scheduling of facilities and adequate preparation for the event. University authorities will not use their control of facilities as a device for censorship. The appearance of a speaker on campus in no way indicates agreement with his views or endorsement of his position by the University or the sponsoring student organization. The sponsoring group has the responsibility to make reasonable efforts to make this fact known to the academic and the larger community.

B. Student Participation in University Governance.

Students are free individually and collectively to express in a peaceful and orderly manner their views on matters of University policy and on matters of general interest to the student body. Students shall be provided the opportunity to participate in the formulation and implementation of University policy, both academic and nonacademic, in accordance with the rules and regulations of the University Council and the Board of Trustees.

C. Student Publications.

The University of Akron regards student publications, campus radio stations and other student news media as necessary aids in establishing and maintaining an atmosphere of free and responsible discussion and intellectual exploration on campus. They are a valuable means of providing campus communication, of bringing student concerns to the attention of the University community and of formulating student opinion on campus issues and on community and world affairs.

APPENDIX, continued

STATEMENT OF STUDENT RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, continued

If the University provides the funds or facilities or lends its name to the various news media, it may have to bear legal and financial responsibility for the content and operation of the publications and of the programs of the radio stations. Within the restrictions imposed by this responsibility, the University is committed to freedom of expression in accordance with the following statements of professional ethics: Criteria of a Good Newspaper—Associated Press Managing Editors Association; Canons of Journalism—American Society of Newspaper Publishers; Statement of Ethical Responsibilities—International Conference of The Student Press, July 1963; Radio, T. V. Code of Good Practices—National Association of Broadcasters; and by the rules and regulations of the Federal Communications Commission which proscribe libel, slander, obscenity, undocumented allegations and the techniques of harassment and innuendo. WRHA, WAUP-FM and the Radio/T. V. Workshop are governed by regulations imposed by the Federal Communications Commission. The Radio/T. V. Workshop is also governed by the policies of WAUP-FM when broadcasting over the station's facilities.

To ensure the editorial freedom of student publications and campus radio stations, the University to the extent that its legal obligations permit subscribes to the following safeguards:

1. The media should be free of censorship, advance approval of copy and/or programs to be published or aired. The media managers should be free to develop their editorial policy and news coverage.
2. Editors and managers of student news media shall be protected from arbitrary suspension and removal because of student, faculty, administration or public disapproval of their editorial policies or content. Only for proper and stated causes shall editors and managers be subject to removal and then only by orderly and prescribed procedures. These procedures shall be carried out by the appointing authority and include the right of appeal.

All student news media must explicitly state that the opinions expressed are not necessarily those of the University or its student body.

V. Off-Campus Rights and Responsibilities

University students are both citizens and members of the University community. As citizens they enjoy the same rights such as freedom of expression, peaceful assembly and right of petition, and the same obligations as other citizens; and as members of the University community they are entitled to the privileges and subject to the responsibilities which accrue to them by virtue of this membership. University authority shall not be employed to inhibit the exercise of rights of citizenship, either on or off campus, but neither do students have special rights when in violation of the law. Students shall recognize that away from campus while attending a University-associated event, their conduct may reflect upon the University as well as upon the individual.

Students who violate the law may incur penalties prescribed by civil authorities, but University authority should never be used merely to duplicate the function of general laws. Only where the University's interests as an academic community are distinctly and clearly involved should its special authority be asserted. When the authority of the University is so asserted, the student shall be provided with the procedural safeguards contained in the Student Disciplinary Procedures. The student who incidentally violates University regulations in the course of his off-campus activity should be subject to no greater penalty than would normally be imposed. University action must be independent of community pressure.

APPENDIX, continued

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents—Dr. Ali Fatemi

The April meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee was held on Tuesday, April 17, 1973 in Columbus at the OEA Building for the morning session and the Board of Regents office for the afternoon session.

I. The Morning Session

During the morning session the agenda for the sessions with Mr. Coulter, the Acting Chancellor was set:

1. Governor Gilligan's Second Budget and its implication for higher education.
2. The status of the Management Improvement Program - FAC members feel a one-year delay in implementation is required in order to obtain effective faculty input.
3. Actions taken by the Board of Regents at their April 13th meeting - since we have no minutes available at this point - particularly with respect to the Rio Grande College proposal.
4. Fixing the date and time for the next meeting as 24th May, 1973, at 1 p. m.

It was also decided to hold elections (the chairman and secretary of the FAC at the next meeting).

During the discussion on the agenda items, Ohio State Representative presented a detailed analysis of HB 86 - as amended - and its possible consequences for higher education during the next biennium. He reported that this (modified) appropriation bill appears to increase the total expenditures for higher education for the next biennium by about 4.7 percent which is 1.1 percent over the governor's first budget for higher education. This will be totally inadequate to meet the costs colleges face because of fixed costs and inflation, and particularly in the face of possible declining enrollment.

One particular section could be devastating to the state's educational institutions if left in the bill. That has to do with restricting the use of funds appropriated by the state to follow closely the Regents' Expenditure model. This would in effect have departmental budgets fixed by the Regents and allow no flexibility on any campus to meet changes in enrollments demands or other local needs. (See lines 2832-2859 in the April 13/73 version of HB 86) It was suggested that we urge Mr. Coulter to take a strong stand on eliminating this item from the appropriations bill.

University of Akron Representatives presented a resolution passed by the University Council of the University of Akron urging Acting Chancellor Coulter to postpone implementation of the Management Improvement Program as currently suggested for one year, until June 30th, 1974, to allow for a comprehensive examination and input by the faculties of the various higher education institutions in the State of Ohio. They urged that every member of the FAC get their faculty to pass a similar resolution and send it to Coulter.

APPENDIX, continued

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents—Dr. Ali Fatemi, continued

In closing the morning session it was decided to hold elections for FAC Chairman and Secretary at our next meeting, May 24, 1973. Nominations may be sent to either of the current office holders before that date.

II. The Afternoon Session

Commenting on the Regents March 13th meeting (Item 3) Coulter pointed out the action on the request by Rio Grande College had been deferred. He also said that the time and date for our next meeting with him was agreeable to him. (Item 4)

In his general comments about the appropriations bill, Coulter indicated a lot of changes—deletions with some additions—would be forthcoming from the Senate. However, with respect to lines 2832-2859 (see above) we, the faculty, should "raise hell in every forum you have". The Regents' model, Coulter explained, was a convenient state-wide averaging device and was impractical as a device for individual departmental or programmatic accountability. He himself will inform the legislature of this when he testifies before the Senate on the present version of HB 86.

Coulter also pointed out that some of these "strange things" which appear in bills don't come out of thin air, but are a response of legislators to some special interest groups. For example, when some dean of a college at university X feels he's not getting enough money, say according to the Regents' model, he lobbies for more funds for his college and this results in restrictive legislation for all of higher education.

Several FAC members felt that such a dean was totally out of line and, in fact, destroys any united front that higher education in Ohio may have had. Nevertheless, Coulter pointed out, such actions account for some of the restrictions and limitations in the appropriations bill.

As to the wording on honoraria, the 9-12 hours work week and sabbaticals, even though he felt them to be undesirable, Coulter could give no guarantee that they would be removed from the bill.

Regarding the request for delay of implementation of the Manual of "Best Practices", Coulter seemed very receptive. He felt it appropriate for faculties to send resolutions to him such as the one passed by the Akron Council.

The meeting adjourned at 3 p. m.

APPENDIX, continued

Report of Alternate Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents—Mr. Blin B. Scatterday

May 24, 1973, 1:00 p. m.

Chairman Boyer called the meeting to order and the following was discussed:

Task Forces

Chancellor Coulter in responding to concerns of the Committee said that the Management Improvement Task Forces were on schedule. The manuals were such that the Task Forces were on schedule. The manuals were such that the Task Force could endorse them except in the case of the Personnel Task Force which had proposed extending the final draft until October 15, 1973. They did this to seek additional consultation by requesting that the following steps be completed between now and that date:

1. The campus representatives on the Task Force would seek reactions to the manual by meetings with the faculty on the respective campuses, with June 30 draft of the manual.
2. A copy of the manual would be supplied to all presidents for their reaction.
3. Copies of the manual would be supplied to all members of the Advisory Committee to the Chancellor for their reactions.

Mr. Coulter did not consider this a delay but a more positive approach to the problem. He expected that the other Task Forces would complete their work by the 30th of June, 1973. He was not willing to dissolve the other Task Forces or consider their June 30th product just a draft. He did respond that implementation had not yet been decided on and that some alterations on the other manuals could be made after they are submitted. The Advisory Committee will receive copies of all manuals after June 30, 1973. Even though the staff had worked on manuals, he felt that Task Force should have added their own expertise.

Collective Bargaining Bill

The subcommittee of the Senate, under the chairmanship of Senator Cook is considering this and current information is that the Chairman wants a bill.

Board of Regents Meeting

Mr. Coulter responded that most of the considerations were routine program approvals except that Glen Stein had been added by the Regents as a junior staff member to assist the new chancellor, Dr. Norton, with the Citizens Committee (Governor's Task Force) which is being reassigned to the Regents. Mr. Stein was recommended by Dr. Norton.

Articulation

Chancellor Coulter said that the final report of the Articulation Committee between Public Two-Year Campuses and Public Universities had been delayed by the University Presidents from reaching the Regents at their last meeting. He felt that the Presidents were not opposed but that some were not familiar enough with it and that it had been put off for one month.

APPENDIX, continued

Report of Alternate Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents—Mr. Blin B. Scatterday, continuedHB 86

Chancellor Coulter said that a high priority of the Regents for the coming year is to look into a new budget model. He agreed that it is difficult to base total spending on student enrollments during a decline in these enrollments. He felt that even in the present bill the Regents still make final determination in "disastrous" cases. He had also recommended deletion of the fee freeze.

The committee pointed out that pages 86-87, lines 2550-2578 forbids use of state funds or any fund collected by the University for Sabbatical leaves. This could create problems with continuation of benefits like retirement and medical while a professor is on leave of absence.

Mr. Coulter stated that he is not supporting the split in subvention in General Studies, i. e., special figures for branches.

On the subject of instructional grants he felt that since the new \$14,000 figure is after taxes that this is really getting into the private area of education. The private schools have organized and are attempting more direct grants from the state public funds.

At the earlier get-together the existing officers were retained for another year. The next meeting of the Advisory Committee will be at 1:30 p. m., with Chancellor Coulter on Thursday, June 21. The earlier meeting of the Committee will be at 10:30 a. m. at the OEA Building in Columbus.

PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE 1972-73

(As of May 1973)

	<u>Amount</u>
Roger Bain and James Teeter "The Recent Geologic History of the Florida Keys"	\$ 382.00
Carl Bersani "Factors Influencing Foster Care Outcomes of Delinquent Youth"	350.00
Nathan Cardarelli "Evaluation of Molluscicides"	228.00
Stephen Darling "Dissolving Metal Reductions of Organic Compounds"	650.00
Robert Deitchman and Raymond Sanders "The Effects of Maternal Crowding on Subsequent Offspring Behavior in the Rat"	816.75
Elizabeth Erickson, Rober Deitchman, William Hendon, Jim Jackson, John Olive, Simsek Sarikelle "Exploratory Research Toward the Development of Multi-disciplinary Parameters for the Evaluation of the Impact of Waste Disposal or Land Excavation"	280.00
James Harwood "Pyrolysis of Copolymers Derived from Acetylenic Monomers"	600.00
Jim Jackson "A Cursory Study of the Sanitary Landfills of Northeastern Ohio"	319.00
Sebastian Kanakkanatt "Shock Absorption Behavior of Fluid-filled Open-celled Foam Composites"	202.00
Warren Kuehl "The United States and the League of Nations 1920-1941"	265.00
Thomas Maxwell and John Hirschbuhl "An Investigation of the Effects of Computer Assisted Instruction on Learner Attitudes and the Relationship Between Learner Attitudes and Achievement in Two Different Modes of Instruction"	99.00
Donald Metzger "Prehistory of Upper Cuyahoga Drainage"	847.00
William A. Neumann "A Study of Electrochemical Techniques"	300.00
Richard Nokes "Evaluation of An Autologous Artery Graft in Canine"	872.00

PROJECTS APPROVED BY THE FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE 1972-73 (continued)

Wallace Nolin	\$ 325.00
"The Preparation and Field Testing of a Series of Programmed Tapes for Developing Music Listening Skills in Pre-service Elementary Classroom Teachers"	
David O'Brien and Robert Terry	700.00
"Suicide and Suicide Prevention: Behavioral and Organizational Dimensions"	
Isobel Pfeiffer	200.00
"The Effect on Self-concept of a General Methods Course in Secondary Education"	
Gerald Pyle	300.00
"A Comparative Analysis of Leading Causes of Death in Northeastern Ohio, Southern Ontario, and Southeastern Australia"	
	\$7,735.75

UNIVERSITY CALENDAR 1973-74

<u>Fall Quarter 1973</u>		<u>Summer Session I, 1974</u>	
September 24	Classes Begin	June 24	Classes Begin
November 22-25	Thanksgiving Break	July 4	Independence Day
December 1	Classes End	July 26	Classes End
December 3-8	Final Examinations	July 27	Final Examinations
December 9	Commencement		
<u>Winter Quarter 1974</u>		<u>Summer Session II, 1974</u>	
January 2	Classes Begin	July 29	Classes Begin
January 9	Founders Day	August 30	Classes End
March 9	Classes End	August 31	Final Examinations
March 11-16	Final Examination		
<u>Spring Quarter 1974</u>		<u>Post-Session, 1974</u>	
March 25	Classes Begin	September 3	Classes Begin
June 1	Classes End	September 24	Classes End
June 3-8	Final Examinations	September 25	Final Examinations
June 9	Commencement		

*Ester Ward,
VP for Academic Affairs*