

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

10-5-1995

## Faculty Senate Chronicle October 5, 1995

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](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).



Corrected

1995-96, No. 2

46 Pages

October 5, 1995

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Faculty Senate Membership	1
Faculty Senate Committees	2
Senate Members of Other Committees	6
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 5, 1995	8
Appendices to the Minutes of the Meeting of Faculty Senate of October 5, 1995	23
A. Chairman's Remarks	23
B. Amendments to "Faculty Manual" appeals process	24
C. Remarks of the President of the University	30
D. Report of the <i>Executive Committee</i>	32
E. Report of <i>Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee</i>	32
F. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	37
G. Report of <i>Faculty Research Projects Committee</i>	39

---

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

**LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Mrs. Peggy Richards, 96*	Part-time Faculty
Dr. Jesse Marquette, 97*	A & S
Dr. Daniel Sheffer, 96*	Engineering
Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter, 97*	Library
Dr. Carol Gigliotti, 97*	Office Administration

**SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**STUDENT AFFAIRS

Ms. Barbara Bucey, 96\*  
Dr. George Prough, 97\*

CONTRACT PROFESSIONAL AFFAIRS

Mrs. Kathleen Davis, 96\*  
Dr. John Green, 97\*

STAFF AFFAIRS

Dr. Jesse F. Marquette, 96\*  
Mr. James Taggart, 97\*

DIVERSITY

Dr. K. Ross-Alaolmolki, 97\*  
Dr. Carol Gigliotti, 96\*

PART-TIME FACULTY AFFAIRS

Dr. Frank Griffin, 97\*  
TBA\*

Mr. James Wallace, Chair



**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 5, 1995**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Cheung at 3:01 p.m. on Thursday, October 5, 1995 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-one of the fifty-six members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Green and Wright were absent with notice.

**SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* **APPROVED AMENDMENTS TO APPEALS PROCEDURES IN "FACULTY MANUAL"**
- \* **RATIFIED AN AMENDED REPORT OF THE CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE WHICH CONTAINED ITS APPROVAL OF THE 1997-98 CAPITAL REQUEST**
- \* **HELD A RUN-OFF ELECTION AND ELECTED A THIRD REPRESENTATIVE TO LRPC**
- \* **REFERRED A REQUEST TO BPCC AND APCC TO CONSIDER IMPLEMENTATION OF A 3-SESSION SUMMER TERM WITH A FEE STRUCTURE COMPARABLE TO THAT FOR THE REGULAR SESSIONS**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Senator Clinefelter moved to approve the agenda, and this was seconded by Senator Richards. The motion carried.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1995** - The minutes were approved without correction.

**III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS** - For the Chairman's remarks, see Appendix A.

At the end of the Chairman's remarks, Senator Clinefelter wondered whether it was possible to ask the Board for the portions of the "Faculty Manual" which we might need, for example RTP option periods, etc.



The Chairman replied that he had directed anyone with questions regarding the rules, etc. to Secretary Mallo. He was the keeper of the nearest thing to a coherent set of records regarding those by-laws, and that was his suggestion.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The Chairman announced that William Taggart from the Community and Technical College had been elected to serve the remainder of Dean Deborah Weber's senatorial term, and Frank Griffin had been elected to represent the Natural Science Division of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences. He welcomed both Senators. Since the Executive Committee had not yet had the opportunity to certify these elections, he requested the unanimous consent of the body in extending voting privileges to the new Senators, and this was given by the Senate. He then also introduced Celina Echols as the newly elected graduate student representative and extended a welcome to her as well.

**V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - The Chairman stated that the next item, out of its usual order, was unfinished business; namely, the appeals process in the "Faculty Manual."

Senator Oller, as the former Chair of the Academic Policies and Calendar Subcommittee which wrote these amendments, wanted to take a few minutes to explain the background and take the body through the proposed changes in order to make sure that members were aware of what those changes were. It had been discovered about a year and a half ago that two sections of the "Faculty Manual" provided two different procedures for appeals of non-tenured full-time faculty who were not going to be retained by their departments. In section 3359-20-034, "Terminating Employment" the procedure was that the faculty member would have an informal meeting with the dean to discuss the department's decision, the faculty member's situation and what the options were. After a certain amount of time, a second meeting would be called at which the department head could be present if the faculty member so desired. All of this was to be done before the dean made his final decision and put it in writing. At that point, the only other recourse open to the appellant was to go to the President. In section 3359-20-037 relating to RTP decisions, the normal right of appeal was given to the individual at the department, college, and university levels. Because of these two sections, there was confusion about which procedure was to be followed in the case of a non-tenured full-time faculty member who was not going to be retained. In Senator Oller's own college, Arts and Sciences, the new Dean, confronted with both, had been unsure about which to employ, and had been told one thing which initially had denied the appellant the right of appeal at the college level. This was eventually reversed and the individual did have an opportunity to appeal within the college.

In order to deal with this conflict, the amendments which the body had before it were being presented (for full text, see **Appendix B**). In section 3359-20-034, "Terminating Employment," all of (A)(2) (the section containing the informal meetings with the dean etc.) was being eliminated and replaced with a new (2), "THE UNTENURED FACULTY MEMBER WHO HAS NOT BEEN REAPPOINTED HAS THE RIGHT OF APPEAL AT THE DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS AS SPECIFIED IN FACULTY MANUAL SECTION 3359-20-037 D." An additional change in this section was to be found in (3) Termination for Cause. It was in the second sentence which would now read, "Such faculty member HAS THE REGULAR RIGHT OF



APPEAL AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 3359-20-037 D AND may request a hearing before the Board on the reasons for dismissal." This ensured that persons in this situation would also be able to avail themselves of the appeals process. These were all of the changes in this section.

In section 3359-20-037 D a new (b) had been inserted which in effect was the old 3359-20-034 (2)(a) containing the two informal meetings with the dean. Both the Subcommittee and the full APCC thought that this was a good way to begin the appeals procedure in the hopes that some sort of solution might be worked out at this level before going further. The language at the beginning was slightly different and read as follows:

"(b) IN THE CASE OF NONREAPPOINTMENT:

(i) THE FACULTY MEMBER MAY REQUEST an office conference WITH THE DEAN, THE PURPOSE OF WHICH IS TO DISCUSS the dean's proposed recommendation and the reasons therefor. NO FORMAL RECORD OF THIS CONFERENCE SHALL BE MAINTAINED."

The point of the last sentence was to emphasize that these initial discussions were informal. At the end of this section (v) a further change had been made. The last sentence would read, "If the intent continues to be in the negative, the dean will confirm the earlier letter AND THE FACULTY MEMBER HAS THE RIGHT OF APPEAL AS SPECIFIED BELOW. What was being changed here was the original reference to appellants at this point going to the President. They would still have that right, but at the end of the overall appeals process as specified further on in this section. Other changes to this section included the relettering of the subsequent items and additional phrases in new (3)(c), (f), and (h). The new (3)(c) would now read, "A faculty member may appeal an adverse recommendation by a department committee, the department chair, OR THE DEAN (whether or not it is independent of, or supports, a prior recommendation by the department) to the College Appeals Committee. The Committee will report its findings to the college dean." The phrase, "OR THE DEAN" had been added to ensure that if an individual waited for the dean's decision before deciding to go to the college appeals committee he still had that option. In (3)(f) and (h) dealing with direct appeals to the Provost and President, the phrase, "WHO SHALL RESPOND IN A TIMELY FASHION" had been added.

There was one final change in section 3359-20-037 not directly related to the appeals process which had been suggested by a member of APCC and this was in (C)(2)(b). The section dealt with department chairs scheduling and organizing the appropriate RTP committees according to the University calendar time for appeals and their membership on those committees. The proposed amendment here would remove department chairs from those committees. The argument was that the department chairs were getting a double bite of the apple by being able to express an opinion and have a vote as a member of the committee and then again up the line as department chair. Since it was thought that a department chair might still be necessary for informational purposes, the new language of this section would read, "DEPARTMENT CHAIRS SHALL NOT BE MEMBERS OF THESE COMMITTEES BUT MAY AT EACH COMMITTEE'S REQUEST ATTEND THE MEETINGS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES."

Senator Oller concluded by noting that these were all of the changes presented in the document and that he was willing to answer any questions anyone might have about the thinking of either the Subcommittee or APCC about this.



In relation to dismissal for cause, Senator Padovan wanted to know about a document recently distributed by the Vice President for Research and University Development relating to an interim policy/procedure whose subject was, "investigating financial significant interest - management of conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment related to research of educational sponsored projects." There was nothing about this in the "Faculty Manual" nor had the faculty or Senate been involved in the creation of this procedure.

The Chairman answered that he had received a communication from Vice-President Sylvester on this point. The procedure was created in response to federal law which went into effect on October 1 requiring essentially that conflict of interest disclosure statement or nonconflict of interest disclosure statement with every grant we sent in, and it had been adopted as an emergency measure which the President could do. He agreed with Senator Padovan that this was an item which the body should look into, and he was putting it on the agenda of the Executive Committee's next meeting. It possibly could be routed to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities for action. In the meantime he was a bit perturbed to discover that his original assumption that this had been promulgated in keeping with the President's emergency authority might not be true.

As a matter of clarification, Senator Redle wanted to know why the word "timely" was chosen for the amendments in 3359-20-037 D (3) (f) and (g).

Senator Oller responded that the Committee had not had a time frame in mind, but it had not wanted to be too specific (two weeks, for example) since there were situations which might come up which would make it impossible to answer within the allotted time. He granted that there were probably situations in which people would try to argue that four or five months could be defended as "timely", but this was as strict as the Committee wanted to be. He invited other members of the Committee who might remember the discussion on this point better than he to respond as well.

Senator Malhotra was concerned about the amendment which required the department chair to forfeit his right to vote in a promotion committee by virtue of the fact that he was the chair. By keeping the chair out, it could actually determine the outcome of either affirmation or denial by the faculty in the aggregate. Also were we suggesting that if you accepted an appointment as chair, you would have to forfeit your rights in terms of professional judgment to be made in regard to retention, promotion, or tenure? When Senator Oller replied that if the Senate passed the amendment, that would be the case, Senator Malhotra stated that he had a serious objection to the clause. The Chairman observed that he could amend it.

Senator Buchthal pointed out that currently departments had guidelines, and, if they chose, they could decide to set the responsibilities of the Chairs including whether or not they wanted them to vote in these committees. What this document was doing was telling the departments that they no longer had the right to choose to allow a Chair to participate and vote in the deliberations.

Senator Rich noted that at the bottom of the page numbered 46 in 3359-20-037 D (3)(b)(i) the word "therefore" should be corrected to "therefor", and this was accepted as a friendly amendment.

There being no further discussion, the Chairman called for a vote, and the amendments were approved.



The next item of unfinished business was a run-off election between Senators Keener and Clinefelter for a seat on the Long Range Planning Committee. At the last meeting, the two had tied and there had not been enough members in attendance to vote again, so it was necessary to hold the run-off now. Ballots were handed out, and a vote taken. Secretary Oller and Provost Jamison counted the ballots while the meeting continued.

## **VI. REPORTS**

**A. REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY** - Before presenting her prepared remarks, President Elliott wanted to thank the Chairman for his comments on the kinds of efforts which the Board was trying to make on our behalf. The Governor had asked all Boards to begin to understand their campuses and to understand that their positions were not ceremonial roles and that they needed to be informed fully on how Universities worked and the kind of things that went on. She was sorry that there had been some apprehension about what the Board had been doing, but this had been a clearly strong, bona fide effort by them to become informed and to learn what we did and to work with it. She was reminded of a quote which someone had given her yesterday when he had noted that there was a lot of rumor about the Board's activity. It was Mr. Dooley who had said, "It's not what we don't know, but what we know that ain't so that hurts us." She urged faculty not to get caught in a trap like that about it but to ask her, the Provost, or Chairman Cheung for clarification. She could not clarify the scientific integrity policy but intended to get back with a response.

The President then presented her prepared remarks. (Appendix C)

**B. Remarks of the Provost** - There were none.

**C. Report of the Representative to FACCOBOR** - No report

**D. Executive Committee** - (Appendix D)

**E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee** - No report

**F. Faculty Well-Being Committee** - No report

**G. Graduate Council** - No report

**H. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee** - Assistant Provost Kelly had two items to report. The first item consisted of changes to the by-laws of the Senate which would split APCC into two distinct committees - Curriculum Review Committee and Academic Policy and Calendar Committee. (Appendix E)

The Chairman noted that as by-law changes these would have to lay over for one month, but it was possible to begin to discuss them now if anyone wished to.

Since there was no discussion, Dr. Kelly presented his second item. The Policy and Calendar Subcommittee of APCC had met and on the request of the Student Affairs Committee had reviewed



the attendance policy and judged it appropriate as written. Because there had been no specific request from SAC as to what they wanted to see reviewed regarding the attendance policy, the Subcommittee was asking SAC to give a more detailed request regarding what aspects of the attendance policy it wanted the Subcommittee to treat.

**I. Athletics Committee** - No report.

**J. Campus Facilities Planning Committee** - Senator Drummond, the Chair of the Committee, said that a complete report had been handed out at the beginning of the meeting and would appear in the "Chronicle", (Appendix F), but there were some things of import which the Committee had discussed of which he wanted the Senate to be aware. At two meetings, concerns about the proposed renovations to the Chuckery had been discussed, but he wanted the Senate to know that the issue had appeared in the "Buchtelite" before it had been formally presented to the CFPC. There was also one action item contained in the report relating to the 1997-98 biennium capital request as part of a proposed three-biennium capital budget which had been presented by Mr. Roger Ryan. He was moving the Senate's acceptance of the request although it already had been approved by the Board of Trustees on September 27 and had gone to Columbus on October 2. The Committee had approved the request because the items on the list had been on previous capital budgets and the justifications were present. In the future it was to be hoped that the Committee would have this done far enough in advance to present it to the Senate before it went to Columbus.

The Chairman stated that the motion from the Committee was to ratify its report which contained the approval of the '97-'98 capital request, and he asked for discussion.

President Elliott commented that when she had looked into the delay in transmitting the request to the CFPC, the best response that she had gotten was that all of the items had already been ratified in previous biennia and we were working our way down the list. She was not sure that the body would find that satisfactory. She did not because things could change over time.

Senator Drummond responded that Roger Ryan had explained this to the Committee, and this was why it had gone ahead and approved the request. However, it was possible that new issues could come up within the two year period which would need to be discussed.

After a brief discussion regarding procedure, Senator Padovan moved to amend the Committee's report with a recommendation that future capital expenditures be routed to the CFPC and the Faculty Senate in a more timely fashion. This was seconded by Senator Fowler and then approved by the body.

Returning to a discussion of the amended report, Senator Norfolk wondered whether, since the items on the list were from previous budgets, inflation had been taken into account. He was particularly concerned about the Leigh Hall renovations.

President Elliott did not think that inflation had been taken into account. As she understood it, there had been a ten-year proposal in which academic space, library space, emergency space, and land acquisition had been rank ordered, and the Regents had given us a formula which did not have an inflater although we were working hard to get that line increased. She could go into long and



boring detail on this new allocation formula if the body were really interested, but in essence it was an attempt to keep campuses from building what they didn't need and couldn't afford. The allocation was based on what you already had and was a formula-driven number without an inflater.

Senator Buchthal believed that, when the Leigh Hall rehab was a previous capital improvement, the figure had been \$5,400,000, somewhat higher than the sum contained here. That amount had been removed and set aside for the Student Services building. During the interim, Knight Auditorium had been remodeled, and there had been some asbestos removal. The CFPC did not have an accounting of how many dollars had been spent between now and what had been spent before, but when it had figured out what it would take to redo the building the last time, there had been no money for modernized classrooms of tomorrow. It had been for bare-bones asbestos removal, taking obscenities off the tables, and painting the walls.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted to ratify the Committee's amended report.

Senator Drummond had some additional comments on things which the Committee was considering. One was in respect to the publicized student recreation center. CFPC was pleased that it had been invited to a review of the Brailsford Associates Feasibility Study which had been presented to the Board of Trustees as well as to the Committee. That presentation was very thorough, and Dr. Caryl K. Smith had provided a substantial amount of information so everything was being put on the table. However, there were some concerns of which the Committee thought the Senate should be aware. The initial cost was going to be \$25.8 million with a debt service of about \$2,084,000 a year to cover the cost over a 30-year period. As he understood it, there would be a student cost on the general fee of \$6.00 per credit hour. Also, the Ocasek Natatorium would be considered part of the new complex, and so to use its facilities or any part of the new recreation center would cost faculty \$250 a year. This was part of the financing of the building. The Committee was also looking into the possibility of parking problems when there were events scheduled in JAR and a large number of people were using the recreation center. Also, a substantial number of random surveys had been sent out to both students and faculty/staff. A very small quantity of those surveys had been returned which indicated a possible skewing of data. Our more statistically inclined individuals needed to look into that. Finally, the housing recommendations did call for the demolition of two halls, and there was going to be a lot of discussion on this. The plan which had been presented was beautiful looking, but whether or not it was feasible was something else.

Senator Marquette hated to be cynical about this but wondered whether any surveys had been sent to students who might come here. We already had all these students here without this building. He wanted to know whether or not adding this building was going to add students or just cost us \$25 million to make our current students happier. There had been no evaluation of the effect on our market of building this student center. He would like to know why we were doing it.

Senator Drummond did not know about the surveys but noted that there had been focus groups, although their demographics had been extremely limited, and he was not sure how good that data was. Reports had been sent last week, but he and the Committee had not yet seen them so he did not know all the background. Whether or not this was something that people really wanted was an issue which the Committee would have to discuss as part of the statistical basis.



Senator Keener wanted to comment on the fees which were assessed to students. There was a \$6 per credit hr. fee - not to go over a maximum of 12 credit hrs. - that would be assessed, and the assessment would not come until the time the building was actually built. They were also considering having just a flat fee of \$52 for all students, and that wouldn't prorate it according to credit hrs. Also, there were 6000 surveys sent out to students, and she believed that 691 had responded.

President Elliott hoped the members of the body would hear this discussion in its full context and the fact that we had hired some specialists, whose business it was to know what kinds of enrollment initiatives made a difference, to review our financial position, our ability to buy and the cost of that money, and how we could in time pay off in a way that wouldn't be onerous in their experience with Universities around the country. This was their business and they did it a lot. The numbers that the body was hearing were if we built a building that costs this much, this was what we had to pay for it. They were not actually suggesting the building. It was like buying a car. If you chose a Chevy Caprice, the payments would be so much, while if you chose a Buick, they would be a different amount. That was the only basis for their numbers. If you wanted faculty to participate, they should have to pay as well as the students. These were all the "what-ifs." What the specialists were saying in the recommendation was that the two facilities that seemed to give us the greatest difficulty in recruiting in our market were the student recreation center and dormitories, but none of this was engraved in stone. They were all scenarios for us to review and consider. The \$250 fee for faculty had not yet been decided. The first decision would be to do it, the second would be at what level, and the third would be with what kind of financing scheme. The specialists had proposed a building like this at this level, but that was as far as it had proceeded.

President Elliott reminded the body that money from the capital budget - state money - could not be used to improve housing and personal space accommodations for students. So construction of those sorts of buildings would not be competing with classroom rehab which clearly was a first priority. It was separate dollars that were being looked at in a "what-if" scenario. The same was true of location. The recommendation which they made was that if you wanted to create a campus culture it would make sense to build it here, but there were other options here so the blue print was not anything we were committed to either.

Senator Padovan thought that the recreation center was a great idea, but a problem would arise if student enrollment dropped and funding levels did not match \$2 million. Where would the additional funding come from? Would it come from the educational side of the general budget?

When the President responded that it could not and had to be a pass-through fee to the students, Senator Padovan pointed out that the students would be getting an increasingly high fee structure coming down to them, and it wouldn't be \$25 million, but \$60 million, because you had to look at the rate over a 30-year period. That was assuming what bond rate? Were 7%, 8%, or 9% realistic figures?

President Elliott answered that those were all "what-ifs." What the specialists had done was frame the issues for us.

Senator Norfolk felt that perhaps students had not replied because they were too busy. Looking at the survey results which the President had just handed out, 76% of our students were working and



going to school presumably full-time. How much were they going to use these facilities? If you presented the case to students who were hoping to be here for four years and were probably going to be here for six, and then told them they were going to pay approximately \$200 a year for the right to use the recreation center, that was another \$1000+ for resources they probably would not use nor have time to use \$1000 worth. He thought if the question was phrased it in that way, most students would say no.

Senator Clinefelter noted that the housing study recommended the demolition of Bulger and Spanton Halls. Was there a more justified option? She had attended one of the focus groups last summer, and that proposal had been somewhat of a shock to the group. The dorms were always in fairly bad condition and in need of remodeling and perhaps updating, but we were already taking down Simmons Hall and some smaller buildings. Perhaps we might need new classroom buildings. Polsky's was advertised as the largest classroom building in Ohio, and yet we had moved other University functions into that building which limited classroom space. She was hoping that all of this, including the housing study, would indeed get much more discussion.

Senator Richard Gigliotti asked Senator Drummond to characterize the results of the student survey. He responded that they were reasonably positive. In fact, the consultant would say that if we took a vote among students, there would be 75% who would want the building. He was not sure that this was true because he had trouble with 6000 surveys and only 500-600 replies. Those 600 replies might not be random. He also had doubts about the faculty survey. He had received this survey but had no time to fill it out.

Senator Gigliotti also wanted to caution the CFPC about using the survey results. As a faculty member, he had received one. He had been involved for 25 years in survey research, and he certainly hoped that the person who constructed that survey was not one of his former students. The questions were worded in such a fashion that it would be very difficult not to get an affirmation for the recreation center. This did not speak to the issue of whether or not we wanted a recreation center, but we certainly did want accurate data. There was a lot of money involved here. It was a big tax on faculty and students should they choose it, and we had to be certain that we were working with a solid foundation of data. The surveys that had been given to the CFPC were garbage.

Senator Drummond noted that some of the questions were rather strange. For example, would you like to pay \$80 for a great building or \$60 for one that was going to be dog meat?

Senator Erickson wanted to follow up on Senator Gigliotti's comment. As someone who had spent a lot of time a few years ago surveying the faculty and students for the Libraries Committee, she remembered the one thing that came out of the student surveys was a need for places to study. Were questions relating to needs of that sort addressed in the survey?

Senator Drummond replied that there were some questions of that nature. The surveys were relatively general, but they were skewed to the residence halls and recreation center. There were other things involved, but he did not look at them in detail.



President Elliott repeated her earlier point that all the consultants had done was frame the issue for us which we were now ready to address. She felt more comfortable with the dormitory issue. The decision on construction, whether rehabing old buildings or constructing new ones, was an economic one. In a day with the kinds of diseases that were rampant in America, most parents wanted private bathrooms for students who were going to be boarding students. It was not possible to do that with those buildings (Bulger and Spanton) without costs that would be difficult to support. The consultants suggested a quad that would in fact create quiet spaces for students. She did not think we needed to belabor any single point but simply work with the whole study and not leave out the kind of anecdotal data that we were getting from the Admissions Office and our recruiters.

Senator Oller asked what he thought might be a naive question. Even though he was a flabby, unathletic classicist who did not use the recreational facilities on campus, he knew that there were two gymnasias, two swimming pools, and a student center with bowling alleys and pool tables in the basement. There were things for students to do. Could someone please explain to him why we needed this student recreation center?

Senator Carol Gigliotti was not going to answer that question, but she wanted to suggest to the Committee that when it looked at the survey it should also look at the results of the focus groups. She had participated in them last summer, and they were handled in such a way as to get the kind of response that you wanted. For example, at the end of the discussion they had been asked whether they would prefer a new student center or a new recreational facility. Her response was to ask whether they did not have a third option if they did not want either. She thought that the results of the focus groups were suspect as well.

Senator Marquette wondered whether, if the data was as bad as it appeared to be, we did not need to get better data before progressing any further. Was the study done professionally, and, if so, could we get our money back? He was serious about this. Why, with all the people we had on campus, did we pay someone else to do this survey, especially when they had done it so badly?

Senator Keener reminded members that we were talking about a student recreation facility which faculty would be able to use, but which would be paid for through student fees. She agreed that more investigation was necessary to determine whether students wanted this. She did think there was a need for it, and many of the students that she represented and with whom she had discussed the matter agreed. There were those who did not, and she agreed with Senator Erickson that many wanted places to study. These were mainly new majority students who were coming to campus. However, we did have to keep in mind the traditional college-aged student who wanted to stay physically as well as academically fit.

Senator Vukovich wanted to let the body know that there was a full report as well as summary reports available in Dr. Caryl Smith's office. Most of the members of the Student Affairs Committee had received the summary reports on both the Campus Recreation and Wellness Center and also on the dorm facilities. Also, Dr. Smith would be coming to the next Student Affairs Committee meeting to give a brief presentation probably similar to the one which the Board received. If members contacted her office, they might be able to look at some of these summaries.

When Senator Clements asked about the cost of the study, neither the President nor the Provost knew the answer.



Senator Clements then commented that there were consulting firms in the business of persuading people to spend money in certain ways. She wanted to know whether it was ever on the agenda of this particular group to come in and tell people that they did not need something large and expensive. She also wanted to remind the people that if they wanted to experience the folly of spending a large amount of money on athletics facilities they only needed to drive 12 miles to the east and look at the Kent State Field House. Another point that she wanted to make was that while it was one thing to pay for the construction of these buildings, it was another budget matter to keep the lights on. The lights were not paid by student fees. Keeping the building operating, which was a huge expense in a building of this nature, was taken out of maintenance operating budgets, and at a time of zero-sum budgets, it was very possible that money was going to be spent on racquetballs rather than on books.

President Elliott said it was her understanding that the price was to be covered with user fees, but she was not positive that this was the case. Senator Drummond agreed that according to the study, the proposed fee schedule was to cover not only capital but also standard operating costs. President Elliott added that the consultants did recommend not building a field house.

Senator Malhotra thought that if the Committee did collect additional information, some data should be collected as to the present use of the recreational facilities by the students and what they found not very appealing about them. This could help make some determination as to how big a jump this new complex would be over the existing facilities.

Senator Buchthal said that he had questioned the consultants about the cost not only of turning on the lights but also who was going to staff the building, gymnasium instructors, the trainers, and the like, and they claimed according to the budget figures that even the cost of all staff members including student assistants was built into their budget. It was a completely self-contained, economic operation, which was something that would have to be looked at in committee.

Senator Davis commented that what Senator Clements had said was something we all needed to think about. If anybody had listened to the National Public Radio segment in the fall on Duke University, exactly what Senator Clements had described was happening regarding their swimming pool. Even though she was for fitness, it would be unwise to have a white elephant and not be able to sustain it.

At this point, the Chairman thought that the body should probably move on to the next item on the agenda.

Senator Drummond had just one other comment. He was very honored to note that he was at an interview of a group of campus planners who had a master plan for the University. These people were interviewed at the end of September, and there were some extremely well-known and seemingly good groups who were not in the business of telling you what building you should build. As he understood it, they would be asking the Faculty Senate to be involved in the planning process over the 8 to 12 months that it would take to do the data gathering and make the recommendations. They were not proposing buildings; they were proposing possibilities for where you would go when you need buildings, etc. It was a very positive entity and something he thought we needed.



**K. University Libraries Committee** - Senator Ranson reported that at its September 27 meeting he had been elected Chair. The Committee's next meeting would be on Friday, October 13, and a written report of that agenda-setting meeting would be submitted to the "Chronicle." He reminded the Chairman that the Committee was currently missing two members from two colleges who needed to be appointed. The Chairman responded that he was aware of this.

**L. Reference Committee** - No report

**M. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee** - (Appendix G)

**N. Student Affairs Committee** - No report

**O. Computing and Communications Technologies Committee** - No report

**P. Shared Governance Council and Subcommittees** - Senator Fowler presented the following election results: Jim Wallace (Part-Time Faculty) would be the Chair of the Shared Governance Council; Ed Dalessandro (Staff), Vice Chair; Mike Carter (ASG) Secretary; Marshall Ridley (ASG) and Ron McDonald (Contract Professionals) BPCC representatives; Jeannie Hinderegger (Part-Time Faculty) LRPC representative. There were also several staff members who desired to sit on LRPC but were checking into release time to see if they could take those positions. Also, Shared Governance Council would be forwarding a status request on Part-Time Faculty fee remission to be sent to the Executive Committee and a proposal to provide some one-time funds for improvements in the Natatorium in the hopes that the Faculty Senate would assign these issues to appropriate committees. A written report would be submitted for publication in the "Chronicle."

President Elliott asked whether there were faculty members on the Shared Governance Council. The Chairman responded that there were two from this body. Senator Fowler named himself and Senator Richards. The President noted that these were part-time faculty, and Senator Fowler noted that Senator Rich was also a member.

Senator Clinefelter expressed concern that the staff members were not able to serve because they had to make up their time. She thought that this should not be the case. Regardless of your position at the University, if you were elected to serve on a University committee, you should be granted that time as part of your regular responsibilities.

Senator Rich stated that this subject had been discussed in the meeting although not all of the staff members were present so he had no idea what they would have to say. Those who were present indicated that their problem was not that they were not given release time, but that they felt the responsibility to get their work done anyhow. He had suggested to them that faculty members faced the same situation. If you spent time in meetings, it meant that you had to do other things at other times. There were staff members who were members of the Council who were not present, and it was possible that they faced a release time problem. The ones who were present apparently did not feel this way, except in the same sense that anyone would.

The Chairman observed that if the Shared Governance Council felt there was some legislative action that the Senate could take to help, they should not feel inhibited from submitting it either via our representatives or via the Executive Committee.



Senator Fowler agreed, and, adding to what Senator Rich had already said, noted that they, being new to the Council, had raised this issue which provoked a discussion of what had happened in the past. There were not a lot of details forthcoming although they did say the President herself had said that any staff person should be given enough time to attend meetings without any type of recourse. He thought there was still some discussion that needed to take place on the issue before any action was taken, and at that point they would come back with the issue.

**Q. Long Range Planning Committee** - No report

**R. Budget and Planning Coordination Committee** - No report

**S. General Education Advisory Council** - No report

Before turning to the next item on the agenda, the Chairman announced the results of the earlier run-off election for LRPC membership. Senator Clinefelter received 25 votes and Senator Keener 20. He congratulated Senator Clinefelter.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS** - The Chairman asked whether there was any new business to bring before the body.

Senator Kimmell stated that at the last meeting of the Academic Policies & Calendar Subcommittee an item had been discussed which resulted in the suggestion that the topic be brought before the Senate for its consideration. He suggested that students were relatively price-conscious when it came to paying for education and particularly so during summer school. He believed that the University would be interested in increasing the amount of student credit hours that it generated during the course of a year. It seemed to him that there might be a possibility to meet both those conditions or goals - increasing our student credit hours and also giving students a break on the cost of their education - by having three summer sessions. In other words, one would have Summer I, II, III during the 15-week period that existed between the end of spring semester and the beginning of the fall semester. It was difficult for students to complete a full semester's work in two summer sessions, but if they had three summer sessions and were given the same price break that they got during the regular fall and spring semesters, it might encourage enrollment during the summer both to their benefit and to the University's. His motion was that the Faculty Senate consider this as an item for business to be passed on to the appropriate committees to be considered and to be reported back to the Senate. This was seconded by Senator Prough.

After a brief discussion about the details of what would be discussed and to which Committees Senator Kimmell thought the matter should be referred, the final wording of his motion was, "that the Faculty Senate request BPCC and APCC to consider implementation of a 3-session summer term with a fee structure comparable to that for the regular sessions."

Senator John wondered how this would affect 8-week summer sessions, which was what they had in Engineering Science Technology.

Senator Kimmell responded that this would be something that needed to be studied, but he saw no reason why different length sessions could not run concurrently. This was already being done in



the College of Business where they had both 8-week and 5-week sessions going concurrently, and students were enrolled in both.

Senator Bucey did not know whether a concern of hers regarding this idea should wait until BPCC or APCC began discussions or not. She was worried about this system in relation to University College where we were dealing with freshman and sophomores. At the end of the spring semester there was an evaluation of students' grades for retention purposes. If we started a summer session right after the end of the spring semester there would not be time to complete the retention process before students had already enrolled for summer classes. If they were not going to be retained, this would mean that they would have to be knocked out and there was going to be chaos. She was not saying that the idea was unworkable; there might be some way around the problems which would arise because of the way that the present retention system worked. At the end of the fall term, there was the holiday break in which to do the work and even at that, there was not enough time to get the letters out, get responses from the students, and so on. This was one consideration which she would like to see addressed.

Senator Siloac, for informational purposes, stated that the earlier question regarding different schemes of running courses had been informally discussed in the subcommittee, and it had been suggested that there would be a single registration so that students attending all sessions would be available for subvention. At the same time then, courses could be assigned on any basis within that 15-week period - 1-week, 5-week, or 8-week courses, etc.

Since there was no additional discussion, the Senate voted its approval.

**IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Senator Keener apologized for arriving late and had one correction to the minutes on the back page of the "Chronicle." Senator Mike DeWine's phone number was wrongly listed there. It was 202-224-2315, not 2316. Also, she had received in the mail today in regard to student financial aid an amendment that Senator Kennedy had offered to reduce the \$10.8 billion projected cut in education spending to \$4.4 billion. That amendment had been defeated, but there was going to be another vote. If members could call their Senators in support of the amendment, it would be helpful.

Senator Keener also wanted the body to know that ASG was planning a press conference on Monday, October 30, from 11:00 a.m. until about 1:00 p.m. in front of the statue of John R. Buchtel. They were planning to invite all area news media from northeast Ohio - news stations, newspapers and radio. Congressman Tom Sawyer had already confirmed that he would attend, and there was a possibility that another Congressman might be there as well. It was going to be a really big event in opposition to student financial aid cuts, so she hoped all of the Senate's members would be there.

President Elliott said that over the past few weekends a great deal of effort had been spent on this issue, and Senator DeWine had been quite instrumental in getting it down from 2% to .85%. When you called and asked for the educational aide, you might begin by thanking the Senator for what he has done so far. It was going to make a substantive difference of maybe \$500,000 annually for the campus.



Senator Rich was concerned that the BPCC had not yet met this semester and it was now October. Last year, the Committee had had a problem in that it was not able to really develop the academic year incentive program in large part because it was not able to get the relevant information. It was a large undertaking and if the BPCC did not start to meet soon, he was concerned that it might not get done this year either. Who was going to chair the BPCC?

The Chairman answered that the Provost traditionally chaired BPCC. Senator Rich said he had heard a rumor to the contrary. President Elliott commented that they were trying to trade off to accommodate the fund raising schedule, but nothing had changed as far as the Provost chairing the committee.

Senator Rich also wanted to know in connection with BPCC about the 2% technology fee which this body and the Board had approved. Was that money currently being allocated, and, if so, who had been empowered to spend it?

The Chairman did not have an answer but said that obviously this was something BPCC would be intensely interested in. He also believed that the members of BPCC had recently been contacted to provide their schedules, and he trusted that they would shortly be hearing about the date of the first meeting.

Senator Keener, as a member of Omicron Delta Kappa, the National Leadership Honorary, wanted to inform the body that the organization was in the process of accepting nominations for faculty members into ODK. Please feel free to apply or nominate either students or colleagues.

**IX. Adjournment** - A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The body approved and the meeting ended at 4:37 p.m.



## APPENDIX A

### **Chairman's Remarks**

I have three items upon which I wish to remark.

The first is a purely practical one. Senators, when addressing the body, please stand and speak clearly so that your comments, discussion, motions, etc. are recorded. This makes the task of preparing action memos and the "Chronicle" much easier.

The second item I wish to remark upon are the two Listservs, SENATE-L and FAC-ACAD. They are both up and becoming populated. Please give them a try. We have not automatically subscribed Senators, so you'll need to send in a subscription request. The instructions should have reached all of you by now.

The last is the status of the "Faculty Manual" or more precisely what are known in Ohio Revised Code parlance as the "111 Rules" which pertain to faculty and academic matters. They are still with the Board of Trustees. I recently visited the Board Secretary to ask when we might expect the Board to act and conveyed the Senate's concern that the faculty have not had up-to-date manuals in a very long time. While at first appearance Board approval would seem routine, particularly since the product of the Reference Committee's efforts was to update the manual to reflect changes approved by the Board, matters are not quite so simple. It seems that the Board's own bylaws and regulations are in much the same state as the Reference Committee found the manual when it began its work. Much of the delay is due to the Board Secretary and the Board performing housecleaning, if you will, on the bylaws and regulations. Many of the recent changes in the bylaws and regulations have to do with that housecleaning, though not all. I suggested to the Secretary that some sort of interim release of the manual was appropriate, perhaps in an electronic format on ZipNet. I plan to make the same suggestion to the Board directly. I have been attending the Board's meetings and recently attended a meeting of the Board committees. I must say that I was struck by just how hard the Board members work while governing our University. The Board committees meeting lasted nigh on seven hours, not to mention the obvious preparation time the Board members had expended. Further, I must also say that my impression of the Board members is that they are persons of good will who are genuinely interested in our University prospering and improving. I attribute much of the anxiety and many of the rumors on our campus to poor communications concerning the Board's actions and contemplated actions. This is something we, the Senate and the Board both, should be able to fix. With your support, I will continue to try to do my part in that regard.

Respectfully submitted by  
H. Michael Cheung, Chair



**3359-20-034 TERMINATING EMPLOYMENT****(A) Nonreappointment and Termination of Regular Faculty.**

- (1) **Nonreappointment.** If a faculty member not on indefinite tenure is not to be reappointed at the end of a contract term, notice of such nonreappointment (notice from the academic dean being viewed as the effective date of such notice) shall be provided as follows:

- (a) Not later than March 1 of the first academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or, if a one-year appointment expires during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its expiration.
- (b) Not later than December 15 of the second academic year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year.
- (c) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.

~~(2) The procedure to be followed in nonreappointment of untenured faculty is as follows:~~

- ~~(a) The dean invites the faculty member to an office conference, at which the department chair is present, and outlines to the faculty member the dean's proposed recommendation and indicates the reasons therefore, all orally.~~
- ~~(b) The faculty member may accept this advice and offer to resign.~~
- ~~(c) If after a reasonable time, not to exceed two weeks, the faculty member does not tender a resignation, the dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of:~~
  - ~~(i) The dean's intent to forward a recommendation of nonreappointment to the Provost.~~
  - ~~(ii) The reasons thereof in some detail.~~
  - ~~(iii) The faculty member's privilege of a second conference with the dean, at which the department chair is to be present, unless the faculty member wishes otherwise.~~
  - ~~(iv) The faculty member's privilege of outlining reasons why the dean should submit an affirmative recommendation.~~
- ~~(d) The conferences authorized in (2) above are intended as conferences, not administrative hearings. Therefore it is unnecessary to permit legal counsel, a court reporter, the calling of witnesses, or cross examination, etc.~~
- ~~(e) Following a conference, the dean may be persuaded to change the recommendation or to affirm it. In either event, the dean should send a letter to the candidate. If the intent continues to be in the negative, the dean will confirm the earlier letter, and will advise the faculty member of the privilege of conferring with the President.~~

- (2) **THE UNTENURED FACULTY MEMBER WHO HAS NOT BEEN REAPPOINTED HAS THE RIGHT OF APPEAL AT THE DEPARTMENTAL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY LEVELS AS SPECIFIED IN FACULTY MANUAL SECTION 3359-20-037 D.**



the University operation, the length of time necessarily varying from the circumstances of the faculty member's particular case, but the minimum time should be four months before termination of employment.

(D) Terminating Employment (Procedures).

- (1) A faculty member resigning from the University addresses a letter of resignation to the dean. An administrative officer addresses a letter of resignation to the appropriate administrative supervisor.
- (2) Before leaving the University, a regular or full-time auxiliary faculty member must get a clearance memorandum from the department chair or dean. This memorandum is evidence that the faculty member has turned in all grades, accounted for departmental books, supplies and property, turned in keys, and satisfied all other obligations to the University. The clearance memorandum is given to the Office of the Assistant ASSOCIATE Vice President FOR FINANCE AND Controller and is that office's authorization to issue any final payment check due.



October 5, 1995

Page 26

**0359-20-037 GUIDELINES FOR INITIAL APPOINTMENT, REAPPOINTMENT, TENURE AND PROMOTION OF REGULAR FACULTY****(A) Procedures.**

- (1) Each department shall have a set of criteria and procedures concerning initial appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion.
- (2) The procedures shall be prepared by each department and should be formally approved by that department, the college dean and the Provost.
- (3) Subsequent reviews of the procedures may be initiated by the departmental faculty, the college dean, or the Provost.

**(B) Initial Appointment.**

- (1) Initial appointments should involve the entire full-time faculty of the department and should include appointment of a search committee, circulation of vitae, review of any scholarly work, an interview with departmental faculty, and, where appropriate, seminars or other professional presentations.
- (2) Detailed current procedures and regulations regarding such matters as affirmative action, advertising, and interviewing should be obtained from the ~~Division of Human Resources and Information Services~~ **ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES**.
- (3) All newly appointed faculty shall receive a copy of the criteria and procedures for the department, division and college where appropriate.

**(C) Reappointment, Tenure, and Promotion.**

- (1) Regardless of differences between departments (size, numbers in various ranks, professional guidelines), each set of criteria and procedures should contain a general introduction, including a statement of the responsibilities and goals of the department and separate procedures on promotion, tenure, retention, including appropriate committees for each.
- (2) Each set of procedures must contain the following minimum provisions to ensure that:
  - (a) Each candidate under consideration and the committee members shall receive at least two weeks written notice of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting, criteria of judgment and other details should be explained in writing.
  - (b) The department chair or committee chair will schedule meetings of each appropriate committee according to the University calendar allowing time for possible appeals and timely transmittal to the dean. ~~If the department chair does not otherwise qualify to be a member of a committee, the department chair shall be a member ex-officio so that information and explanation of the department chair's views concerning the candidate may be provided.~~ **DEPARTMENT CHAIRS SHALL NOT BE MEMBERS OF THESE COMMITTEES BUT MAY AT EACH COMMITTEE'S REQUEST ATTEND THE MEETINGS FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES.** Each committee will elect its own chair.
  - (c) The candidate shall submit a vita and other professional data, including information about: teaching, including courses taught and evidence of quality teaching; research, publication and creative activities; University service; continuing education; professional activities and recognition; and public service relevant to the candidate's academic expertise. The candidate shall be invited



to meet with the committee before a recommendation is made. This recommendation shall be by secret ballot.

- (d) The committee shall promptly furnish the candidate with a written summary of the relevant proceedings, including any conclusions, admonitions, and advice. The department chair and the committee chair will subsequently review this document with the candidate.
- (e) The department chair shall make a separate recommendation. If the department chair's recommendation differs from that of the committee, the department chair must discuss this recommendation with the committee and the faculty member. In either case, the department chair shall send a copy of the recommendation to the faculty member concerned.
- (f) The department chair shall transmit copies of the committee's recommendation and the department chair's recommendation with supporting materials to the dean.

(3) Composition of the committees for recommendations should be as follows:

- (a) Reappointment Committee. At least all the tenured members of the departmental faculty.
- (b) Tenure Committee. At least all tenured members of the department.
- (c) Promotion Committee. At least all tenured faculty members within the department who are at rank or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered. Any person on such a committee should have served at least one year at The University of Akron in the department.
- (d) If there are fewer than three appropriate faculty members in the department to form the appropriate committee, then rules to add committee members from outside the department will be formulated by the college faculty and included in the procedures of the college or school.

(D) Each college shall have appeals or review procedures which shall include at least the following provisions:

- (1) A College Appeals Committee and a schedule allowing for timely transmittal of results of an appeal or review to the dean and appellant.
- (2) A statement of the grounds of appeal by the appellant.
- (3) An opportunity to appeal as indicated below:
  - (a) A faculty member receiving an adverse recommendation from a department (or a committee thereof) may request a rehearing by that department or committee.
  - (b) ~~The procedure to be followed in nonreappointment of untenured faculty is as follows:~~ **IN THE CASE OF NONREAPPOINTMENT:**
    - (i) **THE FACULTY MEMBER MAY REQUEST** ~~The dean invites the faculty member to an office conference, at which the department chair is present, WITH THE DEAN, THE PURPOSE OF WHICH IS TO DISCUSS and outlines to the faculty member the dean's proposed recommendation and indicates the reasons therefor~~ ~~all orally.~~ **NO FORMAL RECORD OF THIS CONFERENCE SHALL**



October 5, 1995

Page 28

**BE MAINTAINED.**

(ii) The faculty member may accept this advice and offer to resign.

(iii) If after a reasonable time, not to exceed two weeks, the faculty member does not tender a resignation, the dean shall notify the faculty member in writing of:

- The dean's intent to forward a recommendation of nonreappointment to the Provost.

- The reasons thereof in some detail.

- The faculty member's privilege of a second conference with the dean, at which the department chair is to be present, unless the faculty member wishes otherwise.

- The faculty member's privilege of outlining reasons why the dean should submit an affirmative recommendation.

(iv) The conferences authorized in (2) (b) above are intended as conferences, not administrative hearings. Therefore, it is unnecessary to permit legal counsel, a court reporter, the calling of witnesses, or cross examination, etc.

(v) Following a conference, the dean may be persuaded to change the recommendation or to affirm it. In either event, the dean should send a letter to the candidate. If the intent continues to be in the negative, the dean will confirm the earlier letter, and will advise the faculty member of the privilege of conferring with the President. **AND THE FACULTY MEMBER HAS THE RIGHT OF APPEAL AS SPECIFIED BELOW.**

(b) (c) A faculty member may appeal an adverse recommendation by a department committee or the department chair **OR THE DEAN** (whether or not it is independent of, or supports, a prior recommendation by the department) to the College Appeals Committee. That committee will report its findings to the college dean.

(c) (d) An adverse recommendation initiated by the college dean may be appealed to the College Appeals Committee which will report its findings to the dean. In cases involving termination, the review will be timed to comply with the schedule described in Rule 3359-20-034, Terminating Employment.

(d) (e) If the dean continues to make an adverse recommendation, the faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, which will report its findings initially to the Provost.

(e) (f) A faculty member may then appeal directly to the Provost **WHO SHALL RESPOND IN A TIMELY FASHION.**

(f) (g) An adverse recommendation initiated by the Provost may be appealed to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee which will report its findings initially to the Provost.

(g) (h) After exhausting the above steps a faculty member may appeal to the University President **WHO SHALL RESPOND IN A TIMELY FASHION.**



October 5, 1995

Page 29

- (4) Written records of appeals or review committees.
- (5) Written reports from the department committee and the appeals committee given to the appellant and the dean and a written statement from the dean to the appellant of the grounds of the dean's decision.
- (E) These guidelines are established to ensure fair and systematic methods of evaluating faculty members. Detailed procedures will be adopted by each college and department suitable for its special needs but consistent with the guidelines. In the case of a violation of the procedures, it is not intended that appointment, reappointment, promotion or tenure be awarded by default. Nevertheless, in such cases the evaluating or appeals committee shall attempt to rectify matters by considering how a violation of the guidelines may have affected the opportunity for a fair, impartial hearing, and by providing effective relief. Such cases and recommended relief, if any, shall be brought to the attention of the dean and Provost for comment.



## APPENDIX C

### Remarks of the President of the University

Yesterday, I had the occasion to spend part of a day working with a number of our largest donors who are probably the area's most influential corporate leaders. One of the topics of the day was how the area could help the educational establishments in our region respond positively to the radical changes that face all of us whether in available resources, technology, student needs or methods of instruction. Echoes of our campus discussions reverberated all day. Five consensus points reached in that group seemed worth sharing with you in my remarks:

1. Change is learning -- loaded with uncertainty.
2. Change is a continuing journey -- not a blueprint.
3. Change is resource hungry -- even when resources must be produced from the creative redeployment of existing funds.
4. In this period of rapid change, problems are sometimes our friend because exhortation, no matter how compelling, will not usually cause us to undertake the disquiet of change. Real problems, on the other hand, will do that.
5. In a period of rapid change, distributing accurate information is ethical and spreading misinformation is unethical because it creates additional disquiet that could be avoided.

While perhaps less than profound, I think each point reinforces the really tough work which all of us in education are having to undertake today. While a time of change produces few comforts, I kept feeling a real sense of hopefulness yesterday because of the existence of our governance processes, especially the Senate. I was reinforced because the work of the Senate is clearly a positive contributing force in this change landscape. To me at least it is a place where values are mutually understood and even sometimes mutually embraced. It is also a body filled with colleagues who can consider carefully what we must change and weigh that against what we cannot.

One new initiative for change will come forward today relating to broader evaluation of those in the University community. This concept has my support, as feedback loops become increasingly important to any progress in a terrain where data based mid-course corrections can be extremely helpful.

Also new on the campus is a discussion about two potential capital initiatives in support of enrollment: the improvement of on-campus housing and the improvement of campus space for student interaction and recreation. As the University continues to systematically seek expert advice on ways to attract more and better students we will need to weigh that advice well. I urge you to become well informed about these issues before you take a position on them.



Additionally, I would also note that the Trustees delayed action on the proposed changes in the bylaws of the Board to permit further consideration and consultation on these matters. I thank Chairperson Cheung for his persistence in seeking the opportunity for faculty input on this matter.

Finally, I would invite members of this body to send the Provost your input concerning a proposal to create a single division devoted to information resources reporting through the Senior Vice President and Provost. As it is presently configured, the position would be an Associate Provost for Information Resources with non-academic administrative reporting to that person and academic functional reporting to the Provost.

Given the importance and dynamic nature of information technology, this type of organizational structure is becoming fairly common in higher education (as a glance at the "Chronicle" want ads will quickly confirm).

Placing the technology organization administratively under the Provost should ensure the unit is academically centered and also continue our efforts to streamline the general administration. Further, the retirement of Dr. Frank Thomas in December will enable us to implement the new organization without a new position.

A draft of the concept has been shared with LRPC and the Council of Deans. Several suggestions were received and Provost Jamison is working to resolve the issues that have been raised.

For your further information I am distributing a number of handouts at the end of my remarks today in order to respect your time constraints.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted by  
Peggy Gordon Elliott, President



**APPENDIX D****Report of the Executive Committee****FACULTY SENATE BUDGET STATEMENT**

September 30, 1995

	<u>YTD Budget</u>	<u>YTD Actual</u>
Total Compensation	\$6,818.59	\$6,828.20
Supplies & Services	24,720.45	1,664.34
Total Other	1,051.20	454.32
ACCOUNT TOTALS	32,590.24	8,946.86

Respectfully submitted by  
David Brink, Vice-Chair

**APPENDIX E****Report of Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee**

The APCC met on September 12, 1995 and presents the following items for action by the Faculty Senate:

**1. Revisions to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate (attached)**

APCC presents for approval revisions to the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, Section V. (Permanent Committees) - Parts A., B., C., D., L., and M. These revisions establish the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) and the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee (APCC) as distinct and permanent committees of the Senate.



## 2. Student Attendance Policy

APCC reports that the Policies and Calendar Subcommittee of APCC has reviewed the Student Attendance Policy and has judged the policy to be appropriate as written.

If the Student Affairs Committee of the Senate has reason for the policy to be reviewed further, the Policies and Calendar Subcommittee asks that a detailed request outlining the committee's concerns with the present policy be forwarded to the subcommittee.

Respectfully submitted by  
Graham Kelly, Assistant Provost

## **ATTACHMENT TO APCC REPORT:**

### **V. Permanent Committees**

- A. Permanent committees of the Senate shall be Academic Policies, ~~Curriculum~~ and Calendar; Athletics; Campus Facilities Planning; University Libraries; Reference; Research; Student Affairs; Computing and Communication Technologies; CURRICULUM REVIEW.
- B. Members of the Executive Committee shall, in May, and after considering preferences of Senate members and then non-Senate members, appoint all permanent and ad hoc committees of the Senate. To provide some continuity of membership for each committee, the Executive Committee shall appoint committee members so that, if possible, only one-third of the membership of any committee is terminated each year and members serve a three-year term. At the first meeting of each committee, the committee shall elect its chair from among the senatorial members, with the exception of the ~~Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee~~ CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE, which shall be chaired by the Senior Vice President and Provost or said designee.
- C. The following permanent committees shall have ex officio members as indicated: ~~Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar, the Senior Vice President and Provost or said person's designee~~; Athletics, the Athletic Director or said person's designee and the NCAA Faculty Athletics Representative (appointed by the President); Campus Facilities Planning, the Vice President for Administrative Support Services or said person's designee; University Libraries, the Dean of University Libraries, or said person's designee; Research (Faculty Projects), the Associate Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies or said person's designee; and Student Affairs, the Vice President for Student Affairs or said person's designee and the Director of Student Financial Aid; Computer and Communications Technologies, the Associate Vice President of Information Services



or said person's designee; CURRICULUM REVIEW, THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST OR SAID PERSON'S DESIGNEE. If not already a member of the Senate, the chair shall become an ex officio nonvoting member for reporting purposes only. Ex officio members shall be nonvoting unless they are members of the Senate. Additional nonvoting members may be appointed to any permanent committee by committee approval.

**D. Academic Policies, ~~Curriculum~~ and Calendar Committee**

- ~~1. Reviews curricula and course recommendations of the several colleges and divisions and submits them, with recommendations, to Faculty Senate for action.~~
- 2-1. Establishes RECOMMENDS and interprets ACADEMIC policy on various academic UNIVERSITY-WIDE matters such as admission, retention, and graduation AND DISMISSAL requirements, etc., ~~when the legislative action of Faculty Senate empowers it to do so.~~
- 3-2. Recommends ~~to Faculty Senate~~ changes for the improvement of the academic program of the University.
- ~~4. 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.~~
- ~~5. Reviews course changes, proposals, new programs, and recommends such changes and revisions for inclusion in the General Bulletin.~~
- 6-3. Proposes a calendar for each academic year beginning with the first summer session and concluding with the following Spring Commencement.

**E. Athletics Committee**

1. Advises Faculty Senate on all University activities relating to intercollegiate athletics including, but not limited to, conference affiliations and the National Collegiate Athletic Association.
2. Coordinates with other Faculty Senate committees matters of joint concern relating to Intercollegiate Athletics.
3. Provides advice and counsel to the Director of Athletics concerning individual player eligibility, interpretation of policy and other matters relating to the athletic program.
4. The Registrar decides questions of academic eligibility of student athletes. If conflicts arise between the Registrar, student athlete, and/or athletic department, the following procedures shall be followed:
  - a. Appeal could be made by any of the grieved parties to the Athletics Committee;
  - b. Upon reviewing the facts, the committee would make a recommendation to the Senior Vice President and Provost.
5. Promotes academic achievement among student athletes.
6. Reviews team game schedules, seasonal game limitations and participation in post-season events.



7. Reviews the proposed budget with respect to athletic programs.

**F. Campus Facilities Planning Committee**

1. Reviews the future construction needs of the University, the status of current capital projects, and the status of space assignments.
2. Provides faculty and student advice and information to the Planning Department on:
  - a. The priorities assigned to the construction and facilities needs of the University.
  - b. The changes in space assignments for academic, research and residential facilities.
  - c. The utilization of current facilities.
  - d. The naming of campus buildings.
3. Reports findings and actions to the Faculty Senate along with necessary and appropriate recommendations.

**G. University Libraries Committee.**

1. Serves as an advisory group to the Dean of University Libraries to express the faculty will in the growth and development of the academic support which the Libraries supply.
2. Provides the Dean of University Libraries with guidelines and advice on acquisitions, budget, policy and other matters affecting academic areas.

**H. Reference Committee.**

1. Reviews legislation referred to it by Faculty Senate to ascertain if it is drafted properly and does not conflict with existing rules and regulations or practices.
2. Reviews the Faculty Manual annually and submits any suggested revisions by the February meeting of the Faculty Senate.

**I. Research Committee (Faculty Projects).**

1. Reviews research proposals submitted by faculty members and grants University funds in support of those proposals deemed worthy.
2. Recommends the budgeting of sums of the University's support of faculty research proposals to be funded by this committee.
3. Establishes policies for funding proposals and guidelines for expenditures of those funded.

**J. Student Affairs Committee**

1. Provides advice and recommendations to the Vice President of Student Affairs concerning operations of the Division of Student Affairs.
2. Reviews and recommends policy concerning student affairs to the Faculty Senate.



3. Reviews and recommends policy regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants, and loans to University students to appropriate bodies.
4. Recommends to the Senate the extensions for official registration of student organizations.

**K. Computer and Communications Technologies Committee**

1. Provides recommendations to the Senate on policy matters concerning utilization of information technology and resources related to academic systems, computing data and voice communication.
2. Provides advice and counsel to the Associate Vice President of Information Services concerning guidelines on electronic information acquisition, budget, processing, policies, and other matters affecting academic areas.

**L. CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE**

1. REVIEWS CURRICULA AND COURSE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SEVERAL COLLEGES AND DIVISIONS AND, WHEN NECESSARY SUBMITS THEM TO FACULTY SENATE FOR ACTION.
2. CONSIDERS THE MECHANICS OF THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS OF THE SEVERAL COLLEGES AND DIVISIONS, SUCH AS ADJUSTMENTS IN ADMISSION, RETENTION, AND DISMISSAL REQUIREMENTS, AND CHANGES IN GENERAL BULLETIN DESCRIPTIONS.
3. REVIEWS COURSE CHANGES, PROPOSALS, NEW PROGRAMS, AND RECOMMENDS SUCH CHANGES AND REVISIONS FOR INCLUSION IN THE GENERAL BULLETIN.

**L.M. Subcommittees**

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 chair's responsibility to maintain minutes and pass them on to the incoming chair.



APPENDIX F**Report of Campus Facilities Planning Committee**

The Committee met for a regular session on September 14 and in a special meeting on September 21.

In the September 14 meeting, Dr. Guegold, Committee Chair for 1993-1995, called the meeting to order. Dr. Drummond was elected Chair for 1995-96 as there were no other volunteers for that position. Dr. Guegold was commended for his service to this committee over the last two years and has volunteered to help the new Chair during this transition.

There was considerable discussion of the subject of food service in the Hilltop in GSC. This is an important issue for many faculty and it is the intent of this committee that we fulfill our charge of advising in the area of facilities including the area of dining accommodations. We have not had the opportunity to do so in this case. Apparently a sandwich/soup/salad operation will be functioning some time in September.

The subject of the renovation of the Chuckery was discussed and it was duly noted that this committee had also not been part of the loop in this case. Several questions were raised about the need for such a project: would the absence of the Chuckery during the renovation affect special events of the Summer such as the Elderhostel; and our hosting of the Soap Box Derby and the AA Convention. The Committee feels strongly that faculty input is necessary on such items.

Mr. Roger Ryan presented a proposed three-biennium capital budget. The request for this biennium was presented to the Board of Trustees on September 27 and was to be in Columbus by October 2, 1995. The items in the Capital Request for 1997-98 are as follows:

1. Additional Funding - Student Services Building	\$ 6,000,000
2. Leigh Hall Rehabilitation	4,500,000
3. Science & Technology Library Addition	3,500,000
4. Carroll Hall Rehabilitation	4,500,000
5. Guzzetta Hall Addition Feasibility Study	100,000
6. Goodwill Purchase & Minimal Renovation	<u>3,800,000</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$22,400,000</b>

The request of \$22.4 million will be over the new debt ceiling of approximately \$16-\$18 million. It was noted that state law now dictates that the universities service their own debt above a state mandated level. That level has not been definitively established for UA as yet. There were some questions relating to the capital budget although most of the items have appeared on previous requests. Most questions centered on the purchase of the Goodwill building. The extension of the campus and the disruption of the community service offered by Goodwill were mentioned. This facility will be used to house part of the Physical Plant such as the Carpentry and Paint Shops. The University Police would use the entire first floor of the PPOC and North Hall could then be razed. The committee voted unanimously to approve the 1997-1998 request and forward it to the Faculty Senate. It was noted that the approval of the budget by the Senate could not occur before the vote by the Board of Trustees. As we understand it, the Senate is to function as an advisory body and it cannot do so in this case if the capital budgets are given to us at such a late date. Mr. Ryan was asked to note these timing concerns to the Board.



It was suggested that the Committee look into some specific items during this academic year:

1. How are plant funds allocated among administrative and academic units?
2. Should the chair of the CFPC have the prerogative to meet with the Provost over the Summer concerning space issues if the Committee does not meet?
3. Should we begin to look at total space allocation based on long-range planning with respect for what is to grow and what is not to grow? Most space is "owned" by colleges and departments, but is the present allocation appropriate?
4. Should space assigned to a unit be included as part of a budget line? Should units be "charged" for space that is used and would that give an incentive to release space when it is no longer needed?

A new space item will be brought before the committee that requests 5000-6000 sq. ft. of parking area behind the Lincoln Building (20 - 25 spaces). The space will be used for satellite uplinks and downlinks. Three dishes will be installed to provide cable TV to the residence halls. The cost (\$450,000) is taken out of a residence hall rate increase and it is hoped that the additional service will entice students to our presently underused residence halls.

The CFPC intends to continue to make sure that those who have an interest in proposals brought before this body are adequately informed of deliberations.

The meeting on September 21 was a presentation by Brailsford Associates on the results of their feasibility studies concerning a student recreation center and student housing. The work by the consultant was very detailed and Dr. Caryl Smith has supplied the Committee with a copy of the summaries of their two reports and given us access to the complete reports. Although the study is preliminary and the CFPC will discuss the reports at length in our next meeting, several concerns were raised on September 21:

1. The initial overall cost of the recreation center is \$25,800,000. From the Brailsford data, the debt service on this amount is \$2,084,000 per year over 30 years.
2. Student costs (\$6.00/credit hour, part of general fee) and faculty staff costs(\$250.00/yr, not mandatory) for the recreation center seemed quite high. The faculty use of the ONAT would be restricted to those paying the yearly fee since this building would be included in the overall recreation complex.
3. Possible parking problems when events are scheduled at the JAR.
4. Did the student surveys (576 out of 8,361 randomly selected students returned them) and faculty/staff surveys (324 out of 1893 randomly selected individuals returned them) provide a proper basis for determining support for the project?
5. The housing study recommends the demolition of Bulger Hall and Spanton Hall. Is there a more justifiable option?

The chair of the CFPC was present for the interview of firms bidding to carry out a 15-year plan for the University. The interviews took place on September 20 and 26. There were several excellent



firms qualified to do the planning work and whichever is chosen will be looking for substantial faculty input into the process. The subject of a master plan for the campus has been under consideration for some time and there was a workshop on the subject last May. Several members of the CFPC attended this workshop.

Respectfully submitted by  
Jerry Drummond, Chair

## APPENDIX G

### **Report of Faculty Research Projects Committee**

Minutes of March 10, 1995

The meeting began at 9:05 a.m. in the McCollester Room of Buchtel Hall. Members present were Dr. Roger Bain, Ms. Virginia Berringer, Dr. Dale Borowiak, Dr. Dolores Bower, Mr. Earl Ertman, Dr. J. Clayton Fant, Dr. Gary Frank, Dr. Jon Hawes, Dr. Thein Kyu, Dr. Lazarus Macior, Dr. Dan Sheffer, Dr. Nancy Somerick, Dr. Charmaine Streharsky, and Dr. Gerald Young. Absent with notice: Ms. Christina DePaul, Ms. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. William McGucken, and Dr. Isadore Newman, Chair. Absent without notice: Ms. Tana Alexander, and Dr. Brian Leonard.

Dr. Newman is out of town and previously asked Dr. Sheffer to chair today's Committee. Dr. Sheffer explained that Dr. Sylvester, Vice President for Research and University Development, at the September 2, 1994 meeting, had made a funding commitment of \$30,000 to \$40,000 to the Faculty (Research Projects) Committee. Cindy Angerstien, secretary to the Committee explained that the February, 1995, budget statement showed \$3.60 in Supplies and Services and \$1,154.55 in moveable equipment. She suggested the monies be transferred into supplies and services. Therefore, the total budget balance available is \$1,158.15. Dr. Sheffer explained the total amount requested of the fifteen proposals is \$43,253.40. He felt comfortable there were enough funds available for this competition.

Dr. Sheffer stated he had the Faculty Senate make a motion of the BPCC to take a look at the funding level of this Committee.

Dr. Sheffer reminded the Committee that scoring would be done by secret ballot with number one ranking the highest through number four, and three votes of number five made a proposal ineligible. Dr. Sheffer explained that several primary reviewers were unable to attend the meeting and they sent in comments plus had already "scored" the proposals. Dr. Sheffer questioned the Committee if the pre-scored proposals should be added in at the time the proposal is voted. A motion was made that the pre-scored proposals should be accepted and counted; the motion failed.

There were 15 proposals submitted for the Spring 1995 Fellowship competition. All the proposals were reviewed and ranked. Three successful proposals were rebudgeted to \$3,000.



**There were 12 proposals funded, totaling \$33,148:**

Arts & Science	3	-	Biology
	1	-	Math Science
	2	-	History
Engineering	2	-	Biomedical
	2	-	Chemical
	1	-	Mechanical
Nursing	1	-	Nursing

**This Committee will meet APRIL 6, 1995, from 9-Noon, in the McCollester Room of Buchtel Hall to discuss the 1995-96 Guidelines and conclude the current 1994-95 year.**

The University of Akron  
Internal Grant Awarded by  
Research (Faculty Projects) Committee

**Spring 1995**  
**Effective March 10, 1995 through January 31, 1996**

FRG #	ACCT #	NAME	TITLE OF PROJECT	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1312	2-07275	Abdulla Abonamah Math Science A&S	"Remote PC server for X-windows applications"	\$2,500
1313	2-07276	H. Michael Cheung Chemical Engr. ENGR	"Emulsion polymerization in supercritical fluids"	\$3,000
1314	2-07277	Richard J. Gross and Steve Rooke, Mechanical Engr. ENGR.	"Instability of pumps and fans"	\$3,000
1315	2-07278	Jim Holda Biology A&S	"A mechanism for Th1 depletion in AIDS"	\$2,631



1316	2-07279	Philip A. Howard History A&S	"Race, class and politics: The status of Afro-Cubans military occupation 1898-1915"	\$3,000
1317	2-07280	Amy Milsted Biology A&S	"Renal developmental effects and the hypertensive rat chromosome"	\$3,000
1318	2-07281	Daniel Nelson History A&S	"Mining and the Alaskan environment, 1880-1940"	\$1,950
1319	2-07282	Helen Qammar Chemical Engr. Engr.	"Applicability of nonlinear process control to control of the chaotic systems"	\$3,021
1320	2-07283	Donna B. Richardson Biomedical Engr. ENGR	"Towards a standardized ABR examination stimulus"	\$3,000
1321	2-07284	Ron Salisbury Biology A&S	"Estrogen and apoptosis in the developing brain"	\$3,000
1322	2-07285	William D. Timmons Biomedical Engr. ENGR.	"A telemetric rat model for testing automated pressure control"	\$2,875
1323	2-07286	Adele A. Webb NURSING	"The effectiveness of pain management for AIDS patients"	<u>\$2,171</u>
<b>TOTAL 12 PROPOSAL FUNDED SPRING 95</b>				<b>\$33,148</b>

## FACULTY (RESEARCH PROJECTS) COMMITTEE

Minutes of April 6, 1995

The meeting began at 9:05 a.m. in the McColleston Room of Buchtel Hall. Members present were Dr. Roger Bain, Mr. Earl Ertman, Dr. J. Clayton Fant, Dr. Gary Frank, Dr. Jon Hawes, Dr. Brian Leonard, Dr. Lazarus Macior, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Charmaine Streharsky, and Dr. Gerald Young. Absent with notice: Ms. Christina DePaul, Ms. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. William McGucken, Dr. Dan Sheffer, Dr. Nancy Somerick, and Dr. Claire Tessier. Absent without notice: Ms. Tana Alexander, Ms. Virginia Berringer, Dr. Dale Borowiak, Dr. Dolores Bower, and Dr. Thein Kyu. Correction to March 10, 1995 Minutes: Dr. Claire Tessier was absent with notice.



Dr. Newman stated he would like to suggest a possible co-chair for this committee. He explained Dr. Sheffer functioned as a co-chair at the March 10, 1995, meeting while he was out of town. This permitted continuity of a scheduled meeting, which without Dr. Sheffer's help would have meant the Committee meeting would have had to have been canceled and rescheduled. Dr. Newman further explained the co-chair would have to be a Senator. Dr. Young questioned if the chair and the co-chair could be from science and the arts. Dr. Newman explained that could be a consideration but not a requirement. Dr. Streharsky suggested a vice-chair instead of a co-chair so that responsibilities could be shared. Dr. Leonard suggested the vice-chair could automatically be the next chair. Dr. Streharsky explained this would solve the problem about the vice-chair being a senator. Dr. Bain made the motion that a vice-chair (who will also be a Senator) will be elected to the F(RP) Committee at the first 1995-96 F(RP) Committee in September, 1995. The vice-chair's role will be to offer support to the chair for the 1995-96 year and become acquainted with the responsibilities required of the chair. Then, the vice-chair will automatically become the chair during the 1996-97 year. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Newman asked the Committee whether the last F(RP) Committee meeting could be optional (usually held in April). Dr. Fant expressed a great concern in which he felt this last meeting was very important and he was against the meeting being optional. Dr. Newman explained there is a meeting at the beginning of the year which is essential for the new members so they can become acquainted with the procedures of the Committee. Dr. Leonard suggested the meeting should continue to be scheduled and then to cancel the meeting if it becomes unnecessary. Dr. Fant suggested the final meeting could be at the discretion of the chair. Dr. Newman concluded that some issues cannot be addressed at the first meeting; therefore, the final meeting is necessary. The conclusion of the discussion was the final meeting will be at the discretion of the chair.

Dr. Newman firmly believes this Committee should be funded by a line item budget. He expressed feeling very uncomfortable due to the fact that the Committee was making commitments without proper funding. Dr. Newman explained the problem with funding this Committee completely from IDC is not knowing from year to year what amount is available (from the Vice President for Research). Dr. Bain suggested the Committee could request a one-time commitment of money that could be replenished through IDC, therefore, there wouldn't be the wait for money spent and then recovered. Dr. Streharsky explained that no percentage of IDC monies is awarded to this Committee. She did suggest a possible solution could be to carve out of the IDC a percentage (2%) that could flow back to the Committee just like IDC monies flow back to a department or college or to a PI. She further explained this Committee needed both, a line item budget and a recovered percentage of IDC. However, she didn't believe this Committee should be funded entirely from recovered IDC because of the nature of the projects that are supported. There should be funding from the General Fund for the Humanities, Arts, etc., as these are areas that do not have the opportunity to bring in outside money which, in turn, would bring in IDC. Dr. Newman explained that in previous years, there were carry-over monies that helped the next year's budget and for two years, OBR Research Challenge monies were used to help fund awards. Last year's budget was \$60,000. Dr. Newman believes the line item budget should be \$80,000. Dr. Young suggested 2/3 as line item budget, and 1/3 coming from IDC. The Committee unanimously agreed there should be a mix in funding the F(RP) Committee. There should be a line item budget (2/3) approximately \$80,000 from the General Fund and (1/3) from IDC. Dr. Newman stated the Committee needed to speak to their Senators and explain the requirements of this Committee.

Dr. Newman asked the Committee if they had suggestions or comments. Dr. Fant explained that a Committee member should not be permitted to submit proposals to the F(RP) Committee. He explained he felt uncomfortable as there is an appearance of a conflict of interest. Dr. Streharsky stated she didn't want to eliminate the opportunities for some of the best researchers not to serve on this Committee. Dr. Macior explained this would be disqualifying qualified researchers and then this Committee would be left with only non-researchers. Dr. Ertman explained he could understand about feeling uncomfortable, however, he believed professionalism should outweigh the issue and the two could be separated. He further explained that he became eligible to apply when the rules of eligibility changed from five years to three years. Dr. Hawes suggested at the first meeting in the fall, that any Committee member who submits a proposal can at his/her option not attend the meeting at which their proposal is considered. If they feel uncomfortable they need not come and they will not be penalized as an unexcused absence. Dr. Leonard suggested a possible substitute and Dr. Newman questioned who would make the choice for the substitute. Dr. Frank commented



the person could be present but should not vote at that particular meeting. A motion was made that a person who is on the F(RP) Committee is eligible to submit a proposal for a grant. If they submit a proposal, they may be present at the meeting so as to perform their responsibilities to the Committee. However, they may not vote on any proposal during that competition in which they submitted a proposal, nor will they be a primary reviewer to any proposal during that competition. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Newman would like to thank all the members of the Committee for their hard work during the past year and that it was a pleasure working with everyone.

The following Committee members' terms expire June 30, 1995: Dr. Dale Borowiak, Dr. J. Clayton Fant, Dr. Gary Frank (Senator), Dr. Brian Leonard, Dr. Dan Sheffer (Senator), and Dr. Gerald Young.

**THE FIRST MEETING FOR THE 1995-1996 R(FP) COMMITTEE WILL BE FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1995, 9-NOON, MCCOLLESTER ROOM, BUCHEL HALL.**

## RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE

### Minutes of September 8, 1995

A meeting of the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee was held on Friday, September 8, 1995, in the McColleston Room of Buchtel Hall. Members present were Ms. Tana Alexander, Dr. Roger Bain, Ms. Virginia Berringer, Dr. Dolores Bower, Ms. Christina DePaul, Dr. J. Clayton Fant, Dr. Jon Hawes, Ms. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. Brian Leonard, Dr. Lazarus Macior, Dr. Barb Moss (Senator), Dr. Isadore Newman (Chair), Dr. Dan Sheffer (Senator), Dr. Nancy Somerick, and Dr. Michael Williams. Absent with notice: Dr. Earl Ertman, Dr. William McGucken, Dr. Charmaine Streharsky, and Dr. Claire Tessier. Dr. Victoria Schirm is on a Fall 1995 Sabbatical.

The meeting began at 9:05 a.m. The agenda included: election of a new chair and vice-chair who must be Senators; an introduction of the new members and an explanation of their responsibilities (Dr. Barb Moss, Education, Dr. Michael Williams, C&T, Dr. Phil Schmidt, A&S); discussion of the 1994-95 Guidelines, a report on the 1995-96 budget allocation; and an introduction of Dr. Nicholas Sylvester, Vice President for Research and University Development.

Dr. Newman was able to stay for only a few minutes due to a conflict with two meetings. He stated Dr. Bain's suggestion (from a motion passed at the April 6, 1995, meeting) of selecting a vice-chair is a very good idea. The vice-chair, who must also be a Senator, will automatically become the chair for 1996-97. The Senators introduced themselves: Dr. Barb Moss and Dr. Dan Sheffer. Dr. Sheffer explained there could be a third Senator because the College of Arts & Sciences has not yet completed the election of Senators. The Committee unanimously voted Dr. Dan Sheffer as chair and Dr. Barb Moss as vice-chair. Dr. Newman explained to the new Committee members that the intent and purpose of this Committee is to facilitate and initiate research and to supply some funds to those who do research but would otherwise not have access to funds. The primary reviewer's



responsibility is to explain the proposal to the Committee and their responsibility including encouraging the faculty to submit proposals. The idea is to help the faculty to become competitive in their submission, give feedback when a proposal is denied, and to help facilitate in making the proposal more competitive the next time a proposal is submitted. Dr. Newman thanked everyone for the opportunity to serve as chair and explained he believed that this Committee is the most productive and useful committee on campus as it actually does help support the faculty. Ms. DePaul also thanked Dr. Newman for being the chair. Dr. Newman turned the Committee over to Dr. Sheffer and departed.

Dr. Sheffer explained to the new members that the deadline for a proposal competition submission is always on a Friday, and the following Monday each member will receive a copy of each proposal. (Cindy Angerstien, secretary to the Committee, explained that she no longer had the resources to personally deliver the proposals and is requesting each member to send a student, or come personally, to 284 Polsky Building to pick up the submitted proposals.) Then, two weeks later, also on a Friday, the Committee will meet to discuss that particular competition's proposals. Dr. Sheffer further explained this Committee works from a "primary reviewer" mode of operation in which he assigns the primary reviewer. The primary reviewer's job is to concentrate on the proposal to be reviewed and to understand there is the freedom to talk to the author of the proposal or from any other source. At the meeting, the primary reviewer will be responsible for the initial discussions of the particular proposal. Everyone is expected to read all the proposals. If the primary reviewer is unable to attend the meeting, they are requested to send their comments to Dr. Sheffer who will read their comments at the meeting.

Dr. Sheffer noted that for 1995-96, proposal submission deadlines will be: October 20, 1995, for Fall, 1995; November 17, 1995, for Summer, 1996 Fellowship; and February 23, 1996, for Spring 1995.

Dr. Schmidt, referring to the cover letter, paragraph 2, sentence 2, questioned if the year (1992) is changed automatically to the next year, and Dr. Sheffer explained that that was true. Dr. Fant questioned if the year in the sentence referred to the competition or the year the money was disbursed. Dr. Sheffer suggested the wording could be changed to read, "three years from the competition date." The Committee agreed the wording of the sentence would be unchanged except the year will be changed to 1993 and the sentence will read: "Except in extraordinary cases, those who have received funding from this committee since September, 1993 will not be considered for funding this year."

Dr. Leonard asked if there had been a problem in the past concerning how technical or non-technical an abstract was written. Dr. Fant suggested using the words "written for non-specialists." On page 5, item #1, under Required Proposal Format for Proposal Preparation Instructions, the Committee unanimously agreed to add Dr. Fant's suggested wording "...written for non-specialists." This wording will also appear on page 7, under Checklist for Attached Proposal for on the 1995-1996 Application/Checklist/Coversheet.

The Committee unanimously agreed to Dr. Leonard's motion from the November 10, 1994 meeting regarding the use of metric units for inclusion in the Guidelines. On page 5, item 2c of the Proposal Preparation Instructions the following last sentence will be added: "Those proposals involving quantitative measurements should use the Systeme Internationale (SI) metric units when following Federal guidelines."

Dr. Hawes questioned if there was a better way to explain how a proposal was to be typed. The sentence is found on page 6 as the last sentence of the last paragraph (after item 6) in the instructions under the Proposal Preparation Instructions, which reads: "The proposal should be typed



in Pica (10 pitch) or Elite (12 pitch)." The Committee unanimously agreed to both of Dr. Hawes' suggestions and the following will be incorporated: "The proposal should be typed no smaller than 10 point and no larger than 12 point." "These guidelines are typed in 10 point."

Ms. DePaul pointed out that her dean felt very uncomfortable and pressed for time when signing off on the FRG proposals and questioned if a sentence could be added allowing appropriate time. Dr. Sheffer explained that that was a policy within her college and another college could have a different policy. Dr. Fant questioned whether the sign-off was necessary and Dr. Sheffer explained it is necessary especially if the proposer is asking for cost sharing, etc.

Dr. Sheffer explained for 1994-95, 36 proposals (out of 47 eligible proposals) were funded totaling \$120,400.55. Broken down, the Fall 1994 competition had 20 submitted proposals with 16 proposals funded for \$47,252.55; Spring, 1995 competition had 15 submitted proposals and 12 proposals were funded for \$33,148; and Summer 1995 Fellowships had 14 submitted proposals, two proposals were deemed ineligible, and 8 proposals were funded for \$40,000.

Dr. Sheffer explained that for this year \$161,432.41 is the budget available. This means that \$100,000 is the approved budget plus \$60,177.86 as a carryover. This is approximately \$20,000 more than last year. The carry-over was probably because not that many proposals were received in the spring competition; in the past there have been as many as 35-40 proposal submissions. He further explained that if the Committee approves, the funding awards could be increased. Dr. Sheffer questioned whether the Committee believed \$3,000 was sufficient for the fall and spring grants and \$4,500 for the summer fellowships. Dr. Sheffer suggested raising the summer fellowship funding awards to \$6,000 using \$5,500 for salary and \$500 for expenses and raising the fall and spring funding awards to \$3,500. Dr. Fant stated the success rate of about 75% is great and he didn't believe there was a need to increase the number of awards by giving less money to more people. He further stated those proposals that were unsuccessful had concrete reasons. Dr. Fant suggested increasing the summer fellowship stipend. The Committee unanimously voted to increase the funding for Fall and Spring to \$3,500 and Summer Fellowships to \$6,000 meaning \$5,500 for salary and \$500 for expenses.

Dr. Nicholas Sylvester, Vice President for Research and University Development was introduced to the Committee by Dr. Sheffer. Dr. Sylvester explained he is responsible for research, technology transfer, patents, marketing, licensing, revenue, all of fund raising for university development, and UASC (non-credit education). Dr. Sylvester suggested the summer fellowship program should be expanded. He stated that when the University closed its books, there was carryover funds and there is now money available for equipment matching--\$200,000 available university-wide. This is good news for those writing proposals require equipment matching. The budget allocation the Committee received was authorized by the BPCC and approved by the Faculty Senate and the Board and these funds are continuing monies, not a one time allocation. Dr. Sheffer explained the Committee had discussed increasing the number and the dollar amount in the summer fellowships and he believed the low rate of proposal submissions was probably due to the small stipend and the restrictions that one cannot teach or receive compensation for graduate student load hours. Dr. Bain stated he was also concerned. Dr. Sheffer questioned whether this Committee will receive any funds from OBR Research Challenge. Dr. Sylvester explained that funds are available and some of the funds will come to this Committee; however, the amount available will not be known for several months.

**P.S. PLEASE MARK YOUR CALENDAR WITH THE FOLLOWING DATES TO MEET TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSAL COMPETITIONS. WE WILL MEET FROM 9-NOON IN THE MCCOLLESTER ROOM OF BUCHTEL HALL TO DISCUSS:**



October 5, 1995

Page 46

**FALL 1995**

Agenda: Law School

**SUMMER 1996**

**SPRING 1996**

**WRAP-UP MEETING**

**NOVEMBER 3, 1995**

**DECEMBER 1, 1995**

**MARCH 1, 1996**

**APRIL 5, 1996**

Respectfully submitted by  
Daniel Sheffer, Chair

Prepared by Cindy Angerstien,  
Secretary to Research (Faculty Projects) Committee





(