

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

11-2-1995

Faculty Senate Chronicle November 2, 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, uapress@uakron.edu.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of November 2, 1995	1
Appendices to the Minutes of the Meeting of Faculty Senate of November 2, 1995	14
A. Chairman's Remarks	14
B. Remarks of the President of the University	15
C. Report of <i>University Libraries Committee</i>	18
D. Report of <i>Student Affairs Committee</i>	19
E. Report of <i>Shared Governance Council and Subcommittees</i>	21
F. APCC Changes	22
G. Faculty Senate Administrative Evaluation	25
H. Associate Provost for Information Resources (job description)	27

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

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chairman introduced Senator William McGucken, whose recent election from the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences had been certified by the Executive Committee. The Chairman then welcomed Dean Randy Moore who was attending the meeting as the Interim Senior Vice President and Provost, and he extended the Senate's congratulations or condolences, as Provost Moore might deem appropriate a little later in his job. He was pleased to note that Provost Moore's goals and those of the Senate were remarkably similar, particularly with respect to creating an incentive based budget that recognized the preeminence of the academic enterprise in our University. He, for one, looked forward to working with the Provost on this issue.

Although, strictly speaking, it did not belong under special announcements, the Chairman thought that at this point the body could take care of the approval of the list of candidates for the Fall commencement. The Registrar had sent a copy of the list to the Faculty Senate offices, and there were copies available at this meeting if members wished to review them. Senator David Buchthal moved that the Senate approve the list of candidates for the Fall commencement subject to their successful completion of all applicable degree requirements. This was seconded by Senator Barbara Bucey. The Senate then voted its approval.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY - Before presenting her prepared remarks, President Peggy G. Elliott said she believed that the Chairman's comments clearly reflected her position on the updating of the handbook by the Board. The will of the body was that Senator Cheung be the Chair, and should she be allowed to vote, she would vote with the body on that item. Beyond that there would be formal clarification on the Provost, but she appreciated the Chairman's response in bringing that report to the body. She hoped that all the Senators had received the October letter, but she wanted to reiterate some of the things which were in that letter because as the academic leadership of this campus, it was essential that the Senators got these kinds of data right away so that she and they could work in concert to address them.

The President then presented her prepared remarks (**Appendix B**).

Senator Richards had a question regarding the Diversity Council. Over a year ago, the Diversity Council had sent out a survey, but no results had ever been presented. She had asked a colleague who was serving on that committee what the committee was doing, and she had been told that it had not met for over a year. The member had been trying to find out what the committee was up to. It had an office in the Buckingham Center and a phone number, but no one was ever there or answered the phone.

The President answered that this was because Dr. Jeffrey Wallace was working out of his own office in order to try to do two things in one spot. She suggested that Senator Richards give the name of the colleague to Dr. Wallace who would be more than delighted to be in touch with him. There was an active program underway.

Senator Richards added that if one talked to Mr. William Lewis, his response was that this committee was not even going to start to meet again until January. President Elliott emphasized that

Dr. Wallace could give her more information on this, and whatever the disconnect was, he was the one to straighten it out fastest.

Senator Chand Midha, on behalf of members of BPCC, wanted to know who was in control of the money which had been set aside for the technology committee (a 2% increase from last year).

The President responded that right now it was in the bank until plans had been finalized, and then it would flow through the Provost's office. She would not stake her life on it, but it was the only logical place from which to flow.

In regard to the Provost for Information Services Search, Senator Midha wondered who was going to have that search.

The President replied that she had asked for nominations for Chair, and she would work with the Chairman on who made sense to serve on the committee. She had the job description here at the meeting and would pass it out.

Dr. Don R. Gerlach, the Parliamentarian, requested permission of the body to ask the President a question, and the body gave its approval. He stated that last spring he had requested of the former Provost whether it might be possible that the President's monthly letter be sent to emeriti faculty members. He had been cut off. Would she be gracious enough to put him on her mailing list, since he, like a few others around with campus offices, would like to hear this news also?

President Elliott said she was delighted to do this and asked Dr. Joseph Walton to help follow through on the matter.

The Chairman then asked Senator Carmen Keener to introduce the new student Senator who had been appointed by ASG, and Senator Keener presented Senator Michelle Smith.

Since the Executive Committee had not yet received formal notification and therefore had not certified Senator Smith, the Chairman asked the unanimous consent of the body in extending rights as a member of the Faculty Senate to Senator-elect Smith. The body gave its approval.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Provost Moore thanked the body for the opportunity to address it. He also wanted to thank his predecessor and acknowledge the help that David Jamison had given him, this group, and all of the campus for two years. He hoped that he could maintain an office like Provost Jamison had run. He wanted to maintain that office to serve the faculty, staff, and students. He was not interested in looking over people's shoulders, policing and inspecting things. That was the last resort for the office. He hoped that members of the body would let him know how he could best serve them, both individually as well as collectively as a group. He thought that the body might be disturbed to know that right now he had no idea what he was doing, but that by the next Senate meeting, he would have some specific goals to present. Since he was not going to be a candidate for the permanent position, he felt incarcerated with a release date of July 1 already set. If the search committee could get started, maybe he would even get some time off - not for good behavior, but maybe some time off. He and his office were ready to serve. If anyone had any questions now, he was sure that he could tell them, "I don't know."

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Gary Oller reported that the Committee had met October 10 and 17 and had done the following: First, it answered President Elliott's questions about interpretations of procedures relating to the creation of the Provost Search Committee. Second, it made appointments to various committees. Third, it agreed to create a joint ad hoc committee between the Senate and Graduate Council to look at the new financial disclosure/conflict of interest policy. Fourth, it agreed to create a joint BPCC/Senate ad hoc committee to deal with salary equity questions. The members from the Senate on that committee would be Professor Richard Elliott from Chemical Engineering, Senator Ruth Clinefelter from the Library, Senator Frank Griffin from Physics, and Senator Tim Norfolk from Mathematics. BPCC would be appointing its half of the committee in the near future.

The fifth item was to agree to ask President Elliott for the cost of the Brailsford study for the proposed student recreation center. As a result, President Elliott directed the Committee to Vice President Smith, who would be attending our next meeting on December 7 to answer questions about this and other things already raised by the body at its last meeting about the student recreation center. Sixth, the Committee agreed to investigate possible violations in hiring procedures for certain upper-level, administrative positions. Chairman Cheung had initiated that investigation and had thus far received the full cooperation of the administration. Finally, the Committee set the agenda for today's meeting of the Senate.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - (Appendix C)

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - (Appendix D)

SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL AND SUBCOMMITTEES - (Appendix E)

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Marquette, the Chair, reported that the Committee was in the process of actually creating a plan. It had received responses from all of the colleges except Wayne, which it expected to have back shortly. It had plans from the student services unit; it had received a presentation from the Vice President for Research and University Development with which it was able to define the criteria in replying to the administrative plans. It expected to receive plans from the Vice-President for Administrative Services and at some point from the various units in the President's office in terms of athletics and things of that nature. Over the next several weeks, the Committee would be working on melding the academic plans and then finally melding the administrative plans into something that it could present to the body shortly.

The Chairman asked whether the administrative plans followed a similar format to the academic plans in terms of setting goals and measurable criteria for assessing those goals and resources required.

Senator Marquette responded that the Committee had taken the criteria which it used for the academic plans and modified them as appeared appropriate for the administrative plans. Actually, this time people doing the administrative planning had the criteria before they did the planning which the Committee felt was a major accomplishment this time around.

Senator Oller remembered that at the September meeting Senator Marquette had mentioned some information which the Committee was expecting to get out of the Provost's office. Had the Committee been able to get the information which it needed?

Senator Marquette answered that yesterday a conversation had taken place between the Vice-President for Administrative Services, Provost Moore and himself, and it looked like they finally figured out why the Committee was not getting the information. With Dr. Moore in charge of this matter, he expected the Committee to be getting the data shortly.

President Elliott noted that there was an additional point which her office had requested on the administrative plans, and that was that each activity justify itself in terms of its contribution to the enrollment enhancement situation.

BUDGET AND PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE - Senator Midha stated that there was no report, but he did have some information for the body. The Committee had met twice without a Chair. At the last Senate meeting, President Elliott had told the body that Provost Jamison was going to chair the Committee. Subsequently, the Council of Deans was under the impression that Dr. Helmick would be chairing the BPC. This had now been resolved and Interim Provost Moore would be chairing the Committee. What the Committee had done so far was to look at some of the subcommittees, and one of the main agenda items this year was going to be the incentive plan. The Committee had to double up not only for the summer but for the entire year, so it looked forward to working with Provost Moore who would be providing it with information. He hoped to have a report at the next Senate meeting.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman announced that the only item of unfinished business related to changes to the Academic Planning, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee which were presented at the last meeting (**Appendix F**). He noted that the Executive Committee had anticipated the requirements if the body passed these amendments and, when it had appointed members to APCC, it had made a sort of dotted-line division between the policy side and the curriculum side. Therefore, it would be able to move expeditiously to implement the changes once the Senate, President and Board of Trustees concurred. Since there was no discussion, he called for a vote and the amendments were approved.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - The Chairman recognized Senator Marquette who stated that the proposal he was about to move was not actually his. The motion, contained on the second page of his handout (**Appendix G**), was basically a concept from Faculty for Shared Governance, former members of UAFPA, and other members of the faculty including the Chair of the Senate. It was a recommendation that the Faculty Senate institute a review of the major administrative offices on the campus by the Senate and report as appropriate. It had originally been intended to take this proposal as a petition to the campus, but since there was such wide-spread support for this sort of evaluation, it was decided to bring it directly to the Senate. For example, Vice-President Sylvester's recent presentation to the LRPC had included a request that such an evaluation occur. In effect, what the Senate had before it was a mechanism for the evaluation of senior administrative officers by a committee of the Senate.

Senator Marquette then read the second page of the handout which contained the full motion, and then the justificatory letter which was attached (see Appendix G). The motion eventually was seconded by Senator Clinefelter. He noted that the expectation was that if this passed, the committee of the Senate appointed by the Executive Committee would develop and get approval of the instrument, and then it would move forward with an evaluation.

The Chairman said it was his understanding that what the Senate would be voting on was a directive to the Executive Committee to create a committee to bring this evaluation process into being by developing the appropriate instrument, and this would be undertaken purely as an activity of the Senate. Senator Marquette added that it would be an activity of the Senate requesting the input of the faculty, and then the Senate would report back to the faculty.

President Elliott asked whether the deans should be put into this process as well, since they were already being evaluated on a five-year basis. Senator Marquette replied that he would recommend that the Senate attempt this procedure first. If it worked as well as he hoped it would, then it might be appropriate to make them all work together. Now it was probably too much to bite off. He felt it would make it a little bit too much like Clinton's health care plan.

In answer to the Chairman's question regarding who would preside over the whole process, Senator Marquette responded that this would be the Senate's problem.

Senator Bucey had a question in regard to full-time faculty. Some of the units, like the office of the Vice-President for Student Services, had primarily contract professionals working within them. Would they be allowed to be involved in this as well or would it only be full-time teaching faculty?

When it was pointed out that it was possible to amend the motion to include full-time contract professionals in the process, Senator Bucey so moved and this was seconded.

Senator Joseph Padovan spoke against the amendment. He understood that contract professionals had their difficulties, but full-time faculty were subject to certain things which they were not - promotion, tenure, etc. As a result, the kinds of things which the faculty would be evaluating regarding the upper administration were going to be slightly different and taken in a different context. He had no problem with them having a separate vehicle of their own so that they could do some of the same things, but since the faculty had these overriding issues, the two groups should really be separate.

Senator Tim Norfolk wanted to second that idea. He would rather have two separate surveys or evaluations because there were certain things with which the teaching faculty might vehemently disagree that the contract professionals at the University might agree with.

Senator Richard Gigliotti pointed out that this really was not a problem because one instrument could be used which simply identified whether the responder was contract professional or faculty. The data could then be analyzed separately, and this was more efficient than sending out two surveys. Senator Marquette agreed noting that the status of the individual could be treated as a variable and the data reported separately.

In response to Senator Buchthal's question about general faculty and how they would be handled here, Senator Bucey explained that even though she was a member of the general faculty, as far as the University was concerned she was a contract professional. So all that was really needed were the two categories.

President Elliott wanted to know whether any thought had been given to student responses in these evaluations. Senator Marquette thought that this should be done, but it should not be part of this particular process which was being designed for the faculty. Perhaps the assessment group, which Senator Midha chaired, could handle this for the students by adopting a similar mechanism.

Senator Diane Vukovich agreed that if this worked well, the process should be expanded to get some input from students. Also, she preferred to react to the same kind of survey that the faculty received because, although she was classified as a contract professional, she did teach. It was often difficult for her to respond to things that were directed totally to contract professionals because they did not have a whole lot to do with what she did.

Senator George Prough called the question on the amendment, but Senator Padovan objected. A vote was taken, and the body approved closing debate. The Chairman then reminded the body that the amendment was to amend the first sentence of subitem i on the request to read: "The evaluation is to be conducted as an anonymous mail survey of the full-time faculty and full-time contract professionals."

Senator Padovan then wondered what the limiters would be. Would the evaluations of the two groups be equally weighted or would there be a separate weighting for each? When the Chairman responded that they would be separate, Senator Padovan said that this language was not going to do that, and he was not able to support it nor was it the original intention of the group which started this proposal.

The Chairman observed that Senator Padovan had exceeded the point of clarification and had returned to debate which the body had just voted to close. If the body wished to suspend the rules it could resume debate, or it could defeat this and then have a substitute amendment presented.

When the Parliamentarian advised the Chairman that there was a vote before the house which barred a suspension of the rules, the Senate voted its approval of the amendment.

Senator Marquette, in the spirit of insuring that this be the way it was originally intended to be, moved to amend item 4) to read: "A report of the evaluation shall be generated by a committee of the Senate; such report will be separated into results for full-time faculty and full-time contract professionals." This was seconded by Senator R. Gigliotti. Since there was no discussion, the body voted its approval.

Senator R. Gigliotti wondered whether Senator Marquette could clarify item 5 regarding conducting the evaluation at the beginning of the Fall semester with the result reported in November. Why not at the end of the Spring semester with the results being reported at the first meeting of the Fall?

Senator Marquette said that to be perfectly honest, the initial intention had been to get this done, and November had sounded good. Originally, the group which initiated this had intended to present this petition to the faculty at the beginning of this semester, and the suggested time frame seemed appropriate. Then there was a petition of another sort around campus with which the group did not want this to be confused. They did not want this to be adversarial. Therefore, they decided to wait to present it. It might be that now spring would be better.

Senator R. Gigliotti then moved that the evaluation be conducted each year in April with the results being reported at the first meeting of the academic year in September, and this was seconded by Senator Prough.

Senator Gigliotti explained that the evaluation would work better in the spring because at the end of the academic year we were geared up for issues and things were fresh in our minds. The intervening summer would not be there to allow people to be confused or forget. Also, if the evaluation was done in the fall, it would have to include new faculty and contract professionals who really had not been here long enough for an accurate evaluation.

Since there was no further discussion, the body voted its approval of the amendment. It then voted on the main motion and gave its assent.

The next item of new business was a resolution from Senator Norfolk which read as follows: "Be it resolved, in light of a) The University of Akron's financial situation and b) the fact that we employ experts in so many fields of human endeavor, that The University of Akron should refrain, whenever possible, from hiring external consultants and should instead use internal funding to use the resources available on campus. In such cases where it is deemed necessary to employ such external consultants, it should be demonstrated, after discussion with those same experts, that such work cannot be done by the employees of The University of Akron." He moved this, and it was seconded by Senator Devinder Malhotra.

Senator Norfolk explained that he was presenting this in light of the discussion last month regarding the survey done for the proposed student recreation center and also the report on the long-range plan and other things. He did not know how much was spent on external consultants on this campus. Given that we were all supposed to know what we were doing, which was a doubtful proposition in some cases, we should find enough experts to do any particular job that we had. He contended that it could be done cheaper and better, and it would make a lot of people happy because it could provide summer support for faculty and graduate students to do certain portions of whatever consulting was necessary. It would save money for the University and would be a good thing all around to do.

There being no additional discussion, the Senate gave its unanimous consent to the resolution.

The Chairman asked whether there was any other new business to come before the body. Senator John Hebert stated that he was somewhat disturbed by the volume of curriculum change information that he was receiving in the mail. He was not so much concerned that there were curriculum changes, but he was upset by the volume of pages on which the changes were printed. In light of President Elliott's call for paperwork reduction and in light of the fact that this process was recently reviewed, he wanted to move that the Senate revisit the curriculum process and see if

it could do a little bit better. As an example of what he was talking about, he used a nursing proposal which had well over 100 pages. If this went to every member of the body, a whole box of paper would be used just to circulate this item, and he doubted that more than one or two people were going to look at it and have much to say about it. After some discussion with the Chairman over the wording of his motion, Senator Hebert moved that APCC revisit the procedures for curriculum review and approval and attempt to reduce the volume of paper which must be circulated. This was seconded.

Senator Norfolk agreed with Senator Hebert that this was a problem. He had received a huge file, most of which was going to be tossed. However, he did want the Senate to be careful so that the process was not so speeded up that things could slip through the cracks. Too often, people might not see the complete document. He thought that the process needed to be changed carefully. If the Senate expedited it by saying that there would be one copy available plus one electronic copy, it could wind up with things getting passed that people did not want passed.

Senator Hebert thought that things were worse this way because people would tend not to look at things because of the volume, and there would be more of a chance of something slipping through. The re-engineered process seemed more complicated. For example, there was a curriculum proposal coming through the College of Business which changed the course from credit - no credit to a letter grade. It used to take one page to do this, and now five pages of information needed to be prepared. This did not seem to streamline the process. It did not make sense. He thought that we could do better by putting our heads together and working on it.

The Senate voted to approve the motion.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator David Witt had a question regarding the Executive Committee's creation of a subcommittee dealing with salary equities. Some members had been named in Secretary Oller's report. Were all colleges represented on that subcommittee? When the Chairman said that they were not, Senator Witt added that he hoped the Executive Committee would consider all the colleges since there were some basic inequities at the college level in salary. For example, Fine and Applied Arts salaries tended to be on the much lower end, and he had not heard a name from that college.

Senator Midha thought that the intent of the BPCC was that this small subcommittee would collect all information and eventually that information would come to BPCC which did have representatives from almost every college.

Senator Witt replied that the point he was making was that even at the discussion level it would make everybody happy to know they had a representative in on these discussions, since they impinged on our good will.

The Chairman commented that the intent was that this subcommittee would have the task to collect information and create a report for both the Senate and the BPCC. He did not believe that their charge would be to propose remedies but merely to identify, to collect, to analyze and to put together data. He hoped this was something that we could trust any of our colleagues to do. He and Senator Midha had already spoken about trying to broaden the representation via the half which

BPCC was going to supply. If Senator Witt was still concerned after the subcommittee had been completely put together, he urged him not to hesitate to act on or make the Senate aware of his concerns.

Senator Virginia Gunn stated that there was currently some concern amongst her colleagues in the Fine and Applied Arts College with some of the incentive-based programs because as a college they had nearly the highest percentage of part-time faculty. They were already doing more with a lot less, and it might be harder for them to increase when they were already at the top. She thought that the incentive plans needed to be tempered with a look at what people were already doing and the numbers they were serving with the amount of money they had.

The Chairman responded that he couldn't agree more. He did not personally view incentive as a "do better than you are doing now" mechanism, but as a mechanism that created incentive for organizations to do well. Senator Gunn added that she would ask to look at efficiency as well as incentive.

Senator Prough raised a minor point dealing with handouts distributed to Senators at meetings. Occasionally, he had been at meetings when he was not sure that he had received everything. He suggested that perhaps a running list could be kept on the blackboard so that people would know what had been distributed. This would be especially useful if a member had to miss part of a meeting. The Chairman thought this was an excellent idea.

Senator Carmen Keener wanted to report on the student financial aid rally which had taken place on October 30th. She wanted to thank all of the faculty for its support. She also wanted to read a brief paragraph from a fax which she had received on Monday, the morning of the rally. Senator Mike DeWine had proposed an amendment to the budget reconciliation bill eliminating proposed cuts to the student loan program, and this passed in the Senate by a vote of 99-0. The savings that had to be achieved from the student loan program were reduced from \$10.8 billion to \$5.4 billion, and this amendment insured that there would be no cuts to the student loan program. She thanked the body for its support.

Senator Nicholas Ranson, who had come in late from teaching, was looking at the document which President Elliott had handed out regarding the new Associate Provost for Information Resources. (See Appendix H.) He wondered whether there had been any discussion about this. As a member of the University Libraries Committee, he was interested in a little more history regarding this very fundamental administrative reorganization. Since he understood that this position was being researched, presumably responsibilities would constitute part of the job description. One thing which disturbed him in the description was the phrase, "administratively manage the library." He did recall that we had a Dean of the Library. He wondered how this job description and concept had been reached because it had rather far-reaching implications for people who used the library. It appeared to be asking for a rather fundamental shift in responsibilities toward technologies and information providers as opposed to people who made use of those services which had been, broadly speaking, the library thrust up until now. The document which he was looking at was one which appeared to be put together at a retreat of some sort. Could the body perhaps have a little history of this just as a matter of information?

President Elliott answered that although the University was going to go ahead and advertise for this coordinator, there was still debate on what the exact job description would be. There had been four reports from different committees in regard to this, and there had been an attempt to pull together what was common in all of them. She wondered whether Senator Marquette could help her to identify some of those groups or committees. When Senator Marquette replied that he could not, she said she would have to check with former Provost Jamison and find out. It was important to get into the market for this position as quickly as possible since there was a scarcity of these folks.

The Chairman asked whether a job advertisement had already gone out. President Elliott replied that given the recent change in the Provost's office, she was not sure.

Senator Buchthal believed that he had spent a summer on a committee, which had been chaired by at that time Interim Provost Ruebel, and which had looked at what was called the ULLR, a collection of libraries and learning resources, electronic systems and the like. At the end of the process, this committee had recommended the dismantling of such an organization and the reassignment of reporting duties of the head of the computer center to not only the Vice President for Business and Finance but also the Provost's office. Some things took longer than others, but he was a little concerned that we might be going back to where we had been five years ago when we had decided that this was not a good idea. He hoped that someone would pull out that report and read it.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson, who had also been on that committee, agreed with Senator Buchthal. It had been clear that the system which was in place was not one that made sense and the committee had made the recommendations which Senator Buchthal remembered. However, the issue of having Communications and the Library in some relation to each other was another broader issue which that committee had studied. This was also something which had been discussed in the University Libraries Committee over the past few years. It was thought that if the Library was involved, the job description would have to be very different. You would need someone whose major background was in libraries.

Senator Marquette thought that some of this was the result of LRPC's attempt to deal with CCTC's computing plan. It had been referred to a subcommittee of LRPC that consisted of Vice-Presidents, but he had not seen it back at LRPC since it had been referred to that subcommittee. It never got back to LRPC and therefore had not been discussed at that level. There had been some discussion in LRPC of a version of the job description which Senator Clinefelter had objected to part of, and there was supposed to be further discussion. That never happened in LRPC and he had no idea how it got here.

Senator Clinefelter said that she had objected to part of the proposal which had been presented in LRPC, but there had been no further deliberations there on the matter. She was concerned that we appeared to be searching for this position when there were so many different things to be clarified. Was it something that we should postpone until our understandings resolved themselves a little better here?

The Chairman noted that he could sense the urgency of wishing to hire a replacement for Dr. Thomas before or near his retirement.

Senator Ranson seconded the opinion of Senator Clinefelter. It seemed to him dangerous to say that we would know the beast when we ran headlong into it. He was not sure that we really did and thought the shift that was implied in the language in the document was really rather fundamental. He was surprised that the University Libraries Committee had not been any part of this during the 18 months that he had been a member. The description here was not at all of Dr. Thomas' position. It was something very, very different. It might be an opportune moment to use the monies from that position to put into a newly defined thing, but he was not sure that the Senators had any real discussion of this. This was a major new administrative appointment, and he was somewhat concerned.

Senator Buchthal had a suggestion to save money. When he ran a search in his department, he did a search plan and listed what criteria he was looking for and what criteria he would use to make selections. If, during the course of action he decided not to apply some of those qualifications because he had changed his mind on what he wanted to do, he thought that the search was invalidated and he had to start over again. Therefore, he thought that we better have our acts together before we sent out an ad for this new position.

The Chairman asked President Elliott whether she would entertain Senate consultation on the proposed structure. President Elliott answered that what she was presenting today had come to her via a variety of committees and consultations which she could not specify to the body now. She would get back to the Senate with answers, but she was committed, as was the Board, to some coherent coordination of a very large amount of learning resources that were coming into the campus and landing in a variety of ways without the kind of coherence necessary when resources were scarce and sharing would certainly be required. She was also committed to using the dollars which we had for that position to shift the function of those learning resources to the academic side. She would try to follow up on this and consult with the Chairman. She also would go back to the Provost's office and sort out what she could for the body.

When the Chairman asked what the anticipated time line was for sending out an advertisement, the President responded that she was not 100% sure that it was not already out. She would find that out also. Her commitment was to find the kind of person who was an academic and also had experience in coordinating learning resources.

In answer to Senator Erickson's question as to whether or not a search committee had been formed, the President responded that although there had been some nominations, there was no committee.

Senator Malhotra said that for every position we hired there needed to be a search plan, and in the search plan we had to identify the committee and its Chair before the ad could go out. In that sense, either the advertisement had not gone out or there had to be a committee.

President Elliott stated that she just did not know and, until we got information from the Provost's office about this, all we could do was speculate.

Senator Ranson was still entirely unclear on the question which he had asked initially. Was there some way he could find out what had been actually undertaken. Who generated the job description presented here? Where did this come from?

November 2, 1995

Page 13

Provost Moore said that by Monday noon he would let the Senate know whether there was an ad and anything else which he could find out.

The Chairman stated that he would get the information out on SENATE-L as well as hard copy to the Chairs of LRPC, University Libraries Committee, CCTC and anyone else who might want it.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn which was given and seconded by many. The meeting ended at 4:29 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quinn

APPENDIX A

Chairman's Remarks

I feel it is necessary to dispel various rumors that I've heard about a recent Board action. The action in question was their amending section 3359-1-05 (C) by substituting the words "Faculty Senate" for "University Council." The first sentence of that section now reads: "By virtue of administrative assignment, the President is a member of the Faculty Senate and of each college faculty and thus, may preside at every meeting thereof, if the President so wishes." President Elliott has assured me that she has no intention of taking over as Chair of Faculty Senate nor was it the Board's intention that she do so. However, it is apparent that the President and the Provost, though the language in the Provost's case is less clear, should be members of this body, and as presiding officer I shall treat them as such with all the rights and responsibilities appertaining thereto, with the possible exception of committee assignments.

Should the Senate be so inclined, the body certainly would be within its rights to request that the Board modify the regulations to exclude the President and Provost from Senate membership. That would most properly come as a resolution from the body with suggested changes in the appropriate regulation sections.

Frankly, I don't think it matters enough for us to undertake that. Whether the Senate exerts a positive influence on the course of our University is not significantly affected by the membership of the President and Provost.

Respectfully submitted by
H. Michael Cheung, Chairman
Faculty Senate

APPENDIX B

Remarks of the President of the University

It is good to be with you once again. I hope you have already received your monthly letter because the message in it is so important that I want to make some additional remarks about it today so if there are any questions, you can raise them.

Recently, the Ohio University Presidents were briefed by the State Budget Director, Greg Browning, on some of the potential impact of various federal budget deficit reduction efforts. While the message could not be very specific in details, it was clear. Mr. Browning's belief is that this state will probably not be willing to "back fill" the federal budget-balancing reductions with new state taxes.

While the state will be making every effort possible to build the rainy day fund, that alone may not carry Ohio through because of both our size and our age demographics. Reallocation would then have to be used to make up the differences which will, at least initially, likely occur in Medicare and Medicaid. While this is hardly good news for our funding, as responsible citizens all of us recognize that there are some tough realities in deficit reduction as our country must work through that process.

In the Presidents' discussion that followed, it was our belief that any additional funding in the near term would have to come from enrollment success.

The fiscal realities related to enrollment (at the same time that Ohio is producing only moderately sized high school graduating classes) will undoubtedly make the competition for good students the keenest our universities have ever experienced. The many efforts that have been undertaken already in our enrollment enhancement plans will need to continue and additional efforts in retention, campus climate, and academic programming will be required.

Everyone will have to contribute to the recruitment and retention efforts for good students if we are going to be successful. The financial power of retention of good students is great. For example, increased retention resulting in a 10-percent increase in student credit hours, given current subsidy and tuition rates per student, could generate as much as an additional \$15 million annually.

In such a competitive environment, students and parents will be looking even more carefully at all we do. Today one certainly hears much reported complaints from parents and students about the lack of attention students are perceived to receive on college campuses around the country. We need to be very sure we do not respond to students in ways that would label us so.

Our demonstrated concern for our students' success makes a great deal of difference in their perception of our campus climate, whether it is in honoring office hours, scheduling classes, returning phone calls, giving directions, providing information courteously, or a host of other activities. Students

are making a very large investment in us and if they find the campus a cordial and courteous place that is willing to work with them to meet their academic and personal goals, they are much more likely to stay.

In addition to recruitment and retention of good students as the basis of fiscal stability, the University will also need to continue discussions and efforts to redirect internal resources. To illustrate the many efforts that are underway on the campus, I distributed a copy of the University's 1994-95 managing for the future report to our October memo.

I would hope the members of this body would also use their leadership and influence to help any colleague who might be critical of the campus to prospective students and parents to understand how damaging to the campus enrollment that can be.

Like all vital campuses, The University of Akron will continue to have challenges to address. Bodies like the Senate, LRPC, BPCC, and a host of others provide us ways to do that. In the long run, this collective, reflective, analytic improvement process makes us better and can enhance enrollment and resources. This is a highly competitive and challenging moment in higher education and I encourage you, as our campus academic leadership, to make a personal commitment to work with your colleagues to be certain that the urgency of the moment and their help is well understood.

In other matters, as I have informed Chairperson Cheung, the Senate's October legislation regarding Faculty Grievance Procedures is now under review and my hope is that it will be forwarded for consideration to the Board's Educational Policy Committee in December.

In the next week or so we will be appointing a university-wide committee to participate in the preparation of a new campus development guide plan. A new master plan is needed to ensure that the physical development of the campus supports the academic directions emerging in our current planning effort and meets the needs of students, faculty, and staff.

The committee will have significant representation from the Senate's Facilities Planning Committee as well as other campus constituencies. We have hired an experienced consultant to assist the Committee and asked that recommendations be forwarded to the Trustees by June of 1996. We intend for this process to be a campus-driven effort, so I will encourage the Committee to consult widely and communicate broadly in shaping our campus for the 21st Century.

As is the University's custom, today I have brought copies of the overall statistics on faculty salaries for the current academic year. Overall, the average increase for continuing November 2, faculty (at Akron campus) was 4.7% compared to the raise pool of 4%. I am pleased to note that most of the colleges once again were able to supplement the raise pool with dollars from the college.

I would also like to update you on the status of three key administrative searches.

Provost Search: The Deans have been asked to forward the names of their faculty representatives to the Provost Search Committee by November 3. It is my hope that the Search Committee will be duly constituted and able to begin its work next week.

November 2, 1995

Page 17

VP for Business: As requested by this body, Dr. Cheung has also joined the Search Committee for the Vice President for Business and Finance. The search is now being chaired by Vice President Sylvester.

Information Resources: As noted in our October letter, we are beginning a search for the position of Associate Provost of Information Resources. For your information, I have brought a copy of the job description that will be used in the search process.

Exact reporting lines are still under discussion, but the concept of coordination of present and emerging learning supports is one that was central to all the reports and endorsed strongly by me. I will name a Chair shortly and coordinate with Chairperson Cheung to ensure significant faculty representation. I have asked that the search proceed quickly to accommodate the December 31 retirement of Dr. Frank Thomas.

I would like to announce two distinguished speakers who will be visiting our campus in the next several weeks:

Tomorrow Congresswoman Pat Schroeder will speak on peace issues at a noon luncheon at the Martin Center. The event is sponsored by a number of campus and community organizations in recognition of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations.

On Thursday, November 30, Dr. Henry Kissinger will deliver a public lecture at 2 P.M. in E.J. Thomas Performing Arts Hall. Dr. Kissinger is appearing under the auspices of the Hood/Meyerson Lecture Series. The lecture is free and open to the public, and I hope many of you will encourage your students to attend.

On Saturday, December 11, Stanley Gault, Chairman of the Board of the Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, will deliver the fall commencement address. This year we will have one ceremony at 10:30 A.M. in the JAR.

This concludes my report. Once more, I would like to tell you how grateful I am for the part each of you plays in our progress.

Respectfully submitted by
Peggy Gordon Elliott, President

APPENDIX C

Report of University Libraries Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 13, 1995

Present were D. Dobrindt, K. Ketcham, N. Ranson, D. Williams

Dr. N. Ranson, the committee Chair, distributed minutes of the meeting held on Friday, September 16, 1995. K. Ketcham will prepare minutes for the University Libraries Committee meetings. Dr. Ranson has set up access to the University Libraries Committee minutes (after approval) through the e-mail address of lib-comm. To access, simply subscribe according to procedures already written and distributed by Dr. Michael Cheung. (If you need a copy of his instructions for subscribing to the FAC-ACAD ListServ, please call Kaye Ketcham at x7495 or send e-mail to her Banyan address at Ketcham@Library@UAkron).

Dr. Ranson reviewed the themes stated by last year's committee.

1. Salary comparison for library personnel;
2. OhioLINK updates (generally) to all faculty and staff;
3. "Buchtelite" article on OhioLINK with a pull-out section oriented to students.

Updates are available in print in the library, seminars have been taught and are still available, and access to databases continues to grow at a rapid pace (30 since last December). The addition of full text articles from OhioLINK is an added service to patrons.

At Dr. Ranson's request for additional concerns, D. Williams suggested several:

1. Salary Issues. Salaries of library personnel (mostly those in the middle range) are a particular concern. Library personnel with technology skills are also underpaid as compared to those with similar skills who work in the Computer Center, Law Library, and Wayne campus. In general, library faculty salaries are lower than others on campus and also 10 percent lower than the national average.

2. Equipment Needs and Operating Budgets for Support. Due to the growth in technology needs on campus and the library's rapidly growing services that rely on technology, the financial base to support this need should be addressed.

3. Organizational Structure of Information Services. Drafts of the proposed structure have been distributed but are not yet finalized. Dr. Williams distributed a copy of his personal comments that were sent to Mr. Jamison.

4. Inflation Rate. The inflation rate will be at 14% this year.

November 2, 1995

Page 19

Dr. Ranson stated that having several new journals available now on-line will be of help. Dr. Williams agreed and added that OhioLINK's full text service offers an additional, but limited, help.

The next meeting will be held on Friday, November 3, 1995, at 9:00 a.m. in the library's Dean's Office Conference Room.

Also, please note that the committee will have a luncheon/meeting on January 13, 1996, at Martin University Center.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. Nicholas Ranson, Chair

APPENDIX D

Report of Student Affairs Committee

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 23, 1995

Present: B.Bucey, C.Gigliotti, C.Keener, D.Laconi, D.McNutt, L.Pachnowski, G.Prough, C.K.Smith, D.Vukovich

Absent: C.Echols, D.Ely, T.Jolly, M.Weidknecht

Guests: P.Fitzgerald, Asst. Dean, Nursing; A. Goodsell Love, Asst. to VP, Student Affairs

One correction was made to the September 13, 1995 minutes. The phone number for Senator Mike DeWine should be (202)224-2315.

D.Vukovich reported that APCC had reviewed, as requested, the University attendance policy in Section 3359-20-05, Part D of the Faculty Manual and recommended that the policy remain unchanged. Because the Learning Climate Committee is currently drafting a "Campus Civility Statement", committee members agreed to wait to see this statement before making any specific recommendations to APCC.

Several committee members reported having been asked to serve on committees of the Shared Governance Council. Members agreed our committee should work closely with the Student Affairs Committee of the Shared Governance Council.

C.Keener reported that ASC is working on the Faculty Liaison Proposal which had been discussed briefly during Spring Semester 1995. Additional information will be forthcoming.

D.McNutt reported on Student Financial Aid as follows. The Ohio Student Aid Commission estimates that by November 1, 1995, the Department of Education will select an agency to take over their student loan processing activities. No decision has been made yet as to where the Ohio Instructional Grant Program will be administered. The commission is committed, however, to continued, uninterrupted service for both the loan and grant programs during the changeovers.

On the federal level, House floor action on the House reconciliation legislation could occur as early as October 24, 1995. The Senate could consider its legislation as early as October 25, 1995 but it is likely to be delayed until the week of October 30.

C.Keener announced the ASG "Fight for Financial Aid" rally will be held on Monday October 30 from 11:00 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. on Buchtel Common. ASG is requesting faculty to announce the event in classes. All students and faculty are urged to show support by attending this rally.

C.K.Smith updated the committee on the status of the campus housing and the Health and Wellness Center proposals. Immediately following our September meeting, Dr. Smith mailed summary reports from Brailsford Associates to all committee members. Following a brief presentation, which emphasized the importance of these projects not only to our student recruitment efforts but also to the improvement of the quality of campus life for all members of the campus community, she addressed questions relating to the surveys and reports. Dr. Smith stressed that both projects, the renovation of the campus residence halls and the construction of a campus Recreation and Wellness Center, are only in the proposal stage.

Committee members also reported to Dr. Smith that they are still being asked by some of their colleagues about the status of the Student Affairs Building. Apparently there continues to be a belief that the above two proposals will interfere with the construction of this facility. Dr. Smith replied that the proposed projects will not interfere with the Student Affairs Building and that the associate architect for the Student Affairs Building had been selected. She is hopeful that ground will be broken by a year from now. Dr. Smith is open to suggestions of ways to communicate accurate information to our colleagues.

The next regular meeting of the Student Affairs Committee is scheduled for Friday, December 1 at 3:00 p.m. in the Bowers' Conference Room, #432, in the College of Business Administration Building. (Take the elevator to the fourth floor, turn right, then right at the hall, and right into the room.)

Respectfully submitted by Diane Vukovich, Chair

APPENDIX E

Report of Shared Governance Council and Subcommittees

SUBJECT: BUDGET AND PROVOST SEARCH CONCERNS

The Shared Governance Council has been meeting throughout the semester and has appointed its officers and its representatives to BPC and LRPC. In addition, the Council has voiced some concerns over two matters which it has asked me to relay to you.

First, SGC has operated for two years without a budget. As we are not part of the Faculty Senate nor one of its standing committees, we can't ask them to cover our expenses. At present, we have been asking our departments to absorb the costs or we have been paying for them ourselves, and we don't feel that a university sponsored body should be functioning in this fashion. Therefore, we are requesting an operating budget of \$2,000 to defray the costs of Xeroxing, mailings, etc. This is not a request for stipends or refreshment money; we simply would like to be able to conduct our business from our own budget. If the money is not available, would it be possible to make the resources of your office available to us?

Second, while we regret the necessity, we recognize that the University will be conducting a search for a new Provost, and we feel that in the interest of diverse representation any search committee would be incomplete without a representative from Shared Governance. We would, therefore, like to request that Shared Governance be given a representative on this committee.

If possible we would like to have a response on the search committee request before our October 27th meeting, and it would be helpful if we could hear from you on our budget concerns before our November 10th meeting. Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Respectfully submitted by
James Wallace, Chair

APPENDIX F

APCC CHANGES:

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 G

Faculty Senate Administrative Evaluation

MEMO

TO: Full-Time Faculty Colleagues
FROM: Faculty for Shared Governance and Concerned Colleagues
RE: Attached request to the Faculty Senate

During the recent collective bargaining campaign, many of our colleagues either signed cards or considered voting on behalf of collective bargaining in order to "send a message" to the administration. While the ultimate resolution of that effort was not to support collective bargaining, we still believe that there is a need for a regular mechanism by which faculty can comment positively or negatively on administrative performance and priorities.

In fact, continuous evaluation is the essence of university life. Students are evaluated by faculty, faculty by students, faculty by department chairs and deans, and deans and department chairs by faculty. The attached motion requests that the Faculty Senate take the necessary steps to create such a mechanism of ongoing evaluation. We suggest that functional performance would be evaluated annually, priorities reviewed every two years, and specific administrative personnel every third year. This approach seems likely to be effective in reporting our views: it will be anonymous, so fears of retribution for voicing unpopular opinions should be allayed; being conducted by the Faculty Senate, the results should be perceived as legitimate by our colleagues; and coming as a public report of the Senate, the results should be difficult to ignore.

We believe that this is an appropriate and collegial means by which faculty can have regular contact with senior

administration on issues of job performance and priorities. We would greatly appreciate your adding your voice to ours by signing the petition.

Peter Henriksen, Physics, FSG
Roger Grant, History, FSG
Penny Marquette, Accounting, FSG
Joann Collier, Nursing, FSG
Kay Alderman, Education, FSG
Joseph Padovan, Engineering, FSG, Faculty Senate
Nicholas Ranson, English, President AAUP, Faculty Senate
Mike Cheung, Chair, Faculty Senate
Gary Oller, Classics, AAUP, Faculty Senate
Mary Rainey, Home Economics, FSG
Emily Rock, Wayne College, FSG

**REQUEST FOR THE INITIATION OF A REGULAR FACULTY
REVIEW OF MAJOR ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES**

We, the undersigned full-time faculty of the University, do hereby request that the Faculty Senate of The University of Akron commence an annual faculty evaluation of the senior administration of the University. The requested evaluation will contain at least the following features:

- 1) The evaluation is to be conducted as an anonymous mail survey of the full-time faculty. This procedure should include the standard two-envelope return method. The signed outside envelope ensures a single evaluation per faculty member. The unsigned inner envelope ensures anonymity for the evaluator. All outside envelopes are to be opened in the presence of the Executive Committee of the Senate.
- 2) The activities to be evaluated are to include the Office of the President, Office of the Senior Vice-President and Provost, Office of the Vice-President for Business and Finance, Office of the Vice-President for Student Services, Office of the Vice-President for Development and the Faculty Senate itself. There should also be at least one item to measure the overall morale of the faculty.
- 3) Evaluation of each unit shall consist of a series of questions relating to the quality of specific task performance on an annual basis; evaluation of the stated priorities of the unit every two years; and a performance rating for the head of the unit every third year. The various officials should have an opportunity to comment on the relevance and format of the items directed to their unit performance. There should be an opportunity for open-ended comments each year. Additional specific evaluation items shall be added as the Senate deems appropriate.
- 4) A report of the evaluation shall be generated by a committee of the Senate. Membership of the committee will be determined by the Executive Committee, but the membership must have a majority drawn from the elected members of the Senate.
- 5) The evaluation is to be conducted at the beginning of the Fall semester each academic year and the report presented to the Senate at the November meeting. The report will be published in the University Chronicle.

Respectfully submitted by
Jesse Marquette, Chair

APPENDIX H

Associate Provost for Information Resources

RESPONSIBILITIES:

Planning, developing, implementing, and overall administration of computing and information technology support, including library and media services;

Coordinating with other key institutional leaders, both academic and administrative, to assure that a comprehensive program is maintained to address their resource requirements in an optimal manner;

Creating a productive environment for making use of electronic communications technologies in teaching and learning in cooperation with campus leadership;

Establishing an organizational climate and a working environment within information resources administrative purview that encourages creativity, adaptability, and cost effectiveness in meeting The University of Akron's manifold needs in telecommunications and technology areas;

Administratively manage the University Libraries, audio visual, computer center, applications, client and network services, instructional media and telecommunications; and

Serving as a member of the President's Cabinet and in matters of campus-wide technology policy, goal setting and planning and reporting to the President. In matters of day-to-day management operations, reporting to the Senior Vice President and Provost.

QUALIFICATIONS:

Significant senior level experience in a broad variety of related management areas, preferably in an institution of higher education required.

Must have a proven record of success in planning and problem-solving, in managing complex technologic resources involving highly-skilled professional personnel, and in demonstrating a commitment to diversity.

Ability to communicate effectively with all University and community constituencies and to achieve strong interpersonal working relationships with members of those constituencies is essential.

A sound educational background which includes a doctoral degree or comparable level of professional training and experience is required.



10



10

