

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

11-6-1997

## Faculty Senate Chronicle November 6, 1997

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*

14 Pages

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 6, 1997	1
Appendix to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 6, 1997	11
A. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	11

---

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

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING  
OF NOVEMBER 6, 1997**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, November 6, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Deckler, Hoover, Isayev, Lasher, Marquette, Murray, Reed, Ross-Alaolmolki, and Turek were absent with notice. Senators Borowiec, Braun, and Reep were absent without notice.

**SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* **APPROVED THE FALL 1997 COMMENCEMENT LIST**
- \* **APPROVED TRANSFER OF ACADEMIC NEPOTISM ISSUE FROM REFERENCE COMMITTEE TO ACADEMIC POLICY AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE**
- \* **APPROVED SPACE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING THE COMMITTEE AND THE SENATE'S ROLE IN THE CAPITAL BUDGET REQUEST PROCESS**

**I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** - The Chairman asked for a motion to approve today's agenda. This was made by Senator Peggy Richards and then was seconded. Since there were no changes to the agenda, it was approved by the body.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 18 AND OCTOBER 2** - Secretary Gary H. Oller said that he had received no corrections. Since there were none from members of the body, the minutes were approved.

**III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN** - The Chairman said that a lot had already been said about the NCA visit, and he assumed that the President would be presenting more later in the meeting. However, he wanted to let the body know what the Senate's role had been in the NCA discussion coordinated by Interim Associate Provost Mark Auburn. Senator H. Michael Cheung and the Chairman had met with two individuals; namely, Professor Gowen who was the Chair of the NCA team, and Professor Gilliland, a professor of psychology at the University of Oklahoma. Senator Cheung had been asked as the former Chair and he had been asked as the current Chair to discuss shared governance with them. They had talked about the structure of shared governance as it had evolved in recent years and its effectiveness on the campus. Some specific issues had been discussed including the modification of the search procedures for presidential searches as well as the procedures relating to the budgeting process and strategic planning. Both he and Senator Cheung had thought that



it had been a good meeting. They had received some valuable insights from the two team members, and he hoped that some of it had gone into their thinking when they were formulating their own recommendations. While he was on the subject of the NCA, he wanted to take the opportunity to commend Prof. Auburn, the NCA coordinator, for a job very well done. He had produced an excellent self-study report, and the whole accreditation process had gone very smoothly. Prof. Auburn deserved very high compliments from the faculty in general and this body in particular, and he wanted to convey that at this time.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The Chairman wanted to introduce two new Senators - Senator Kevin Butler (new SEAC Senator) and Senator Scott Johnston (Fine and Applied Arts).

The next item was the approval of the Fall 1997 Commencement candidates. **Senator Dennis Kimmell moved approval of names on the list contingent upon completion of all work required for graduation, and this was seconded by Senator Chand Midha.** The Chairman reminded the body that there was a copy of the list available at the meeting as well as in the Senate office. Since there was no discussion, the Senate gave its approval.

## **V. REPORTS**

**REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT** - President Marion Ruebel gave the following remarks:

"I'm going to talk a little bit later on in my report about the North Central evaluation. Let me report on some going-ons on campus right now. Our target cities grant has just been a tremendous thing for the campus, and I'm pleased to inform you that the University recently received notification of a multimillion-dollar grant. Dr. Richard Stephens, Prof. of Sociology, has received grant continuation of more than \$3.1 million, and I understand that since I got this report he has received another \$1 million from the same source. Dr. Stephens is in his fifth year of evaluating the effectiveness of substance programs as part of this target city's project. At the last Senate meeting I mentioned the goal setting retreat held with the Planning & Budgeting Committee and university leaders in September. Since that time we have made some progress in this area. The Espen Committee is exploring alternative needs of scheduling students, different ways we can do it more efficiently for the students. We have plans for staff training underway currently working with SEAC and Human Resources, and this ultimately will improve the service environment that we provide for our students. This is a difficult area, because I know that when students come in, the last thing they want to do is stand in line; since most of them have never been in the Army they don't understand standing in a line. We're trying to improve this as much as we possibly can.

*raised*  
We plan some Physical Plant changes on the campus that I think will make a difference as far as the campus appearance is concerned. The Forge St. building and former Alpha Pi sorority house will be raised very soon. The Forge St. building, and I don't know if that has an official name or not, is a little brick building across the street from the pizza place - that's going to come down. Several other buildings slated for demolition include Simmons Hall and the boiler plant right next to the Student Center. These two buildings will be coming down very shortly. We plan also to remodel and expand the Student Center, and the capital budget request for funding to build a new Arts & Sciences classroom building has been submitted. So this is on the drawing board right now.



The capital budget request for 1999-2000, the first biennium, includes the Arts & Sciences classroom office building, Science & Technology Library addition, and the Polymer Engineering Annex. The second biennium includes the Guzzetta Hall addition, the Auburn west tower rehabilitation, and the Carroll Hall rehabilitation. The third biennium includes the Ayer Hall rehabilitation, Zook Hall rehabilitation, Gladwin Hall 4th floor addition, and the hazardous storage facility. Requests for the second and third biennium all of you understand, can be changed. I have had a number of requests concerning a student recreation facility, and I understand that this body discussed this a number of times last year and possibly the year before. I have agreed to look into the possibility of a student recreation facility providing it comes 100% from soft money - no student fees, no tuition dollars. I don't feel that the students should pay for this facility, but if it comes from outside sources, I'm willing to look at this and seriously consider it for the Board of Trustees. If we can raise the soft money, then this is perfectly all right with me and I know that the Board of Trustees will go along with this. We have studies that would indicate that we're going to be more competitive with our recruitment and so on, but I'm not at this point in time willing to bring forward any kind of recommendation for increase in student fees or tuition or any capital request from the state for this facility. Given our location and the interest if it's there, I feel we can raise it with soft money.

The NCA update: as you know from the memo to the campus, the accreditation went well. We were reaccredited at the doctorate degree granting level, which is a continuation for six years. I want to share some of the details which were sent to the Board of Trustees from the North Central team. There were four concerns - first, the need for stable central administration. I assume that means that Dr. Leathers and I are not stable. Second, the need for a more effective working relationship between the EEO office and Human Resources. If we go back several years in our history, this was a very strong concern. I knew that this would come up. Third, the need for effective strategic planning, facilities maintenance, criteria for resource allocation and reallocation. I knew this would come up also, and I'm glad that it did. Also, a need to address the creation and implementation and adherence to University policies and procedures. In other words, we have to cut down on what we have to do, where we want to go and how we're going to get there. I think we have committees that are starting to work in this direction. So I feel good about the recommendations that they made.

The team will recommend that they come back in 1999 for a focused visit on the planning and budgeting process, and I have to be honest with you - if they had not put this in, I would have requested it. And this is not anything derogatory toward the institution, but I think that considering how long we went without a true budgeting process, we have to go through this planning. Put the budgeting process in order, then have them come back and look again to see whether we are doing it properly for the kind of institution that we are. The Provost met Monday with the Planning & Budgeting Committee to address these concerns, and progress is already being made.

The strengths that were cited by the North Central team were our general education program. Whether we realize it or not, our general education program is pretty unique as far as other institutions are concerned. I think this always attracts the attention of an outside team. Secondly, the College of Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering was commended as a young, notable, very successful unit. We were commended on the dedicated staff who served as the stabilizing force at the institution. This was brought up in the exit interview that I had with the chair of the committee, and he had a very good feel for what the institution went through, and a very good feel that the faculty and staff were stable enough to see the institution through this. This will come back as a strength of our campus. The student body



characterized by high aspirations and dedication to learning and commitment to the community - we were commended for that. We were commended for the high quality education contribution to the metropolitan area and support from business and industry. We were commended on the recent successes in private fund raising and providing entrepreneurial opportunities for colleges. If you haven't heard, our development department right now is 119% ahead of where they were last year at this time. So this speaks well for the institution, and the team recognized this. They also were very impressed with the attractive and informative publications we sent out.

I want to thank all of you who took an active part in planning for the North Central, and I appreciate your frankness and your honesty with the team. Like I said, when I had the exit interview with the team chair, we talked pretty straight-up about the institution, and we were in complete agreement as to what we had to do, how we were going to get there, how long it was going to take us to get there. The fact that we've been reaccredited for 6 years and not 10 bothers me zero, I don't care. I want them to come back in 6 years, and the fact that the chair was from Iowa State had nothing to do with it. I also would like to pay special attention to Prof. Mark Auburn, because he did a tremendous job in preparing for this. Self-studies really are not good reading, but I picked ours up and honestly had a hard time putting it down. This guy can write, and he did a good job. I thank all of you for your assistance. Mr. Chairman, this completes my report, and I'll entertain questions."

Senator C. Frank Griffin assumed that the President already had some ideas on the budgeting process and wondered whether he would share any of them.

The President replied that he thought Provost Leathers had indicated that he was going to get something out very shortly to a campus committee. He asked Presidential Assistant Richard Gigliotti to help him out with this.

Professor Gigliotti asked whether there were members of the Planning and Budgeting Committee who could speak to this, since the Provost had shared this with them at their last meeting.

Senator Forrest Smith, a member of the PBC, said that the main focus was to move the budgeting process back into line with what it had been five or six years ago so that we were not still fooling around with the budget in the middle of the summer in respect to raises, finalizing temporary budgets, etc., as the federal government did. There was a preliminary calendar which Dr. Leathers would probably be sharing. The PBC would be meeting every two weeks; it had already had its first regular meeting a few weeks ago after the retreat that the President had mentioned earlier. The intent was to have most of the budget finished in early December so that it could be looked at in detail by PBC in February. Therefore, by the March deadline there would be something to go to the Board of Trustees so that contracts, etc., would be out by the first of May after having been approved at the Board's April meeting. These were the things which the Committee had been focusing on other than the bullets it had started to work on at the retreat about a month ago. Also, there had been a formation of two subcommittees that were going to speak to some of the issues raised by the NCA.

Dean Roger Creel asked for permission to speak and the body granted his request. He added information regarding the two newly-created subcommittees. The one was called the evaluation committee, which was supposed to set the criteria on which various units would be measured. The other was called the processing committee which was supposed to determine who gathered the data, who evaluated it, and also essentially to set a calendar for the evaluation process. The PBC would be doing



two things in parallel this year; it would be developing next year's budget, and at the same time it would be developing a process and testing it to go along with the budget process for next year.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson had a question about the recreation center. The President had mentioned that the Senate had had discussions about the need for this building. In the course of that discussion, it had been suggested by Senator Jesse Marquette and then-Senator Gigliotti that the survey that had been used to justify the need was flawed. A resolution had been passed asking the administration or the appropriate authority from Student Affairs to conduct a new survey to assess the impact of renovation of residence halls and the creation of a student recreation center to be carried out by campus experts in the area. She was wondering whether such a survey had been conducted or whether a new survey of that kind would be carried out before any decision was made regarding a need for a recreation center.

The President said that the point he was making was that someone could come along and say he would give the money if we would build a recreation center. Senator Erickson replied that perhaps it could be pointed out to that person that we did not need one, but the money could be used for something else that we had in mind. The President answered that perhaps that person was not interested in anything other than a recreation center.

Senator Midha had a request for the President to consider. The request came from several of his colleagues. Last year, the fourth ERIP window had been established for the year 2000 to stop the brain drain. Personally, he thought that it had actually added to it, because now more people were going to get out. Many people were considering it even though they were really not ready to retire because it was too good to pass up. He was not one of the people considering this retirement, but in talking with those who were, he had come up with this request that he hoped the President would consider and perhaps recommend to the Board. Assuming that there were 100 slots available for the year 2000, perhaps 50 could be given in the year 2000 and another 50 could be given at a later date - maybe 2003 or 2005. This suggestion required no additional resources and perhaps it would slow the brain drain so that we could keep experienced faculty with us.

The President said that he would take this under consideration.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met several times last month to talk about a number of issues as well as to set the agenda for today's meeting. It had also met with President Ruebel and Provost Leathers on October 20 to discuss items of mutual interest. There were a few matters on which the Committee wished to report to the Senate. The first concerned an impending move of the Senate offices from Schrank Hall to Carroll Hall. This would be formally presented to the body during Senator Drummond's CFPC report later in the meeting. The Executive Committee had been asked to consider giving up our office space in Schrank for the PeopleSoft Year 2000 computer project. Possible new space was offered in Carroll Hall, and since the Executive Committee of the Senate wanted to be obliging, after some negotiation the Committee agreed to accept Carroll Hall 326 and 308. The Committee wished to thank Associate Provost Graham Kelly and the CFPC for facilitating these negotiations, as well as Developmental Programs and the Department of Geography and Planning for their willingness to trade some space. The Committee thought that this new location would benefit the Senate in a number of ways, including raising its visibility on campus. The Committee had been talking about making the Faculty Senate offices available to faculty for a variety of things such as a source of information on faculty governance and university rules, etc. It could also be



used as a place for faculty senators to meet with their constituents on a regular basis. Therefore, this move worked out nicely with some of the things which the Committee members had been considering.

The second matter related to a concern which had been raised by this body before and also had been mentioned in the preliminary NCA report, and that was the accessibility and maintenance of an updated collection of University rules and regulations, some of which used to be in the Faculty Manual, both on the Web and in hard copy. In order to facilitate and expedite this, the Committee had decided on two things. First, it was agreed that from now on the Faculty Senate Secretary would be a member of the Reference Committee. Secondly, it decided that it would be helpful if the Secretary of the Senate would meet on a regular basis with Deputy General Counsel Michael Sermersheim, who was now responsible for making sure an up-to-date, easily accessible, user friendly set of University rules was on the Web. Chairman Malhotra and Secretary Oller had already met with Mr. Sermersheim to discuss these matters, and he had agreed that this would help to keep him informed of what recent items the Senate had passed and was sending on to the President and Board and therefore what changes to the old rules as well as what new rules might be coming up that he needed to be aware of.

During the meeting with Mr. Sermersheim, they had also talked about the accessibility question. Members of the body might remember that last spring the Senate had discussed the issue of whether or not to give everybody hard copies of the Faculty Manual. It had been suggested that people could be told that the information was on the Web, and if they wanted hard copies they could request them. The Senate had approved a recommendation that forms be sent out for such a request, but so far that had not happened. In talking about this, Mr. Sermersheim had shown the Chairman and Secretary the University rules as they now existed in hard copy. It filled three big, loose-leaf binders. The first question was who would get all that information. Should it just go to Deans' and department offices? The second question was how much needed to go to the faculty? It was decided that the Reference Committee, using the tables of contents of the three binders, should decide on an abridgement for faculty members who wanted hard copies. There were things which faculty did not need, such as University Police regulations for instance. In effect, what the Reference Committee would be doing was creating a new version of the Faculty Manual containing those things that faculty might want to have on their shelves. There probably would have to be a version of this on the Web as well. Since the President had already approved this (sending out forms to request hard copies and supplying them to those who requested them) last spring, once the Reference Committee came up with a list of things, the Provost had promised to expedite it. This was all that the Secretary had to report.

Senator Griffin wanted to know how up-to-date the University rules were on the Web.

Secretary Oller answered that he did not have an exact answer to that question. He knew that some of things which the Senate had passed last year were still not quite correct and up-to-date on the Web. This was one of the reasons for putting the Secretary on the Reference Committee. The assumption was that the Secretary of the Senate should be familiar with what the body had been doing and be able to pass that information along. Working with Mr. Sermersheim would help make sure that what was on the Web would be as up-to-date as one could make it.

The Chairman added that Mr. Sermersheim had given him the impression that there had been a back-log because last year so many rules had been amended or entirely changed. This was why what one saw on the Web right now was not up-to-date. It was in this context that the Executive Committee had thought that the Senate and Reference Committee should get involved and cooperate with Mr.



Sermersheim's office to make sure that all rules passed by the Board of Trustees got into the rule books as quickly as possible so that when we acted we knew exactly the rules and regulations under which we operated.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Kimmell, the Chair, reported that the Committee had met and discussed the calendars for 1998-99 and 1999-2000. It would be submitting them to the Senate for its consideration at the next meeting. The second issue which it had discussed was a request to evaluate the University's class scheduling pattern with a view to making recommendations for improvement if necessary. The Committee had decided to ask department chairs to communicate any shortcomings that they were aware of to the Committee, and it would see what transpired as it received addition information. The third issue the Committee discussed was the matter of the proposed academic nepotism policy which the Senate had returned to the Reference Committee last spring. The Committee thought that this was a matter over which it ought to have responsibility and therefore **he moved a recommendation that the issue be transferred to the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee.**

Senator Mark Tausig understood that there was some discussion right now on this matter, and he wondered what the motivation might be in moving it to this committee.

Senator Kimmell asked Secretary Oller to comment on this. Secretary Oller noted that the discussion in APC had focused on this as a policy matter which was part of the purview of the committee. Reference was not supposed to get into dealing with the philosophies behind or formulation of the policies themselves. That was really not part of its charge.

The Chairman stated that the group to which Senator Tausig was referring was a subcommittee of the university-wide department chairs' committee. Since Senator Jerry Stinner was the chair of that group, he asked him to speak.

Senator Stinner said that the subcommittee was chaired by Professor Frank Falk from Sociology, and there was a document in place about which the Senate would be hearing soon. He was not sure how the committee was going to handle this. They were still investigating a conflict of interest statement which the Board might have adopted a few years ago. It had been signed off by the Secretary of the Board, but there was no record of it in the Board's minutes, which was fairly typically at this place. They hoped to take the statement which they were working on to Provost Leathers. Quite frankly, however, they had not decided whether to take it directly to the Senate and the APC.

The Chairman said that it was up to that committee to decide what it wanted to do. He did not want to suggest to a group outside of the Senate what it should or should not do. Since there was no further discussion, the body voted, with one abstention to transfer the academic nepotism issue from Reference to APC.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Drummond, the Chair, presented the report in two parts - the first relating to space allocations and the second to a discussion regarding capital requests. He moved the following reallocation recommendations from the Committee:



A. In order to facilitate the installation of a new Student Administration System and a new Financial System from PeopleSoft such that the year 2000 compliancy problem can be addressed, a team consisting of personnel from Information Services, Student Services, and Business and Finance has been formed to do the work. This team will work together for about two years and the following allocations are to be made to house the team:

1. Temporary reallocation of SHN 252 and 151 from the College of Engineering to Information Services for the PeopleSoft team;
2. Temporary reallocation of SHN 155, currently occupied by the Faculty Senate offices, to Information Services for the PeopleSoft team;
3. The Faculty Senate offices will be temporarily relocated in CH 326 and CH 308. These two rooms are presently assigned to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost, although the CFPC had approved a loan of CH 308 to the Department of Geography and Planning for office space.
4. In lieu of CH 308, CH 307 will be reallocated to the Department of Geography and Planning. CH 307 is presently assigned to Developmental Programs.
5. CH 50B, 50C, 50D, 50E, 50F, and 50G will be reassigned to Developmental Programs. These rooms are currently assigned to Information Services.

The above changes have been approved by all affected parties.

B. CH 55 will be reassigned to the English Language Institute. The space is currently assigned to Information Services, who will vacate the space when renovations in the Lincoln building are complete. Information Services and the ELI have approved this change.

Senator Drummond added that all the parties were happy with these changes. Associate Provost Graham Kelly, who was an engineer, had done a wonderful job working behind the scenes to achieve all of this.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the space reallocations.

The second part of the report related to the Committee's October 30 meeting at which it had discussed the capital requests for the next three biennial periods, a summary of which was included in his report (see Appendix A). The Committee was endorsing the content of the plan for the first biennium. It also saw no problems with the plans for the next two periods, although it had not had time to discuss them thoroughly. As the President had mentioned earlier, these had a habit of changing anyway over the 2-year period. The items in the 6-year period had been noted in previous communications with the CFPC so there were no surprises. He pointed out, however, that the plan for the 1999-2000 biennium had already been approved by the Board of Trustees prior to its presentation to the CFPC. Therefore, this had already been done. While the Committee recognized the effort that had been put into the capital planning process, it strongly recommended that the final draft of the capital planning process should be provided to the CFPC in a timely manner so it could be reviewed and forwarded to the Faculty Senate before going to the Board of Trustees.



The Chairman stated that in effect the Committee was informing the body on what had already been approved and was also making a motion regarding what it would like the procedure to be in the future.

Senator Drummond agreed. If the CFPC and the Senate were to be in an advisory capacity, it obviously needed to be in on the process earlier. It recognized that a lot of effort had gone into the capital budget plan, and that there was a lot of wheeling and dealing of priorities, etc. But if we were going to be able to do what we were supposed to do, we needed to see this earlier in the process. He then presented the motion which read as follows: **"We strongly recommend that the final draft of the capital requests be provided to the Campus Facilities Planning Committee in a timely manner so it can be reviewed and forwarded to the Faculty Senate before going to the Board of Trustees."**

There was no discussion, and the body voted its approval.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO FACCOBOR - Senator Shelley Baranowski reported that there had been basically two items discussed at the Committee's Oct. 29 meeting. The first was a "scare you to death" type about which she wanted to go into some detail. The Vice Chancellor for Administration had presented the concern that the OBR had about a Supreme Court decision last March regarding the unconstitutionality of the present system of public school funding. The problem for higher education arose in how precisely the new basis of funding was going to be achieved, since an increase in the sales tax had been voted down by the General Assembly last July. The legislature was now scurrying for ways to find an alternative means of funding. There was evidently something in the works in caucus in the legislature to put something on the ballot in May of 1998. If a source of revenue, whether it was in taxation, bonds or whatever, could not be achieved, then some sort of juggling of the budget would have to be undertaken. That would probably mean bad news for higher education, since Medicaid costs were relatively fixed. Higher education was an obvious target. The Vice Chancellor did not have any recommendations other than for all of us to think of possible arguments to use to defend higher education should such a moment arrive. Hopefully, that dark cloud would not loom so large if the legislature could get its act together and come up with some alternative means.

Senator Baranowski continued to item two which had to do with the revamping of the uniform information system with higher education which included a component called the faculty staff area. This was designed to replace the faculty service report which, as should not surprise anyone, was not taken very seriously. What the Board of Regents wanted to do was to come up with a selective instrument, a survey done annually that would more accurately represent what it was that faculty did in different departments in different institutions. OBR was inviting input as to what sorts of questions should be asked. There was a discussion group Web site for which she had the address if anyone was interested. She was also willing to take questions or comments from any of the Senators or their constituents, and she would then bring them to the next FACCOBOR meeting on December 3 when this item would be on the agenda. This was important precisely because the information would not only be used to determine allocations and costs, but it would also be used as a means of answering questions that came out of the legislature about what it was that faculty actually did. The current mood in the legislature was apparently less hostile than it had been earlier in the decade, but it was far from favorable. So if higher education was going to be threatened with cuts, we had better have an instrument that put us in the favorable light which she thought we deserved to be in. If Senators had any questions, comments or



suggestions about how this instrument should be constructed or what sort of questions should be asked, please see her at the end of the meeting.

**VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS** - There was none.

**VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Senator Kris Gill wanted to share with the body that the Nursing College had just completed its accreditation visit by the Ohio Board of Nursing, and it had been fully accredited without any recommendations. The Chairman congratulated her and her colleagues in the College of Nursing.

Senator Barbara Heinzerling asked for a point of clarification. At its last meeting in the spring, the Senate had forwarded a recommendation regarding salary inequities and the creation of a subcommittee of PBC to deal with that issue. She had heard no mention of its creation when the formation of the other two subcommittees of PBC had been discussed earlier in the meeting. Where was this in the process?

Since he attended the meetings of PBC as an observer, the Chairman offered a response. Nothing had been done about this yet. The PBC had not yet even elected a Vice Chair. He had made the Provost's office aware of this. At its next meeting, the PBC should elect one of its senatorial membership as Vice Chair. Then the Senate would have a liaison to inform it on where such issues stood. Although nothing had been done about the formation of the Salary Equity Subcommittee, perhaps one of the Senators here today who was a member of PBC could take Senator Heinzerling's concern and raise it at a meeting of the Committee.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT** - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn. Senator Midha so moved and this was seconded by Senator Tim Norfolk. The body voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 3:55 p.m.



APPENDIX A**Campus Facilities Planning Committee****Report to the Faculty Senate****November 6, 1997**

The Campus Facilities Planning Committee met on October 23 and October 30, 1997, to consider several items of committee interest.

The following reallocations of space have been reviewed by and are unanimously recommended for approval by the Faculty Senate:

- A. In order to facilitate the installation of a new Student Administration System and a new Financial System from PeopleSoft such that the year 2000 compliancy problem can be addressed, a team consisting of personnel from Information Services, Student Services, and Business and Finance has been formed to do the work. This team will work together for about two years and the following allocations are to be made to house the team:
  - 1. Temporary reallocation of SHN 252 and 151 from the College of Engineering to Information Services for the PeopleSoft team;\
  - 2. Temporary reallocation of SHN 155, currently occupied by the Faculty Senate offices, to Information Services for the PeopleSoft team;
  - 3. The Faculty Senate offices will be temporarily relocated in CH 326 and CH 308. These two rooms are presently assigned to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost although the CFPC had approved a loan of CH 308 to the Department of Geography and Planning for office space.
  - 4. In lieu of CH 308, CH 307 will be reallocated to the Department of Geography and Planning. CH 307 is presently assigned to Developmental Programs.
  - 5. CH 50B, 50C, 50D, 50E, 50F, and 50G will be reassigned to Developmental Programs. These rooms are currently assigned to Information Services.

The above changes have been approved by all affected parties.

- B. CH 55 will be reassigned to the English Language Institute. The space is currently assigned to Information Services who will vacate the space when renovations in the Lincoln building are complete. Information Services and the ELI have approved this change.

The University of Akron Capital Requests for the next three biennial periods were discussed. The summary of the request is attached. The CFPC endorses the content of the plan for the First Biennium. The Committee sees no problems with the plans for the next two periods, although we have not had time to discuss these thoroughly. The items included for the six-year period have been noted in previous communications with the CFPC so there are no surprises. It should be noted that the plan for the 1999-2000 Biennium has already been approved by the Board of



Trustees and was approved prior to the presentation of the plans to the CFPC. The Committee recognizes the effort that has been put into the capital planning process, but we strongly recommend that the final draft of the Capital Request should be provided to the Campus Facilities and Planning Committee in a timely manner so it can be reviewed and forwarded to the Faculty Senate before going to the Board of Trustees.

Dr. Jerry Drummond was elected as Chair of the Committee for the coming year. The CFPC will meet prior to the end of the semester and focus on more clearly defining our priorities

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON  
1999-2004 CAPITAL REQUEST**

**FIRST BIENNIUM - 1999-2000:**

1.	Classroom/Office Bldg. (Arts & Sci., PH.II)	6,420,000
2.	Science & Technology Library Addition, PH. II	1,605,000
3.	Polymer Eng. Bldg. Annex	2,675,000
<b>TOTAL FIRST BIENNIUM REQUEST:</b>		<b>\$10,700,000</b>

**SECOND BIENNIUM - 2001-2002:**

1.	Guzzetta Hall Addition	6,420,000
2.	Auburn Science & Engineering Center West Tower Rehab., PH. III	\$10,379,000
3.	Carroll Hall Rehabilitation	6,420,000
<b>TOTAL SECOND BIENNIUM REQUEST:</b>		<b>\$23,219,000</b>

**THIRD BIENNIUM - 2003-2004:**

1.	Ayer Hall Rehabilitation	\$ 1,605,000
2.	Zook Hall Rehabilitation	4,815,000
3.	Gladwin Hall, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor	2,675,000
4.	Hazardous Materials Bldg.	4,494,000
<b>TOTAL THIRD BIENNIUM REQUEST:</b>		<b>\$13,589,000</b>

Note: Inflation for 2 years included.



## CAPITAL PLAN (COMPREHENSIVE)

CURRENT PROJECTS	State Funds	Aux. Funds	Univ. Funds	Private Donations
Polsky 3rd/5th (95/96)*	\$3,800,000			
Student Affairs Build.(Arts/Sci.)95/96*	9,468,000.			
Arts/Sci. Ph. II (97/98)	(6,000,000) Turned back			
Leigh Hall Rehab.(97/98)*	6,000,000			
Sci. Lib. (97/98)*	2,080,000			
Global Business Institute*	300,000			
West Campus Parking Deck Repair (97/98)**		4,500,000		
ASEC Park'g Deck Repair (97/98)**		2,500,000		
Exchange, PAH P.Decks & Surf.Lot Repair**		1,029,000		
Corbin Common construction				\$800,000
Hazardous Waste Storage			\$125,000	
Converter Plant Demo. Study*			25,000	
Sub-total	\$21,648,000	\$ 8,029,000	\$150,000	\$800,000

\* funds not encumbered

\*\*bonds have been sold

FIRST BIENNium PROJECTS (1999/2000)	State Funds	Aux. Funds	Univ. Funds	Private Donations
Classrm./Off Bldg. (A&S. PhII)	6,420,000			
Sci.Tech. Lib. PH II.	1,605,000			
Polymer Eng. Bldg. Annex	2,675,000			
Basic U & R	3,400,000			
Bulger Hall Dorm Remodeling		\$ 5,700,000		
GSC Addition & Rehab.		12,000,000		
West Campus Park'g. Deck PH 4,5		950,000		
Schrank Deck Repair		3,100,000		
Converter Plant Removal			\$ 2,675,000	
Simmons Hall Demolition			535,000	
Land Acquisition			4,500,000	
Olson Res. Ctr. Rehab.			2,354,000	
North Hall & College SV/CSX Demo			300,000	
Guzzetta Hall Addit'n -Feasibility			50,000	
Bel-Aire Bldg Demolition and Sitework			169,000 City of Akron	
ADA Projects	\$ 350,000 (Formula)			
Asbestos Projects	1,600,000 (Formula)		\$ 160,000	
Equipment Replacement Moveable or Fixed	1,900,000(Formula)	200,000	500,000	
Wolf Ledges Parking Deck (1000 Cars)		10,000,000		
Robertson Deck Repair		\$ 1,500,000		
Surface Park'g Lot Repairs		645,000		
Communications			400,000	
Plant Fund Projects		600,000	1,600,000	\$200,000
Sub-Total (1999/2000)	\$17,950,000	\$34,695,000	\$13,243,000	\$200,000



SECOND BIENNium (2001/2002)	State Funds	Aux. Funds	Univ. Funds	Private Donations
Carroll Hall Rehab.	6,420,000			
Auburn Science West Tower (Ph.III)	\$10,379,000			
Guzzetta Hall Addition	6,420,000			
Basic U & R	3,400,000 (Formula)			
ADA Projects	350,000 (Formula)			
West Campus P.D. PH6		\$ 5,000,000		
Asbestos Projects	1,600,000 (Formula)		\$ 160,000	
Equipment Replacement	1,900,000	200,000	500,000	
Communications			400,000	
Land Acquisition		1,000,000	2,000,000	
Plant Fund Projects	<u>          </u>	<u>600,000</u>	<u>1,600,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
Sub-total (2001/2002)	\$30,469,000	\$ 6,800,000	\$4,660,000	\$200,000

THIRD BIENNium (2003/2004)	State Funds	Aux. Funds	Univ. Funds	Private Donations
Ayer Hall Rehab.	\$1,605,000			
Zook Hall Rehab.	4,815,000			
Gladwin Hall 4th Fl. Addition	2,675,000			
Haz. Mat. Processing Lab	4,494,000			
Basic U & R	3,400,000 (Formula)			
ADA Projects	350,000 (Formula)			
Asbestos Projects	1,600,000 (Formula)		\$ 160,000	
Equipment Replacement	1,900,000 (Formula)	\$200,000	500,000	
Communications	-	-	400,000	
Plant Fund Projects	<u>          </u>	<u>600,000</u>	<u>1,600,000</u>	<u>\$200,000</u>
Sub-total (2003/2004)	\$20,839,000	\$800,000	\$2,660,000	\$200,000



