

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

12-5-1996

Faculty Senate Chronicle December 5, 1996

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.



1996-97, No. 4

December 5, 1996

26 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of December 5, 1996	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of December 5, 1996	22
A. Academic Calendar	22
B. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	23
C. Faculty Senate Bylaws Changes	25
D. Faculty Manual Changes	26

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 DECEMBER 5, 1996**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, December 5, 1996, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-four of the sixty-nine members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Batur, Davis, Deckler, Fowler, Kimmell, McGucken, Reep, Ross-Alaolmolki, Scott and Woodley were absent with notice. Senators Braun, J. Buchanan, Hardy and Witt were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **APPROVED THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR FOR 1997-98 AND PRELIMINARY CALENDAR FOR 1998-99**
- * **APPROVED SEVEN SPACE ALLOCATION RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CFPC**
- * **APPROVED AMENDMENTS TO FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS REGARDING THE TERMS OF FACULTY SENATORS**
- * **APPROVED AMENDMENTS TO FACULTY MANUAL REGARDING DEPARTMENT CHAIR REVIEWS**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chairman stated that there were two items to be added to the agenda under new business. One was a Faculty Manual amendment proposed by Senator Andrew Borowiec for which there was a handout, and the other was a Bylaw amendment proposed by Senator Kris Gill. Since there were no other changes to the agenda, the body voted its approval of the amended agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 7 - Secretary Gary Oller stated that he had received no corrections to the minutes. Since there were none offered by members of the body, the Senate voted its approval of the minutes.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman reported that two weeks ago he had attended a meeting of the Pew Roundtable and Knight Collaborative in St. Louis. It had been an interesting weekend during which he had learned that most of our sister institutions faced very similar problems to ours. Indeed for miscellaneous reasons, many faced worse problems than we did. He thought that our ERIP program and some downsizing had perhaps been too severe. Some would argue that

it had left on the academic side some unpleasant decisions to make at least on the short term. Most of our sister institutions were pursuing very similar attempts to solve those problems. He wanted the body to know that we were not alone. It was easy when one was looking just at The University of Akron to see those problems and wonder whether we were pursuing the right courses of action to get out of those problems. Either over a hundred other institutions were headed in equally bad directions or we had at least formed a good set of possibilities for approaching those problems and finding a way through them. One place that we were far ahead of most of those institutions was in addressing the need for bottom-up planning and faculty involvement. While this might be hard to believe because we all felt somewhat disempowered at times, in comparison to many universities, our faculty was well acknowledged. We were way ahead of many universities in implementing a bottom-up, half-sane budgeting and planning mechanism which was thanks in large part to this body. He wanted to think that this was the case because faculty had been involved in these issues from the very beginning.

In patting the body on the back in regard to this, he also wanted to exhort it to keep up the good work. He knew that it was hard to find time to serve on committees and that the reward system which we had built did not always compensate us in a way which we thought was appropriate. However, it was important to remember that the cost of not being willing to do the work was to give up the very real advantages of faculty involvement in planning and budgeting. He asked that members please not sit on their hands when it came time to volunteering for a committee. One should make a special point of making one's hand available when people were needed to do things such as chairing committees. We were going in the right direction, but it was an awful lot of work and we had constructed a reward system which did not recognize that work over the short term. Over the long term, we did get our reward by spending time and effort working on these kinds of things.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - There were none.

V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. During the past month some key personnel recommendations were made and we have made significant progress for several important searches that are going on on campus. First, the Executive Director of Human Resources: We had approximately 120 applicants. The committee has identified seven candidates who will meet with the committee this month, and three or four finalists will be brought back for full campus interviews after the semester break. Second, the Vice President for Public Affairs and Development: the committee has identified four candidates who will be interviewed on campus within the next few weeks. Thirdly, the Provost search is underway; the committee has started its process. Pending Board approval, Provost Moore has appointed Dr. Steven Myers as Interim Associate Vice President for Information Services. Dr. Myers, an Associate Professor of Economics who was selected for this position through an internal search, will oversee the Computer Center, University Libraries and the Institute for Policy Studies. I am also recommending that Dr. Larry Bradley be named coordinator of the Central-Hower project. As you know, this project is very important to the University and to the

community; therefore, it deserves a full-time effort from one of our best educators and I am delighted that Dr. Bradley is willing to take on this responsibility. The Board will also consider my recommendation to appoint Dr. Rita Saslaw as Interim Dean of the College of Education. Dr. Saslaw is a well-respected and long-time member of the University family and a recognized scholar in Education. She will replace Dr. William Klingele, who announced his resignation on November 22.

In addition to updating you on these personnel matters, I wanted to talk about two campus events - first, the campaign kickoff and second, commencement. On November 23 we had a formal kickoff of the 125th Anniversary Campaign. If you recall, a couple of months ago I mentioned the possibility of 200 full academic rides for worthy scholars and this particular kickoff was primarily for this. We have a \$125 million goal for our 125th Anniversary as an institution, and I have to tell you that we have over \$100 million raised already, so we're well on our way to reaching this goal. So I'm sure that within the 3-year period we will see 200 full academic scholarships on our campus. One thing that took place at the event and I wish all of you could have been there to hear two of our Buckingham Scholars who had the opportunity to speak at the gathering. I couldn't help but make note that most of the things we read about young people in the papers and the media are negative, and that is primarily the focus of most newspapers dealing with young people. But if all of you could've had the opportunity to hear these two young people, one was a freshman and one was a sophomore, that spoke to the group about the importance of scholarships and the importance of full academic scholarships, it puts your faith back in young people. It was truly an impressive ceremony and they truly added to it. This fall we will have more than 600 honor students, and among them are seven Buckingham Scholars, 21 Presidential Scholars and 17 high school valedictorians. So we have our share of scholars on the campus right now, but I truly feel if we're going to remain competitive not only in the state of Ohio but nationwide, we're going to have to up the number of full academic scholarships that we offer and I know that we're going in the right direction in this particular area. On December 24 nearly 700 of our students will take part in commencement. We will have one ceremony starting at 9:30 a.m., and our commencement speaker will be Mr. John Ong, who is the Chairman and CEO of the B.F. Goodrich Co. I would appreciate as much participation from the faculty as we possibly can get, because I think this is one time the faculty has an opportunity to recognize the graduates of the institution. Mr. Chairman, that completes my report and I'll be happy to respond to any questions."

Senator Ruth Clinefelter commented that a few days ago the Beacon Journal had run a story about the downtown, and in it Jim Phelps, Deputy Mayor for Economic Development, had noted that there had been continued talk of putting more public money into a downtown arena next to the new baseball park. This new arena would be a site for The University of Akron basketball games, and other entertainment events could be part of the package. Were we being hit again to give money for a downtown arena? The University had declined a couple of years ago when this had come up. She was curious to know if the President knew anything about this.

President Ruebel answered that he had not been officially approached about this. He did think (and he would say this even if his good friend Dr. Guzzetta were standing next to him) that the institution a number of years ago had made a serious mistake when it had built the Rhodes Arena as it was today. What we had was probably a poor high school gym in which approximately 40% of the space was unusable because it was hallway and stairwell. So facility-wise, if they talked about a basketball arena, we were not in the same league. However, he could not respond to her question

because he had not been officially approached for anything dealing with an arena downtown, although he had heard the word mentioned. There was one thing which this institution was going to have to take a hard, serious look at if it was going to stay competitive, and that was an indoor recreation facility which all students, faculty, and townspeople could use. Kent State had one that was far removed from their campus, but the downtown people made heavy use of that facility. He could see one of these indoor recreation facilities for us just east of Rhodes Arena because it was a recruiting tool. However, if a student decided on this school because it had an indoor facility, he was not certain whether we wanted that student or not, but this was one of the things that went into the mix of recruiting students. Of course if he were going to rebuild the campus, we would probably have a football stadium that was not seven miles away from the campus.

Senator Ken Siloac wondered in regard to the proposed 200 academic scholarships whether there were plans to phase any in to come up with a number for next year.

President Ruebel responded that he anticipated 15 would be phased in next year. The following year there would be 30 and then probably double the 30 to 60 and so on.

Since there were no other questions, on behalf of his wife, Neoma, and himself, President Ruebel wished the body a very happy holiday season.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met twice last month and set the agenda for today's meeting. It also had held its regular meeting with President Ruebel, Provost Moore, Vice President Mallo and Special Executive Assistant Wilson to discuss matters of interest.

ACADEMIC POLICIES, CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Graham Kelly, the Chair, presented the proposed academic calendar for 1997-98 and a proposed preliminary calendar for 1998-99 (Appendix A). This had been approved by APCC. He pointed out that in the summer of 1998 there were 16 weeks between the end of the spring semester of 1998 and the beginning of the fall semester 1998, and the Academic Policy and Calendar Subcommittee of APCC had decided that this was best handled by having five weeks between the end of spring and the beginning of Summer I. There was an additional week there in the summer of 1998.

Senator Barbara Bucey had a question regarding the double-asterisked phrase at the bottom of the page, "Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5:00 p.m. through Monday at 7:00 a.m." Since the classes at that time of day began at 6:45 a.m., should that not be the correct time listed here?

Associate Provost Kelly agreed, and as a friendly amendment from the floor "7:00 a.m." was changed to "6:45 a.m."

Since there was no further discussion of the calendar, the Senate voted its approval.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Jerry Drummond, the Chair, presented his report which contained seven distinct items, some of which had several parts. He began by noting that those individuals who had put forth these proposals had done an excellent job of dealing with any problems before the requests came to the Committee.

The first space allocation request (Item A in the report) was "That SHS Room 4 be assigned as a dedicated classroom for Aerospace Studies and Military Science. The move will put most of the courses for those departments in SHS 4 and release SHS 1 for more general scheduling. The Registrar's Office feels this is nearly an even trade as far as classroom space is concerned although it will hurt scheduling flexibility to some extent." The Committee recommended this change based on the need of the two departments involved, and Senator Drummond added that there had been no objections lodged regarding the change.

Since there was no discussion, the body voted its approval.

Item B of the report read as follows: "That the alcove in Polsky 269 be reassigned to the Institute for Policy Studies. The space is presently part of the Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies. This proposal was presented at the last Senate meeting, but the objection made at that time has been worked out between IPS and Urban Studies."

There was no discussion and the Senate voted its approval.

Item C read as follows: "That MGH 310 (classroom) be allocated to the College of Nursing for use by undergraduate nursing students for a study and meeting area as well as for student mailboxes. The Registrar's Office notes that during the present academic year, six courses using that space could not be rescheduled elsewhere if the room were taken off-line. Four of these courses are in the College of Nursing and Interim Dean Dunham-Taylor intends to schedule these using MGH 310 or other space within the College. It appears that the impact on classroom use is minimal and the need for undergraduate space in Nursing is substantial." Senator Drummond added clarification to this by indicating that during the present year there were six courses that could not have been scheduled elsewhere if this room had been taken off-line. Four of those courses were Nursing courses, and if the room were to be given to Nursing, Dean Dunham-Taylor had stated that they could find Nursing space for those courses. Therefore, we were talking about only two courses that would be affected on the present schedule.

President Ruebel wanted to know how the Dean could find space when the Registrar's Office could not. Was the Registrar's Office missing some information?

Senator Drummond answered that Nursing would be using MGH 310 for these classes since they were apparently small discussion classes. The room itself was very small.

President Ruebel said his reason for asking the question was that he did not want the Registrar's Office to get into the habit of saying that it could not schedule a class. It was your problem, but if the Dean could find a room, then the Registrar's Office would schedule it there. He wanted to make sure that the Registrar's Office had all the information that it needed as to whether it could or could not schedule in a particular facility.

The Chairman stated it was his understanding that the Committee was recommending that this room be taken off-line as far as the Registrar's Office was concerned. Senator Drummond responded that this was correct. The Nursing College wanted the room for uses besides classroom use. However, if they were going to use it for scheduled courses, comment was appropriate and the Registrar should know that. He did not believe that the room was listed as a classroom.

Senator Jerry Stinner asked what department the other two courses were in and had that department been consulted. Senator Drummond replied that they were two English Composition courses, but the English Department had not been consulted on this matter.

Provost Randy Moore urged that before any room that was currently being used by departments for classes was taken off-line, all those departments be consulted about the proposed change so that they did not find out two days before classes started that there was no space.

Senator Virginia Gunn noted that some classes did not use those rooms on a regular basis. If her department needed a class at a certain hour, it was put into the schedule, and the Registrar assigned it to whatever space was available on campus. The course might not get the same room each time. It was not a permanent part of any one room. She imagined that this was what had happened here. The English classes had been scheduled where there was available space.

Senator William Rich added that this was why, although consultation in the abstract sounded good, he was not sure that it made a whole lot of sense. How far back did one want to go? Did you want to talk to every department that had used the room in the last year, two years, five years, ten years? It sounded like the room was being assigned as needed. He did not see why the Registrar's Office was not the appropriate office to consult on this. In other words, why should any particular department have a greater claim to the room in future semesters than any other? The only reason for being concerned might be if the Registrar's Office was not adequately taking into account the needs of the teaching parts of the University.

Senator Gill thought that in the College of Nursing there was a situation in which its numbers had increased exponentially without space increasing exponentially. The college was constantly looking for space. Within the limited space which the college had outgrown the day it moved in, space was needed for discussion groups and where students could hang their hats and so forth. The idea regarding MGH 310 was that if it were allocated to the college to assign, the college could make the most efficient use of it. This would be better than having to go through the Registrar on a constant basis and the use as a sporadic thing. It would allow constant, efficient use of the room.

Senator Karen Reed supported Senator Gill by pointing out that this was not a premier classroom or prime real estate. The room could be used by the college as a multi-purpose room for a variety of needs relating to small numbers of students - discussions, graduate seminars, etc. Using this room would actually free up larger classrooms that could be utilized in other ways. Instead of using a room that could probably seat 20 people for a class of ten, those ten could be moved to this space and free up the larger space as needed.

Senator Wolfgang ^{back of the} Pelz said that we had been focusing on six classes that were not able to be rescheduled. Using a ~~faculty~~ envelope calculation, he noted that if the classroom were fully utilized, it came out to roughly 18 classes, so 12 other classes had been moved out of that room in this scenario to other classrooms elsewhere thereby making difficulties for the rest of campus as well. He was assuming that the classroom would be used on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays for the same class starting at 8:00, the next class at the next period, and so on. That came to nine class periods, MWF; doing the same again for Tues., Thurs., the total came to 18 classes.

Senator Gill added that all 18 of those classes could easily be Nursing courses.

Senator Devinder Malhotra thought that the crucial question here was whether as a result of this reallocation there would be some classes cancelled.

The Chairman thanked Senator Malhotra for his point and reminded the members to stand when addressing the body. There were several reasons for this. One was custom, and the other was that we were attempting to record the proceedings.

In answer to Senator Malhotra's question, Senator Gill stated that Nursing would need to cancel classes if the reallocation did not go through. In the past, they had been forced to hold some of these classes in their clinical agencies because they could find no open space on campus.

Senator Connie Murray, who had been at the Committee meeting when this had been discussed, had understood that the classes would still be scheduled in this space for Nursing and Nursing was okay with this. If there was a problem, they would move them into a conference room or another space, so the Registrar would continue to schedule them. She had been very impressed at the meeting with the interest from the College of Nursing and their student groups that had come to speak to the Committee. They were actually pleading for a space in which to meet. Nursing students did form a cohesive unit within each year with clinicals, and they did need a place to meet and learn about things that were going on. This was why the Committee felt this would be needed.

Senator Pelz wanted to propose a compromise. Let Nursing have the room on a trial basis for a year. If they did utilize it completely for that year, then they could keep it. If not, it could be returned to the Registrar for ordinary scheduling.

Senator Drummond did not think the question was whether or not they would utilize it. The question which the Committee had felt was answered appropriately was whether the rest of scheduling would be upset sufficiently. In response to envelope calculation of Senator Pelz, the scenario which the Committee had been given was that eight courses had been scheduled in the room in the fall, and six were scheduled for the spring. Two of the fall courses in this room had been taken off-line for this semester not to be rescheduled. One of those courses was a Nursing course. Of the six scheduled in the spring, five were Nursing courses, and the only three courses that couldn't be rescheduled were Nursing. So out of the 14 courses which were offered there, seven of them were Nursing. Therefore, the problem was not that they were using the room. Would it substantially affect scheduling? If one looked at the other scheduling of buildings that were going to be taken off-service like Leigh Hall eventually, obviously classroom space was going to be at a premium. However, this change was not going to be a big deal especially looking at a 50% change in enrollment in the last four years and the need to have undergraduates. The Committee had made the statement last June that it was not intending to shift classroom space to other uses. It did not want to do that, but there was a strong case to be made for this change.

The Chairman pointed out that this was a room roughly 10 x 20 with a 3-ft. wide blackboard, and if you put your book down while lecturing you had to ask a student to hold it. This was not a huge classroom space.

Since there was no further discussion, the body voted its approval of the Committee's recommendation.

Senator Drummond then presented item D, a set of changes, which read as follows: "That the following changes be made on the fourth floor of the Polsky Building: 1) Polsky 451 and 453 be reallocated from the Transfer and Articulation Office to the University of Akron Service Consortium (USAC) and the Community and Technical College; 2) Polsky 408 and 410 be reallocated from the Community and Technical College to the School of Social Work. This was requested by the College of Fine and Applied Arts last year due to an increase in full-time faculty and outside funding. The other space received by C&T appears to have made this change possible. 3) Polsky 407 be reallocated from the Department of Sociology to the School of Social Work; 4) Polsky 412 be reallocated from a 293 sq. ft. classroom to the School of Social Work; 5) Polsky 436 be converted from a storage area for the Graduate School to a 293 sq. ft. classroom; 6) These changes are predicated on finding permanent storage space for the Graduate School and Anthropology from existing space within the C&T College. Such space must be adequate, secure, and accessible.

The Chairman asked whether there had been any objections to these, and Senator Drummond stated that the only comments along those lines were contained in number 6.

Senator John Bee wanted to know who would certify that requirements of number 6 had been fulfilled. Senator Drummond did not know but presumed that it might be at the behest of Dean Dye and Anthropology. Senator Bee wondered whether the other changes would go ahead without the certification of number 6. Senator Drummond answered that as of now there was no official way to do that. He presumed that Anthropology or the Graduate School could refuse space that was given to them and argue for other space. The Committee could follow up on this if the body wished it to.

Senator Bee said that he was only trying to understand the terms of what had been proposed here. If this was passed, was it then passed for implementation or passed contingent upon some further verification of the contingency of number 6?

Senator Drummond assumed that voting for this would be a vote to implement the changes with the trust that the contingency of number 6 would be taken care of. They who had their oxen gored would make sufficient noise. He was not sure what the purview of the Committee was on this. It could bring it back once certain drawings and sketches had been prepared so that they would be a part of the record.

Senator Paul John asked permission of the body to allow Dean David Sam of the C&T College to address it on this issue. The body gave its approval.

Dean Sam said that he and Deans Creel, Dye, and Moore would make sure that the contingency of number 6 would be satisfactorily fulfilled. Senator Bee replied that if we could not take the solemn word of the Dean on this, then he did not know.

Senator Dolli Markovich, speaking on behalf of the Graduate School, stated that if it did not get adequate space which was also dry, secure and accessible, the hallway in Polsky's would contain all of this year's graduate bulletins. The needed storage space was used for the storage of those

bulletins, so there would have to be somewhere for those to go before the present storage area could be converted to a classroom. She was sure that they would make adequate arrangements for the Graduate School. The Chairman said they should not let Corky Calderone know what they were doing. Dean Sam added that they could store them in his office before that happened.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate approved item D.

Senator Drummond then presented item E which read as follows: "That room 68 in Whitby Hall now used as storage by the Department of Chemical Engineering be converted to a storage area for hazardous waste generated by the University, and that room 74 in Whitby be transferred from the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering to Chemical Engineering for use as a storage area. The need for hazardous waste storage is acute on this campus and the CFPC approves the changes with the proviso that the College of Engineering be assured that adequate funding is available for the project and that final plans for the storage area be approved by College of Engineering with respect to safety issues. The Committee also notes that a hazardous waste storage facility in Whitby Hall is a temporary solution. We recommend that plans for a permanent facility for the storage of hazardous materials be given the highest priority in future planning exercises. Such a facility may also include provision for receipt and storage of hazardous materials being used by the University."

Senator Dan Sheffer asked the Chairman, who was a member of the Department of Chemical Engineering, where hazardous wastes were currently being stored. When the Chairman responded that they were not stored in Whitby, Senator Sheffer went on to ask whether the Whitby area would be one where students, faculty, and staff would be exposed to hazardous waste.

The Chairman answered that this was why his department was concerned and wanted approval of the final plans. First, they were not shown any plans and engineering-types of people got nervous without blueprints. Whitby 68 was a room that was in close proximity to a student lounge and was directly below two classrooms.

Senator Drummond, responding to Senator Sheffer's first question, said that the Committee had been told that the present hazardous waste storage was in Knight Chemical. It was in a small triangular room, and the reason it had to be moved was that any spill occurring in there could essentially roll off the loading dock into the sewer system. It had not happened but it could, and basically we had a few months in order to get something up that was in better shape to handle the storage of hazardous waste.

Senator David Redle wanted to know what kind of hazardous waste we were talking about. He did not know whether to go in there or not.

The Chairman replied that he would not. He presumed that we were talking about mixed solvents. He had not been in the existing facility but assumed that it looked like most hazardous waste handling facilities where you would have segregated mixed solvents, mixed organics, which were non-chlorinated, mixed solvents which were chlorinated and other materials. It was volatile and would include radioactive material.

Senator Gill asked whether final approval from the College of Engineering regarding safety issues would include OSHA guidelines and so forth. Did we have to have OSHA's approval regarding the safety of the facility or could we make that decision?

Senator Drummond said that he was under the impression from the safety people who had attended the meeting that we could make the decision. They had been obviously also aware that this was going to be temporary until something else could be built. The approval was to make sure that the chemical engineers were not sitting over something dangerous.

The Chairman made a point of clarification that he understood the College of Engineering was not taking responsibility for compliance with OSHA.

Senator John Hebert, a member of the CFPC, was very concerned about this hazardous waste and wanted to offer an friendly amendment to item E in the report. In the second paragraph, second sentence which read, "We recommend that plans for a permanent facility for the storage of hazardous materials be given the highest priority in future planning exercises." he proposed to strike the concluding phrase "in future planning exercises." Planning was going to take three to four years, and this was an issue that needed to come to a head immediately and be taken care of. This was something that had been sat on far too long and needed to be handled now, if not yesterday. A strong resolution from this body to urge the administration to act post-haste would be in order. At this point, he wanted to move to strike the phrase "in future planning exercises" so that we could get on it right now as opposed to going through the ordinary planning process which would take forever. This was seconded by Senator Gunn.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate approved the amendment.

Provost Moore said that members were probably wondering why the University was putting this where students were. Vice President Ted Mallo's office had brought in an outside firm to do an environmental audit. Their conclusion was that there was no option except Whitby 68. It was temporary; we were not going to put this facility in if it was not safe. However, according to this audit, our only option was Whitby 68 as a stop-gap measure. Provost Moore indicated that Vice President Mallo could talk more about this. The University was looking at options involving using part of the parking deck to make this facility and come up with a long-term solution.

The Senate gave its approval for Vice President Mallo to speak.

Vice President Mallo, having heard some of the questions, thought that a number of comments were in order. The University of Akron had been involved in the largest super-fund lawsuit in the country when RECLA had been first enacted. We had been involved in the Deerfield Dump lawsuit. We were still facing potential liability from that lawsuit because what we had dumped at the Deerfield Dump was the most dangerous of all of the things which had been deposited there. The point was that the University's concern with environmental hazardous waste had been an ongoing one since that Deerfield Dump lawsuit. Within the past year and a half we had conducted a building-by-building review using an outside environmental consulting firm and engineering firm identifying every compliance issue that we could identify under both federal and state law with

regard to Clean Air Act, Water Act, hazardous waste control, hazardous materials transport, waste labeling, etc. Essentially we had tried to correct as much as we could as we were moving through the review. At this point, we were not a hazardous waste transporter. We did not have a hazardous waste transport license, so we had to be very careful about where we stored the current waste that we had. Where they were currently stored in Knight Chemical was adjacent to classrooms, above, below, around and everywhere. So it was not a question of moving material from a currently safe position to one where there were students and faculty. One of the things that we had been looking at in addition to the parking deck was the possibility of a stand-alone facility. Several of the state universities had already moved in that direction; it had been on the priority planning list of the University under capital planning for about 12 - 14 years and simply continued to move down the list of priorities. In conclusion, he reiterated what Provost Moore had already said that the outside consulting firm had identified Whitby 68 as the only logical solution because of the kind of drainage that it had, the type of facility it was and so forth.

The Chairman asked whether the report of the outside consulting firm was available for review, and Vice President Mallo replied that it was not.

Senator Derwin Hammonds wanted to know who was taking responsibility for the OSHA requirements here. He was not sure if anyone was checking to see if the OSHA standards were going to be made at this change. He understood that this was supposedly a stop-gap measure, but this had been a priority for 12 to 14 years. The chance of this becoming more than a temporary rearrangement sounded quite logical to him. If we were in a dangerous position now, he did not want to see something going from out of the frying pan into the proverbial fire. Was someone going to be looking out for the OSHA requirements considering that there was a student lounge adjacent? It seemed to be an obvious liability if something were to occur when there was a student lounge and student classrooms right in the vicinity as opposed to the draining into the city of Akron. You were more likely to claim that something came in the sewer, but it would be harder to trace.

The Chairman assumed that responsibility for OSHA and EPA compliance would vest with the Board.

Vice President Mallo said that this was correct; in fact, the OSHA compliance had been part of this effort. He went on to say that he had been quite abrupt in answering the Chairman's previous question about access to the consulting firm's report. The audit had been conducted under the auspice of the Legal Office to privilege the documents. They believed that the document was a privileged document and the scope in which the audit had been conducted was with a view to eliminate problems as opposed to exposing the University to liability issues.

Senator Bee gathered that the issue before the body was whether or not Whitby 68 could be safely and adequately converted to this use on a temporary basis. He asked whether we had the assurance that was stated in the proposal that adequate funding was available and that the College of Engineering approval would be obtained before the space was used.

Senator Drummond answered that as he understood it, the funding was not now available and there was nothing in the budget for doing this. Seeing that was the case and remembering that when Auburn Science Center had been renovated the work had been done and the roof had been removed and then leaks had developed and things had been damaged, the Committee wanted

to make sure that the funding was there. Because it had not seen plans for the room, the Committee wanted the College of Engineering to take a look at it. The move was based on those contingencies.

Senator Bee concluded that unlike the previous proposal, passage of this did not imply implementation on solemn word and trust but rather on the presentation of actual, hard evidence that funding was available and the College of Engineering had approved. These were actual contingencies to the implementation of the proposal.

Senator Drummond said that this was correct. Faith in the Deans went down the tubes when one was sitting over a cauldron.

The Chairman pointed out that it was similar to a previous proposal in that if it did not seem that it was being complied with, the matter would be brought up again just as he assumed that if the Deans could not come to an agreement, the matter would end up before CFPC again.

Senator Clinefelter wondered whether we could be a bit more precise in defining temporary. There were many things on this campus that had been temporary for years.

Senator Drummond responded that the Committee had been told that this was viewed as temporary. It had not been given a definition of temporary and that was why it had put the second paragraph in the recommendation. This apparently had already been a priority.

In response to Senator Redle's question of whether this would be safer than the current condition, the Chairman said that he had not seen the current condition, but from the way it had been described to him it was almost impossible to conceive that this could be less safe.

Senator Hammonds asked whether there had been a provision or information as to the OSHA and EPA standards and possible implementation in Whitby in the privileged report. If so, would it be possible to forward that information to the College of Engineering so that it could have a look at it and make sure that those provisions were met?

Vice President Mallo answered that any changes, additions, renovations, etc., recommended by the environmental engineers would have to comply with all OSHA and federal and state environmental laws. There would be no problem with forwarding this information to the College.

The Chairman added that the College had a pretty good idea of what regulations they needed to comply with. Since there was no further discussion, he called for a vote and the Senate approved the recommendation.

Senator Drummond then presented item F which read as follows: "That the following reallocations be made in Spicer Hall: 1) Spicer 125, now used by Property Accountants working for the Associate Vice President for Business and Finance, and Spicer 127, now used by external auditors working for the University Auditor, be allocated for the Transfer and Articulation Office; 2) External auditors, on campus during the Summer, be assigned space in Spicer 126, space currently assigned to the University Auditor; 3) Spicer 209D and 209E, now allotted to Academic Advising, be reallocated to house the Property Accountants."

He noted that representatives from the Controller's Office and from Academic Advising had said that the reallocation was all right. There had been no complaints.

Senator Bucey said her only concern about this was that Academic Advising was not using those two rooms right now because the full-time staff in the office had dwindled down to a bare minimum and they had a cadre of part-timers. How long was this reallocation with Property Accountants taking up two offices in the complex going to exist? There were a great number of needs for office space - summer orientation, honors preceptors meeting with students, etc. There was not enough office space now without losing two offices for next summer. What was the time parameter for these people using the space, and had there been a discussion about the future? There had been some discussion in her office, but there had been no solution.

Senator Drummond said the discussion had been that the Interim Director of Academic Advising had said that it was acceptable. Regarding the future, he presumed that it would be based on the future of Spicer.

There being no further discussion, the body voted its approval.

Senator Drummond then presented item G which read as follows: "That the Forge Building be reallocated from the College of Engineering to the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. The Construction Technology Program in the College of Engineering, now housed in the Forge Building, will be allocated space in Shrank Hall North that has been assigned to the College of Engineering."

Since there was no discussion, the Senate approved this recommendation. (For the amended version of the Committee report, see **Appendix B.**)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman stated that the one item of unfinished business was a proposed change to the Faculty Senate Bylaws regarding terms of office for Faculty Senators. The proposal had been attached to the meeting's agenda (**Appendix C**). The motivation for the proposal was to handle the situation of starting up of the Senate where we had a number of people who had less than full terms for their first term. The suggested change was an attempt to handle this in some graceful way. The item was now open for discussion.

Senator Gill moved an amendment which she wanted to insert as a new number 6 and renumber the old number 6 as number 7. The amendment read as follows: "Senators who are on professional, medical, or administrative leave for one semester or less will retain their seats. If the leave extends past one semester, the Senate may declare that seat vacant." This was seconded by Senator Reed.

Senator Gill explained that one of those three things could happen to any member of the Senate. She did not think that it was necessary to have the seats of individuals in these situations for a temporary period of time considered vacant or reelected. Since the body was dealing with this section of the Bylaws, she thought that this was a good time to deal with this and give protection to any members who happened to be in these situations for that short period of time.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson wondered whether the "may" of "may be declared vacant" was deliberate in order to allow for options.

Senator Gill replied that this was correct. It also fit the tone of the other items of the section and allowed the body some discretion in the matter.

Senator Oller said that one thing which he did not hear the amendment address was whether or not the individual unit or college would then have the right to appoint someone to represent the person who was not there for the semester. Was Senator Gill assuming that the unit would be down one representative for the semester?

The Chairman answered that this would not be the interpretation of the last section of the Bylaw. If the seat was deemed vacant, then there would be an election. Since there was no further discussion, the body approved Senator Gill's amendment and the entire proposal by the appropriate majority with one member voting nay.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - The Chairman opened the floor to new business. Senator Andrew Borowiec moved three amendments to the section of the Faculty Manual containing guidelines for the review of department chairs (**Appendix D**). He noted it was possible that the text he was using might not be correct to the very letter. It was rather difficult to get one's hands on what was considered the current version of the Manual, but he believed that the spirit of the changes which he was proposing should apply regardless of the minor details and punctuation in the text. His motion was seconded by Senator Hebert.

Senator Borowiec explained his three amendments. The first would change the time of the department chair review from every three years to every four. As it now stood, the mandated 3-year review happened at the beginning of the third year, in essence therefore after barely more than two years in office. His proposed change would result in the faculty review of the department chair taking place essentially after three years in office. As a former department chair, this seemed to him to be a more reasonable time period over which to evaluate a Chair's performance. An alternative would be to conduct the review at the end of the 3-year term, but the result would be the same. There would still be the required necessary time for a dean's review and conceivably a new search by the faculty for replacement if the Chair did not want to be reappointed.

His second change had to do with requiring colleges to have specific guidelines for a process by which the review was conducted. He was aware of at least one instance where faculty in a department simply voted the entire faculty as a committee of the whole and proceeded from there to have a vote on the Chair's continuation without any kind of discussion of the Chair's performance. He thought that if the colleges had a mandated process that was thorough, comprehensive and objective, they would have a fairer and more efficient process.

His third change had to do with the change from a 2/3 vote for continuation of the Chair to a simple majority. Under the current system, a Chair could have 65% of the faculty approving him or her and still not be continued as Chair. In other words, a minority could derail the process, and we could have a situation where 1/3 plus one in a department would oppose the Chair and that person

could be out of the position. He was not aware of any elected office in our political system that required a 2/3 majority for office.

Senator John needed some clarification. First, would department chairs also include C&T's division Chairs? When the Chairman replied that it would, Senator John asked whether Senator Borowiec meant "majority" or "simple majority." When Senator Borowiec confessed that he did not know the difference, Senator John explained that he thought an example of a simple majority would be if you had an electorate of ten people but only eight had voted, it would only take five votes to carry.

The Chairman said that the electorate was defined; he did not think that the modifier "simple" would change the meaning either way. The electorate was the regular full-time faculty of the department, so if only eight voted you would need five of the eight to form a majority. If only four voted, you could not get a majority.

Senator Hebert asked what would happen if a college's procedure required something different. For example, as he read the document it was a majority vote of the regular full-time faculty members. If a person was not there, his or her vote did not make any difference. If you had 11, you would need six affirmative votes whether eight voted or not.

The Chairman replied that this was correct. It did not say of those present or casting ballots; it said of the regular full-time faculty of the department, a presumably well-defined number.

Senator Rich disagreed and noted that the term "majority of the body" referred to a majority of those who were casting votes. If you wanted to say majority of the total group, then it should be a majority of those eligible to vote.

The Chairman responded that the point was not settled, but he and Parliamentarian Gerlach agreed that it was interpreted in the other way. He believed that we had been executing it in the other way so far. He asked the Provost to enlighten the body.

Provost Moore said there had been many battles over this; that was what had happened so far. In some cases this had been extremely divisive and controversial, especially in regard to the 2/3 requirement. There had been all sorts of exchanges about who was eligible to vote. He had tried to interpret it as literally as he could. There had even been a debate over what the word "regular" meant. It was interpreted that if there were ten people on the faculty, it took seven yes votes.

Senator Borowiec thought the body was getting side-tracked into an issue other than the one which he was proposing here. There were many instances throughout the Faculty Manual that used identical language to this. His proposal simply changed from 2/3 to a majority; whether we were talking about 2/3 of regular full-time or whatever was not the issue. Whatever the proper interpretation of regular full-time faculty was, he was proposing a majority rather than 2/3 of that. The other issue was something that could be addressed at some other point, and it pertained to almost every section where voting was referred to in this document.

Senator Bee thought that there might be a reason to clarify or modify some of the language because depending on how it was used, majority could be either a majority of members present

voting or of the entire group. The thought he wanted to add was that the Senate consider the issue which he hoped Dr. Gerlach and Chairman Cheung would agree with him on, which was that a fundamental principle of any parliamentary process was the rule of the majority under most circumstances, unless there was a compelling reason as in closing of debate or something like that to require more than that. In the circumstance which we had here, he thought this proposal was well worth looking at very closely and soberly in that light. What were the results and consequences of a process that might under some circumstances frustrate in fact the expressed wishes of a substantial majority within a unit? Was that something that we really thought was the best administrative and academic practice?

The Chairman presumed that while his questions had been rhetorically posed, Senator Bee was in favor of the change. Senator Bee responded that he thought it would be a good change.

Senator Tim Norfolk moved to divide this into three separate motions. This was seconded by Senator Carol Gigliotti.

The Chairman called for a vote on this motion. When a voice vote was unclear, he called for a division of the house, and the motion was passed 34 to 14.

The Chairman then proceeded to the first item - changing the period from three years to four years. Senator Norfolk called the question. There was no objection. The Chairman called for a vote, and the Senate approved the amendment.

The second item was the addition of the phrase, "The evaluation shall be conducted according to the process set forth in the college's guidelines." There was no discussion, and the body voted its approval.

The third item was to change the required fraction for continuance from 2/3 to a majority.

Senator Hebert wanted to speak in favor of the motion. As he had noted before, he thought that the requirement that a department chair have a 2/3 majority was possibly extreme. It was many times difficult for a department chair to do a good job and carry the majority. For a department chair to do his or her job required saying "no" more often than "yes." For this reason alone, he supported the motion. It would give department chairs a better chance to do a realistic job in terms of what they had to do as opposed to sitting down and figuring whether or not they had to say yes to an individual because they needed a 2/3 majority. It would be much more functional with just a majority.

Senator Jesse Marquette thought that we probably ought to consider this whole exercise as a failed experiment. Two-thirds was just too many, and while it sounded good when we had said it fast the last time, it probably had not worked the way we had hoped. It was time to admit the error and move on.

Senator Bee, carrying on with Senator Rich's earlier concern, proposed an amendment so that the phrasing would read: "majority vote of ENTIRE regular full-time faculty of the department." This would clarify the document and any possible ambiguity on that point. This was seconded by Senator William Taggart.

Senator Marquette thought that if we were trying to clarify this, more work was going to be needed here. He had just chaired a departmental chair review for his department, and they had had one faculty member who was going on medical leave. We had to have some consideration of active or something here if we were going to get this specific because this had been a problem. The dean had questioned what the vote would have to be. It might be less of a consideration now that we were only doing a majority, but there was an issue of someone on medical leave or something like that. This conjured up visions of the United States Senate with ailing Senators being carried in on their sick beds. Perhaps Senator Bee would be willing to make his modifier a bit clearer or the deans were going to be stuck with having to make this sort of decision.

Senator Gill did not think that we needed to clarify this any more. If the document itself used this terminology throughout, why would we change the terminology for just this one statement? That did not make a lot of sense to her; if we wanted to change what majority meant or clarify or make it more specific in any way, then it should be throughout the document and that would be for another day.

Senator Bee did think that "entire" clarified the intent of the nature of the vote. There might still be a residual issue around defining who was a member of the voting population.

Senator Norfolk did not believe that the word was needed because we had just passed something that said that college guidelines were going to be in place. It was up to the college to define who was eligible to vote and who was not.

The Chairman took exception to that since it was the Senate which defined who voted. He could not imagine that a subordinate body could change at that point.

Senator Redle asked for a point of clarification. There appeared to be definitional issues - what was entire, what was regular. Were there any areas within the Manual where some of these terms were specifically defined?

The Chairman answered that Senator Redle had opened a hornets' nest. There had been a difference of opinion among those who spent time with the parliamentary reference manual. His understanding of the wording was that it was all regular full-time faculty of the department. Others like Senator Rich disagreed; thus far, however, we had been applying it at the University as to be all people of the whole regular appointments in that department. In that sense, he did not think there was any confusion.

Senator Borowiec thought that when you were just trying to go from 2/3 to a majority further clarification seemed excessive. It was redundant semantics, and he did not think that the word "entire" was necessary.

Senator Bee said that the body could see these points as arguable. From his experience he thought that there would be a useful function served by having the word "entire" just so the document very clearly spoke to the difference between a majority understood to be a majority of members present, accessible or able and voting in contrast to a majority of the absolute number of the regular full-time faculty in the unit. This would be useful language to have at this level in the document. With regard to Senator Rich's point, he did not think that the word "entire" affected the

body's understanding or definition of the voting unit. That had already been defined; it had been by precedent and by alteration in language. He certainly did not wish to propose anything that was understood to affect that. In making this amendment, his only intention was to clarify and make explicit the number of the voting unit required to pass the motion.

Senator Clinefelter noted that regular full-time faculty were defined somewhere in the Faculty Manual as those persons with the rank of Instructor through Professor. So regular full-time faculty were a part of this document the way it was now. She was assuming that the section which the body had just approved regarding the evaluation being conducted according to a process set forth in a college's guidelines might clarify whether those persons on leave should be able to vote in this or not. It could not do anything to what was already established about the unit and the majority vote of the regular full-time faculty. Was that correct?

The Chairman stated that the question was not the definition of the faculty body involved which was clearly specified in other portions of the Faculty Manual, but rather whether the denominator for computing the majority was all of the people who were regular faculty in that department or all of the people who cast ballots in this issue.

Senator Rich said that the point he had been making had to do with just conventional usage. If there had been a consistent, interpretive practice in this body so that we all understood what we were referring to by this language was that the numerator included all those eligible to vote and not just all those who showed up, then there was not any ambiguity except to the outside world, which did not matter.

Senator Malhotra thought that it was a personal decision pertaining to promotion and tenure if the faculty member could not be physically available. If faculty members were on leave or could not be physically present, then they could ask for an absentee ballot and whatever material was needed in order to make their decision.

The Chairman said that nothing in this would forbid that.

Senator Hammonds thought that we were getting off the subject. We were getting into something that needed to be clarified elsewhere. The word "entire" here did nothing to add or detract one way or the other. It did not serve a realistic purpose and we were getting into a circular argument.

Senator Norfolk called the question. Since there was no objection, the Chairman called for a vote, and the amendment failed.

The question was now called on the original motion to change 2/3 majority to a majority. There was no objection, and the body voted its approval.

Senator Hebert, who arrived late because of a departmental faculty meeting, asked whether the academic calendar might be reconsidered. Since a motion to reconsider had to be made by someone who had voted on the prevailing side, Senator George Prough made the motion on behalf of Senator Hebert. It was seconded by Senator John.

Senator Hebert had two quick points. First, a number of units at administrative request now had classes on Saturday. Under the proposed 1997-98 calendar, if you had a Saturday class, the final exam for that class was going to be on Saturday, Dec. 13, so we had a situation where commencement and final exams were occurring on the same day. So he wanted to propose that the semester actually start for Saturday classes on August 23. This situation had happened in his unit where they had a number of Saturday classes and the final exam was on the day of graduation. It would be appropriate to move the calendar forward to begin on Saturday, August 23, so that the final did not occur on the same day as graduation. Secondly, he wanted to make a point and he knew that this was very contentious, that he still believed we ought to be scheduling 15 full weeks of classes regardless of the amount of vacation days we had, and he wanted to propose that this be considered.

The Chairman suggested that if Senator Hebert were concerned about these issues, he should move to refer them back to APCC rather than using a scalpel on it on the floor of the Senate. He had also been reminded by the Parliamentarian that he had never called for a vote as to whether we should reconsider the calendar. A voice vote was taken which was indecisive, and a division of the house resulted in approval by a vote of 27 to 16.

The Chairman then entertained a motion to refer this to APCC. This was moved by Senator John Green and seconded by Senator Bee.

Senator Oller reminded the body that there was a problem in terms of when the schedule had to be to the printers. This was why we always did this in December. There was some urgency in getting this done today, so perhaps Senator Hebert or the body might consider referring the issue to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee for its consideration in finalizing the preliminary 98-99 schedule and try to deal with this next year.

In response to a query from the Chairman, Provost Moore said that he was not aware of the schedule required for the completion of the calendar.

Senator Barbara Clements, as a member of the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee, wondered whether an acceptable alternative solution would be to move commencement back to December 20. The following year commencement was going to be on December 19. Moving commencement back one week would allow the exam to be held on the 13th without conflict.

The Chairman said that we were debating whether or not to do the surgery. He took Senator Clements' comment as a sentiment to do it now.

Senator Siloac asked whether Senator Hebert would entertain the suggestion that perhaps the body deal with the first issue that seemed fairly straightforward and leave the philosophical issue of the 15 weeks for another time.

After a brief discussion, Senator Green and Senator Bee withdrew their motion to refer without objection from the body. The matter of reconsideration was again before the Senate.

Senator Marquette moved that the question be divided so that the two matters could be considered separately. This was seconded by Senator Green. The body voted its approval.

Senator Christina DePaul wondered whether there was any reason why we could not have commencement on Sunday, Dec. 14. There might be religious reasons, but it was a possibility. The Chairman reminded the body that the motion on the floor was to start the fall semester on August 23 rather than August 25.

Senator Gill really did not see this as much different from a Monday class that missed Labor Day in the fall semester or Martin Luther King Day in the spring semester. Instead of changing the calendar to start earlier than we had indicated, the final could be on the last day of class or one could consider that the final exam week started that particular Saturday rather than end Saturday the 13th.

Senator Prough noted that if final exam week started on the 6th, then you had to start classes on the 23rd. They were a coupled issue.

Senator Borowiec was concerned that if classes started on the Saturday prior to the first Monday of classes it was going to affect enrollment. Students might not want to sign up for a class that began before the perception of the official start of classes. That might be an issue.

Senator Bucey also raised the issue of residence halls. Would they be ready and prepared for new students who were moving in and had registered for a Saturday class? There was also the question of the food service, etc. All of these issues had a kind of domino effect.

Senator Hebert said that he could only speak for the College of Business, but these Saturday classes were not the only sections of the courses being offered. They were scheduled as an alternative to coming on other days. Students then would typically have a choice. He doubted that any of the objections which had been raised would follow for most of our students.

The Chairman asked whether this would only affect one particular category of student; namely, one who was graduating. The question was called. Since there was no objection, the body voted and the motion to begin classes two days early failed.

The second motion was to refer the question of having a full 15 weeks in the semester to APCC for future consideration. There was no discussion and the body voted its approval.

Senator Hammonds wished to make a motion to move graduation to December 20. A discussion then ensued over whether the motion was in order or not. Had the body voted to reconsider the entire calendar or just the two items which Senator Hebert had raised? Senator Rich said that the effect of approving the motion to reconsider was to open the whole matter of the calendar up again. Therefore, Senator Hammonds motion was in order.

Senator Hammonds moved that graduation be changed to December 20 in the fall semester of 1997. This was seconded by Senator Siloac.

Senator Bucey pointed out that one of the reasons why the Saturday at the end of finals week had been traditionally chosen for commencement was for the students who did not commute but who lived on campus and were from some other place than Akron, Ohio. They would be forced to either leave and come back or not participate in commencement, or the residence halls would have

to make accommodations to house those students for an additional full week. She wanted the body to have this historical perspective.

There was no other discussion, and the body voted down the motion.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Taggart asked what the effective date of the changes the body had just made to the department chair review would be. Was it effective immediately? The Chairman replied that nothing was effective until the Board of Trustees approved it. It would be forwarded to the President who might or might not forward it to the Board. He might also return it to the body. Therefore, the effective date was at present uncertain.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn. This was moved and seconded, and the meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn O'Neill

ACADEMIC CALENDAR

	1997-98	PRELIMINARY 1998-99
<u>FALL SEMESTER</u>		
Classes Begin	Mon, Aug 25	Mon, Aug 31
Labor Day *	Mon, Sep 1	Mon, Sep 7
Veteran's Day (classes held, staff holiday)	Tue, Nov 11	Wed, Nov 11
Thanksgiving Break **	Thu, Nov 27 - Sat, Nov 29	Thu, Nov 26 - Sat, Nov 28
Classes Resume	Mon, Dec 1	Mon, Nov 30
Final Instruction Day	Sat, Dec 6	Sat, Dec 12
Final Examination Period	Mon, Dec 8 - Sat, Dec 13	Mon, Dec 14 - Sat, Dec 19
Commencement	Sat, Dec 13	Sat, Dec 19
Spring Intersession	Fri, Jan 2 - Sat, Jan 10	Sat, Jan 2 - Sat, Jan 16
<u>SPRING SEMESTER</u>		
Classes Begin	Mon, Jan 12	Tue, Jan 19
Martin Luther King Day *	Mon, Jan 19	Mon, Jan 18
Presidents' Day *	Tue, Feb 17	Tue, Feb 16
Spring Break	Mon, Mar 16 - Sat, Mar 21	Mon, Mar 22 - Sat, Mar 27
May Day ***	Fri, May 1	Fri, May 7
Final Instruction Day	Sat, May 2	Sat, May 8
Final Examination Period	Mon, May 4 - Sat, May 9	Mon, May 10 - Sat, May 15
Commencement	Sat, May 9	Sat, May 15
Summer Intersession	Mon, May 11 - Fri, Jun 5	Mon, May 17 - Fri, Jun 11
Commencement/Law School	Sun, May 17	Sun, May 23
<u>SUMMER SESSION 1</u>		
First 5-Week and 8-Week Sessions Begin	Mon, Jun 15	Mon, Jun 14
Independence Day *	Fri, Jul 3	Mon, Jul 5
First 5-Week Session Ends	Sat, Jul 18	Sat, Jul 17
<u>SUMMER SESSION 2</u>		
Second 5-Week Session Begins	Mon, Jul 20	Mon, Jul 19
8-Week Session Ends	Sat, Aug 8	Sat, Aug 7
Second 5-Week Session Ends	Sat, Aug 22	Sat, Aug 21
Commencement	Sat, Aug 22	Sat, Aug 21
<u>FALL SEMESTER</u>		
Classes Begin	Mon, Aug 31	Mon, Aug 30

* Classes canceled (day and evening)

** Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5:00 p.m. through Monday at 7:00 a.m.

*** Classes canceled from noon to 5:00 p.m.

6:45

ald\polcal.967\acadcal

APPENDIX B

Report of Campus Facilities Planning Committee

The CFPC met on December 3, 1996, to discuss several space allocation items. The Committee recommends the following requests for changes in space allocation:

- A. That SHS Room 4 be assigned as a dedicated classroom for Aerospace Studies and Military Science. The move will put most of the courses for those departments into SHS 4 and release SHS 1 for more general scheduling. The Registrar's Office feels this is nearly an even trade as far as classroom space is concerned although it will hurt scheduling flexibility to some extent.

- B. That the alcove in Polsky 269 be reassigned to the Institute for Policy Studies. The space is presently part of the Department of Public Administration and Urban Studies. This proposal was presented at the last Senate meeting, but the objection made at that time has been worked out between IPS and Urban Studies.

- C. That MGH 310 (classroom) be allocated to the College of Nursing for use by undergraduate nursing students for a study and meeting area as well as for student mailboxes. The Registrar's Office notes that during the present academic year, six courses using that space could not be rescheduled elsewhere if the room were to be taken off-line. Four of these courses are in the College of Nursing and Interim Dean Dunham-Taylor intends to schedule these using MGH 310 or other space within the College. It appears that the impact on classroom use is minimal and the need for undergraduate space in Nursing is substantial.

- D. That the following changes be made on the fourth floor of the Polsky Building:
 - 1. Polsky 451 and 453 be reallocated from the Transfer and Articulation Office to The University of Akron Service Consortium (USAC) and the Community and technical College.

 - 2. Polsky 408 and 410 be reallocated from the Community and Technical College to the School of Social Work. This was requested by the College of Fine and Applied Arts last year due to an increase in full-time faculty and outside funding. The other space received by C&T appears to have made this change possible.

 - 3. Polsky 407 be reallocated from the Department of Sociology to the School of Social Work.

 - 4. Polsky 412 be reallocated from a 293 ft. classroom to the School of Social Work.

5. Polsky 436 be converted from a storage area for the Graduate School to a 293 ft. classroom.
 6. These changes are predicated on finding permanent storage space for the Graduate School and Anthropology from existing space within the C&T College. Such space must be adequate, secure, and accessible.
- E. That Room 68 in Whitby Hall, now used as storage by the Department of Chemical Engineering, be converted to a storage area for hazardous waste generated by the University, and that Room 74 in Whitby be transferred from the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering to Chemical Engineering for use as a storage area. The need for hazardous waste storage is acute on this campus and the CFPC approves the changes with the proviso that the College of Engineering be assured that adequate funding is available for the project and that final plans for the storage area be approved by the College of Engineering with respect to safety issues.
- The Committee also notes that a hazardous waste storage facility in Whitby Hall is a temporary solution. We recommend that plans for a permanent facility for the storage of hazardous materials be given the highest priority. Such a facility may also include provision for receipt and storage of hazardous materials being used by the University.
- F. That the following reallocations be made in Spicer Hall:
1. Spicer 125, now used by Property Accountants working for the Associate Vice President for Business and Finance, and Spicer 127, now used by external auditors working for the University Auditor, be allocated for the Transfer and Articulation Office.
 2. External auditors on campus during the Summer be assigned space in Spicer 126, space currently assigned to the University Auditor.
 3. Spicer 209D and 209E, now allotted to Academic Advising, be reallocated to house the Property Accountants.
- G. That the Forge Building be reallocated from the College of Engineering to the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. The Construction Technology Program in the College of Engineering, now housed in the Forge Building, will be allocated space in Schrank Hall North that has been assigned to the College of Engineering.

With the wording noted in the above recommendations, there are no objections to these proposals from any of the affected parties.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. Jerry Drummond, Chair

APPENDIX C

SUGGESTED CHANGES TO THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS ON TERMS OF OFFICE

3359-10-2-H-E. Terms of Office

1. The terms of office for members of the Senate shall be three years, ~~with one-third of membership being elected in each year.~~
2. New members shall take office at the first Senate meeting of the Fall semester.
3. Senators are limited to two consecutive COMPLETE AND ONE PARTIAL terms of office. ~~, but former Senators may again stand for office after a hiatus of one year.~~
4. Should any elected member of the Senate become an administrative officer either on an acting or permanent basis during the term for which the member was elected to the Senate, the person's seat shall be deemed vacant.
5. Should a member of the Senate be unable to discharge the duties of the office, the Senate may declare that seat vacant.
6. SENATORS WHO ARE ON A PROFESSIONAL, MEDICAL, OR ADMINISTRATIVE LEAVE FOR ONE SEMESTER OR LESS WILL RETAIN THEIR SEATS. IF THE LEAVE EXTENDS PAST ONE SEMESTER, THE SENATE MAY DECLARE THAT SEAT VACANT.
- 6-7. Should a vacancy occur, the Senate shall notify the appropriate unit to conduct a special election to fill the vacant seat.

APPENDIX D

Proposed Changes to Section of Faculty Manual Pertaining to Review of Department Chairs

3359-20-02-B-(5)

(b) Department chairs are selected and shall hold office as follows:

(v) Every ~~three (3)~~ **FOUR** 4 years, or upon the specific request of a majority of the regular full-time faculty in the department, chairs shall be subject to a mandatory performance review. The review shall include:

(aa) A faculty review:

An evaluation of the chair's performance as a chair shall be conducted by a committee of not less than three (3) full-time faculty of the department, as elected by the faculty.

THE EVALUATION SHALL BE CONDUCTED ACCORDING TO THE PROCESS SET FORTH IN THE COLLEGE'S GUIDELINES.

The committee shall conclude its evaluation by presenting to the faculty a recommendation. To be continued as chair a ~~two-thirds~~ **MAJORITY** vote of the regular full-time faculty of the department. *is required.*

The committee's evaluation and recommendations and the faculty's recommendation, shall be reported to the Dean and communicated to the Chair.

