

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

3-6-1997

## Faculty Senate Chronicle March 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).



1996-97, No. 6

March 6, 1997

37 Pages

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 6, 1997	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of March 6, 1997	15
A. Report of <i>Academic Policies and Calendar Committee</i>	15
B. Proposal for Amendment to Faculty Manual	20
C. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	22
D. Report of <i>University Libraries Committee</i>	27
E. Report of <i>Research Faculty Projects Committee</i>	33
F. Report of <i>Student Affairs Committee</i>	36
G. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Inequity	37

---

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 MARCH 6, 1997**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, March 6, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-eight of the sixty-nine members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Davis, Drummond, Isayev, McGucken, Ross-Alaolmolki and Woodley were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Hammonds, Hardy, Pelz and Witt were absent without notice.

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* APPROVED A MOTION TO DROP THE IDEA OF CREATING AN AD HOC COMMITTEE FOR A GENERAL STUDIES DEGREE**
- \* VOTED TO POSTPONE UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING A DECISION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE FACULTY MANUAL REGARDING THE APPEALS PROCESS**
- \* VOTED TO DEFER A DECISION REGARDING THE CREATION OF A COMMITTEE ON SALARY INEQUITY UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING**

**I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA** - The Chairman asked whether there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda. He had one item that could be added under new business which was a report from Senator Tim Norfolk representing the ad hoc committee on salary inequity with an accompanying handout. Since there were no other additions, he called for a motion to approve which was made by Senator Peggy Richards and seconded by Senator Ruth Clinefelter. The body then voted its approval.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 6, 1997** - Secretary Gary Oller said that he had one correction at the very end of the minutes on page 12 in the Good of the Order section in the first large paragraph beginning with, "Dr. Gerlach had also spoken about this with Senator Ruth Clinefelter." About two-thirds of the way through the paragraph there was a line which read, "English Book of Common Prayer" there was a "Service of Connotation" which.... "Connotation" should have been "Communion."



Since there were no other corrections, Senator John Bee moved that the minutes be approved as amended, and this was seconded by Senator Richards. The Senate approved the minutes.

**III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS** - The Chairman said that he had updated the list serve called Senate-L, which enabled the members of the Senate to communicate rapidly with one another, at least in principle, via e-mail. He had sent out a test message shortly before walking over here. If members had not received it, he asked them to email or phone him to let him know and he would try to correct it.

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - The Chairman announced that there was a new member of the Senate, Senator Lindgren Chyi, who had been elected from the Dept. of Geology, the College of Arts and Sciences, to fill out the remainder of former Senator David Buchthal's term. Senator Chyi was welcomed with a round of applause.

The Chairman then introduced Professor Richard Gigliotti, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, who wished to present an update on the Provost Search.

Professor Gigliotti stated that to date the committee had received 69 applications for the position of Provost, and it had cut that number down to 18. It had received written answers to nine questions from each of the 18 and also had gathered references from them and had conducted telephone interviews with them. Now the number was down to 11, and the Committee would be conducting off-campus interviews with those individuals this weekend and next Wednesday. He thought that members might be interested in the disciplines these people represented. There were three from Chemistry, one engineer, two from Education, two from Psychology, one from Nursing, one from Classics, and one from Physics. The Committee was planning the on-campus interview period for the week immediately following spring break, March 24-28. Then there would be a breather for a week, and the second interview period would be during the week of April 7 through 11. It was not certain yet how many candidates would be coming to campus, but each of them would be giving a scholarly presentation to the department in which he or she would receive tenure. There would also be an open session for the faculty to which the Committee hoped Senate members would come. There would also be a session for the Executive Committee of the Senate. Also, a number of the Search Committee members were members of this body - Senators Heinzerling, Braun, Hebert, and Scott. Speaking for all the Committee, Professor Gigliotti said that they all felt good about the people they would be presenting as candidates. He asked that Senators come out, meet with them, complete the evaluations and return them to the Committee. It would help in making a final recommendation to the President.



## V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a number of things I'd like to report to you. First has to do with the state budgeting process. I think I touched on this last month, but in the period of time I've been in the state of Ohio, I felt that this budgeting process was done properly as far as the planning was concerned. The Board of Regents was involved in it, the state presidents were involved in it, the office of budget management was involved in it, and I think we got perspectives from many different constituencies. This is a process we're going through now. I guess it's kind of intriguing at this point in my career to watch it, because I remember and a lot of you do too, the last time we had the very severe budget cuts when I played an integral role, and I know, Jess, you could take credit for a lot of things on campus that we had to do. The economy in the state was very bad at that particular time; the economy in the state is not that bad right now. So the presidents are coming together and making a concerted effort to get out to the business communities, to the legislative communities, to all of the constituencies of the state to drive this idea home that when this planning process took place we talked about access and research, accountability, job training and community needs. But we're talking about The University of Akron right there, because we reach out to the community, we want all of our students to have access to education, we want to help prepare the work force for the immediate Akron area and so on. So this is a process that we have to go through. I personally don't think it's this glum. We're \$192 million apart, and that's a lot of money, that's true. But when we have an \$800 million rainy day fund in the state, the \$192 million is not that great. So it will come closer together, but I'm sure this is a process that we have to go through. I'm going to testify for the university presidents before the Senate Budget Committee, and I'm very happy to do this because I think I can make a case for higher education. So it has to go through the process and this is where we're at right now.

From our last Board of Trustees meeting dealing with Faculty Senate items, the Board approved the academic calendars for 1997-98/1998-99. The recommendations from the space allocation committee of the Senate were approved by the Board; the terms of office for the Faculty Senators and department chair reviews were approved by the Board of Trustees, and other housekeeping duties having to do with the Faculty Manual. I might add that the latest version of the Faculty Manual is not in hard copy yet but is on-line through the Legal Affairs Home Page, so if you want to pull it up, all the information is there.

Let me update you a little as far as Bulger Hall is concerned. If we continue to operate Bulger Hall next year as we're operating right now with the same percentage of residency that we have, it would cost us some money simply because I referred to deferred maintenance a little bit last month. This is one of the facilities that has gone by the



wayside in that particular area. If we close Bulger Hall next year, we'll save about \$350,000. We're going to close Bulger Hall but we're going to close it so we can determine what we want to do with it. Now if I were to make a guess right now, I would say that Bulger Hall will probably come on-line the year after next as a renovated living area for students, and some of these students might be graduate students. We also would use probably about half of that building for administrative space, and there's no law that says we can't have a combination here between administrative space and living quarters. So we're not closing Bulger Hall, we're not going to tear Bulger Hall down, but Bulger Hall will come back on-line in a new format from what it has right now.

In the personnel area the Board approved the hiring of James Prunty, the new Executive Director of Human Resources. He comes to us very well qualified; he's the Associate Vice President for Human Resources at Tri-C right now. He has 18 years of experience in the human resource area, both public and private. He has served the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas in the Juvenile Division and spent eight years as the Personnel Director with the Sherwin Williams Co., so he comes to us very well prepared. He holds a Masters degree from Case and a Baccalaureate degree from Virginia State. So Jim will start with us on March 31 of this year and we're looking forward to his coming. John LaGuardia was named the Vice President for Public Affairs and Development. Needless to say, I think most of you know John. He's been with the institution for a number of years. For 14 years he served in the area of alumni relations and from 1970 to 1985 he was the Director of Alumni Relations and has a great deal of effect on annual campaigns and funding for the University. He brings a wealth of knowledge to the campus and right now he is doing most of our work in Columbus, so we're happy to welcome John.

I also am pleased to announce that last month we received about \$2 million in gifts from alumni and friends of the University; \$800,000 has been received to complete the Buchtel Common as we know it. I remember so well when it was put in and Buchtel Avenue was closed and we got over the impasse with downtown and so on because they felt that was the only way they could get downtown. But this will help our campus; it will go all the way down to Wolf Ledges now. It will be extended and will be known as the David C. Corbin Common. We also received a gift from Dr. Gary B. and Pamela Williams for \$125,000 for the Scholarships for Excellence program. You remember I said we wanted 200 full academic scholarships - we're at 50 now. So if we got 50 for next year and 50 the year after and can do this in four years, I'll be delighted because I figured it would take ten. But anyway, we're moving in the right direction and I'm pleased to report that.

Also, the Center for Family Business was approved by the Board of Trustees, which is a continuation of the Fitzgerald Institute for Entrepreneurial Studies. Some very interesting statistics having to do with business in the United States came out from this grant. Nearly 50 percent of the gross national product comes from small businesses and



corporations. I will mention this to the Senate Finance Committee when I testify before them, because I think we're reaching out to the community through our College of Business. So kind of an upbeat report when we're \$192 million in the hole, but I think we're going in the right direction. I'd be happy to entertain any questions."

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met on February 11 and had done a number of things. First it had set the agenda for today's meeting. Second, it had met with Provost Randy Moore and Interim Associate Dean Michael Williams of the Community and Technical College to discuss the creation of a training center for law enforcement and criminal justice in the C&T College. Since there were no academic ramifications - no new faculty, no additional courses, basically a non-credit offering program - and there was no cost to the University, the Committee saw no reason why this had to come before the Faculty Senate. Third, at this meeting it heard from Provost Moore that as a part of the Teaching and Learning Center, he was creating a program of support grants for teaching related projects. His office had set aside \$150,000 for this purpose, and he had asked the deans to add any money which they might have for this as well.

The Committee had also met with President Ruebel, Provost Moore and Special Executive Assistant Wilson on February 17 to discuss items of mutual interest. One item which the Committee raised was the question of the change regarding the academic procession which Parliamentarian Gerlach had brought up at the Senate's last meeting. As a result of this discussion, President Ruebel decided that the University should go back to the traditional procedures regarding the academic procession. The Committee was also informed by President Ruebel that the interim policy for stipends and overloads which this body had passed last June had been approved and was now in effect. Following the decision made by the Senate last June, the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee would now be looking at this policy for anything which it thought needed to be recommended concerning it.

The Committee also wanted to raise the issue again of an ad hoc committee for the creation of a General Studies degree. As members might remember, this was a recommendation made by APCC last year coming out of a discussion regarding three proposals coming from University College, Arts and Sciences and C&T. Last fall the Executive Committee had asked the body for some guidance regarding the creation of this committee and its charge. The response to the issue and willingness to serve on such a committee had not been very great. Only one individual contacted to serve was enthusiastic about the idea, and most others were not interested in serving. Unless there were Senators who were interested in serving or could suggest individuals who would be, it was the Executive Committee's sense that it might be best to drop the idea for such a committee.

Senator Devinder Malhotra asked regarding the last item in the report whether the Committee was making a formal motion which the body could consider.



Secretary Oller responded that he would make it a formal motion that the idea of forming an ad hoc committee to study the creation of a General Studies degree be dropped.

The Chairman thanked Senator Malhotra for prompting the Committee to do this in this fashion. Since there was no debate, the Senate voted its approval of the motion with two opposing it.

Senator Dan Deckler asked where members could get copies of the interim policy on stipends and overloads. Secretary Oller answered that there was a copy of it in the June 96 Chronicle. If members wanted to contact the Senate office, Mrs. Quillin would be able to make copies of the policy and send them out.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Bee, the Chair, stated that the committee had two items to bring before the Senate. The first was a report item and the second was a proposal. The report item related to incomplete grades, and there was a handout which contained the report, the policy itself, and a copy of a form for administering incomplete grades (see **Appendix A**). The concern about the manner in which incomplete grades were being given and administered had been raised in Buchtel College, and action had been taken within the college to change those policies. At the same time, concern had been forwarded to the Executive Committee for broader discussion and deliberation by the Faculty Senate. The Executive Committee referred it to the APC and it had investigated the matter. As a part of its investigation, the Committee had invited Associate Dean William Francis from the Buchtel College to visit with it and to share the discussion and experiences that Buchtel College had had in its discussion and changes. The substance of that meeting as well as the reflections of the Committee were contained in its report.

Concerns regarding incompletes for undergraduates in Buchtel College especially (and they would apply elsewhere) included the following: grades of incomplete were often given for reasons not consistent with the current wording of the policy; students had requested an incomplete rather than dropping a course to maintain a minimum load necessary to meet financial requirements or other scholarship or assistance requirements; students often delayed or failed to complete requirements within the time period specified by the policy; students had waited until the following term to "retake or resit in on the course"; students had often not yet completed work by the end of the classes for the following term; instructors' efforts to be lenient sometimes compromised the policy for removing incomplete grades; an instructor might submit a grade change or an incomplete that had turned into an "F" after the time limit had expired even though the student did not complete the work within the time frame. Current practice sometimes resulted in misunderstanding and incomplete information. Dean Francis certainly had stressed this as a problem with which he had regularly dealt. Perhaps a part-time instructor was no longer teaching or a full time instructor was no longer at the University, but a student who had



taken a course from the now-gone individual might come to the Dean's office with questions regarding the still outstanding incomplete, and there would be insufficient information to know exactly what conversations had taken place between student and instructor and what the substance of them were.

There were obviously a number of points raised, and with these concerns in mind, on the second page of the report the Committee noted the following: "1. It is evident that there are problems and difficulties with the current practices for giving and processing grades of 'Incomplete' for undergraduates. 2. The primary source of the problem is more in the administration of the current policy than in the policy itself." That second point was the primary finding of the committee. In consulting the wording in the Faculty Manual, the Committee found that most of the situations that seemed to arise as problematic were not because of difficulties with the current wording. It was because of what students tried to do and in some cases were permitted to do in connection with incomplete grades. For that reason, the Committee found no reason to recommend any changes in the current policy wording. The Committee did concur with Dean Francis that there were chronic difficulties connected with grades of incomplete so it did "encourage the Provost, Deans, Department Chairs, School Directors, course and program coordinators and other appropriate administrators to call the current policy to the attention of faculty, to work with faculty in developing operational guidelines [appropriate to the unit or program] for assigning grades of 'Incomplete' and to develop and implement the forms for recording the necessary information about the agreement between the student and instructor regarding time and work requirements for removing a grade of 'Incomplete' when it is given."

The Committee then did not find any particular difficulty with the current policy; it would join in exhorting everybody who was involved with it to familiarize themselves more with the current policy, to try to adhere better to the letter and spirit of it, and to anticipate difficulties that arose when there was not sufficient information recorded for subsequent administration.

The Committee's second item was a proposal (**Appendix B**) to amend the Faculty Manual, specifically the sections that pertained to certain points in the process of a faculty member's grievance under the grievance process or secondarily, a faculty member's appeal under the appeals section of the RTP guidelines. It was brought to the attention of the Executive Committee that there was some inconsistency in wording in some of the sections as far as where reports of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee should go. For example, at one point in the grievance procedure it was stated that in any event the decision and recommendation of the FRRC should be transmitted to the President. In a comparable section of the RTP appeals process, the language was, "If the dean continues to make an adverse recommendation, the faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee which will report its findings to the Provost." It was in light of the apparent inconsistency in where reports initially went that this was brought to the Committee. As the Committee studied it, it thought that perhaps the language was



certainly inconvenient, but it was also symptomatic of some other difficulties as far as the coordination of those sections. Therefore, the amendments which the Committee was presenting were made in an effort to clarify and coordinate language and procedures primarily to make it a bit clearer for everybody to understand the process and role of the FRRC.

Senator Bee noted that the Committee had been fortunate to have two members who were also presently members of the FRRC, Senator Barbara Clements and Associate Professor Nancy Stokes, who were able to speak from personal experience with regard to the various problems and difficulties that arose. The present Chair of the FRRC, Associate Professor Bruce Simmons, also attended one of the meetings so the Committee had the benefit of inside people who were intimately involved with the process and some of the difficulties that arose.

Without going over the amendments line by line, Senator Bee wanted to indicate what the Committee had attempted to do in the modifications of the wording to the two sections. The proposal contained modifications to the wording both for the grievance section under the final review process and the appeals process section D(3)(e), after the final level of appeal within the college. Among the things which the Committee tried to do in the proposed changed language was first, coordinate the language between the RTP and the grievance sections. There had been slightly different vocabulary used, and the Committee had tried to look at the two sections and bring just the terms and the reference into coordination with each other. The second thing was to make clearer and more explicit the points of appeal and the number of times in any given case a person could appeal to the FRRC. From the way the language was written, it did not seem to be entirely explicit or clear that a faculty member could only go to that committee once. The Committee had endeavored in the revised wording to make that a bit clearer and more explicit, and then also in that context to identify the options as to the point in the process at which a faculty member could go to the committee. In other words, they could go to the committee at the point that the process was moving to the Provost's office, or they could go to the committee at the point that the process was moving to the President's office.

The Committee had also endeavored in the revised language to make a bit more explicit the expectation of the burden not only of the FRRC but also subsequent points of administrative review for not only receiving the FRRC's report but of also continuing it through the various points of administrative decision so that whatever FRRC submitted would be carried through to the final point of decision - all of the documents, all of the reports. Finally, the Committee had endeavored in the revised wording to make explicit and consistent the time frame in which it hoped decisions would be arrived at from the various parties involved in the appeals process at whatever point. The language there again sometimes had not been clear and explicit between the two sections of the document. In the hope that the revised wording would accomplish these goals, on behalf of the Committee he moved approval of the proposed amendments to the Faculty Manual.



The Chairman was confused regarding the enumeration of sections in the amendments in relation to sections in the old wording. Senator Bee replied that they would not totally match because in revising the Committee had in some cases combined or added paragraphs, so it was in that sense a substantial redrafting of the sections as they currently appeared in the Manual.

Senator Paul John said that he would like to delay voting on this since the body had just received it. He wanted some time to really look at it. Therefore, he moved that a vote on this matter be postponed until next month's meeting. This was seconded by Senator Norfolk, and the body voted its approval.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - The Chairman welcomed back Associate Provost Graham Kelly, the Chair of the Committee, who had been ill, and he was greeted with a round of applause. Associate Provost Kelly referred the body to his report (**Appendix C**) which listed curriculum proposals which were without objection and which had been approved by the Provost. There were two changes to the courses on the list. The first was FA-97-15 which still had a few problems to straighten out before it would be approved by the Provost. The other was FA-97-19. Half of that proposal dealt with a title change for the School of Communicative Disorders to something else. That was something that should not be handled through the curriculum review process. So only the course change parts of this proposal had been approved by the Provost.

The Chairman asked whether the body might interpret his comments regarding FA-97-19 and the title change to mean a referral to APC. Provost Kelly said that this was correct.

Since there were no questions raised about any of the proposals the Chairman said that the list was adopted by the body, as was its general practice.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - Senator William Taggart, the Chair, said that this was intended as an informational report. The Committee thought that it was wise for it to occasionally report back to faculty on the condition of the library. There was a handout entitled "Key Library Statistics" (**Appendix D**). Starting on page one, he pointed out that the total library budget had lagged with inflation by 4.4 percent. Most departments would feel that they were doing well if they had lagged inflation by only 4.4 percent, except that the library's rate of inflation was higher than the general consumer price index and they had started way behind in the process. A key statistic was that the budget for collections had lagged by 12.3 percent. A shocking number, if one looked at it at first glance, was that the personnel budget was up 30 percent and therefore we would all want to transfer to the library. But in reality this was because of the reduced student assistant budget and the fact that students were hired through temporary budgets, and the temporary budget was included in the personnel budget. In fact, the Committee had looked into the salaries of the library personnel and found some things which were shocking. The conditions were rather



abysmal. Taking the library staff's salaries paid on an 11-month basis and converting them on the standard formula for a 9-month basis, the faculty who were professors tended to be fairly okay in comparison because they tended to be either administrators or former administrators. However, 4 of the 7 associate professor bibliographers were below the published minimum for associate professors. Senator Taggart had been here for 28 years, and this was the first time he had realized that the professional library staff were not part of the annual report that came from the President's office each year. He understood that the format for that report was standard among the state universities; nevertheless, since the library personnel had academic rank they should be included in the report, but they were not. Also, 13 of the 20 assistant professors were below the published minimum at that rank which was shocking. On a 9-month basis, the two lowest assistant professors were paid \$22,349, and the ones above them were only a couple of hundred above that.

Collection size at the library was up which was good, but much of that was due to gifts and processing the backlog of gifts and new purchases. Periodicals were way down from 6,167 in 1990-91 to 3,495 in 1995-96. Inflation in the periodicals budget had been running from 9-12 percent. There was a proposal to address this in going to journals on an electronic basis which would grant us more periodicals at the same cost. However, we would have to guarantee at least three years and at an inflation rate of 10 percent to get that, and we could not do it on our own. Hours of service at the library were up, and that was good.

On the next sheet entitled "Selected OhioLINK Institutions FTE/Materials Expenditures 1994-95," Senator Taggart pointed out that of FTE students we were 4 out of 8. This list included selected institutions in similar situations as The University of Akron, leaving out Ohio State and Central State. By budget, we were 6 out of 8; by volume we were 5 out of 8. That was pretty good and close to where we should be. The next sheet, "Library Investment per Student Selected OhioLINK Institutions 1994-95" containing dollars spent for FTE students for the period unfortunately showed that we were 7 out of 8. For the sheet entitled "1994-95 Library Expenditures Mid-American Conference Institutions," for FTE students we were 9 out of 10. For the total budget we were 9 out of 10; materials was better - 3 out of 10. He thought this said that the others were doing poorly, not that we were doing that well. In professional salaries, we were 9 out of 10; in non-professional salaries we were 10 out of 10. In volumes, we were 5 out of 10, and that was not too bad.

What the Committee wanted to request was that Budget and Planning Committee give serious consideration to the budget request proposed by the Dean of the University Libraries, particularly with respect to an amount to adjust the salaries for professional staff toward equity with other faculty professionals on campus holding academic rank. The faculty needed to be aware of the serious financial problems facing the library, which was a good resource for all of us. On behalf of the University Libraries Committee, he had written to President Ruebel as Chair of the PBC and to Vice Chair Marquette expressing its



concern. The purpose of the report today was merely to raise the profile of the issues involved in the library. He thought that it tended to be under-appreciated because it provided a good level of service. If one did not see problems with one's own service, one did not necessarily realize the difficulties which the organization was facing. He offered to take questions, and added that Dean Del Williams was also in attendance and could answer any questions that he could not.

Senator C. Frank Griffin asked whether the figures presented here included the library at Wayne. Senator Taggart answered that they did not.

#### RESEARCH FACULTY PROJECTS COMMITTEE - (Appendix E)

#### STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - (Appendix F)

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Jesse Marquette, Vice-Chair, reported that the Committee had been meeting regularly to consider the money, including the library's request, which was one among many. It would be meeting either weekly or more frequently from now on until the first part of April, at which point it would present to the Senate and the campus its recommendations. It would be hearing from the deans and various vice-presidents. It had already heard from Vice-President McFarland and the Senior Vice-President and Provost.

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

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Norfolk presented the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Inequity (**Appendix G**). He reminded the body that the Executive Committee had formed this committee last year to look into issues of salary inequity and salary compression. The Committee had obtained data from the President's office or somewhere around there. It had looked at the data but had not done a formal analysis of it. However, even a cursory glance at the figures revealed some very odd things going on on the campus with regard to salaries. As a case in point, he mentioned his own department (Mathematical Sciences) where there was a person who had been promoted to professor three years ago who was making significantly less than three brand new assistant professors in the department. In light of that kind of observation, the Committee felt that there were significant problems on this campus with salaries in comparison with other institutions as well as within departments, between colleges and everywhere. Its recommendations were that all members of the Council of Deans should be required to come up with policies and plans to remedy the situation, and that this body should create a committee to oversee those plans, to see what they were doing, to investigate salary equity issues on the request of individual faculty members, and also to complete compiling data. If the body so desired, this committee would need a little money in order to contact the AAUP to get the salary



figures from other universities. It could be done for approximately \$100. We could get all the salary information from other universities; the AAUP would do it for us. They would send students out to photocopy things and then they would send them to us - a fairly primitive manner.

The Chairman said that he was in a parliamentary quandary. The body had essentially a set of recommendations from an ad hoc committee. It might choose to receive the report and possibly act on it later or it could act now.

Senator Malhotra wondered why the committee had been worried about not usurping "the responsibilities of the deans and the Provost," etc. Why could not the Senate be more specific and present its recommendations and then let them make a decision of whether they considered our recommendations worthwhile or not?

Senator Norfolk said that it was because he had no desire to stick his hand in a buzz saw. If we were to stand in front of certain members of the administration and suggest that the salaries in their particular area were out of line with the rest of the salaries, nothing would happen. We were in a better position if we encouraged each college to try and remedy things and have the Provost coordinate between colleges. In light of the Chairman's quandary, he made two suggestions. First, he recommended that the Senate create such a committee. If that were seconded, he would then move to defer any discussion on it until next month.

The Chairman said that the representative of the committee had moved that the body accept its recommendations. Since it was coming as a committee report, ad hoc or not, he held that it was on the floor and seconded. Was there debate with the proviso that the body would be deferring final action until its next meeting as were the wishes of the ad hoc committee as a separate motion? He called for a motion to defer consideration of the committee's recommendations until the next meeting, and this was moved by Senator Clinefelter and seconded by Senator Bee.

Senator Virginia Gunn had some concern about the deferral. She was the one who had asked for this to be brought forward. The report was dated May, 96. This was March 97; had the committee met since May 96?

Senator Norfolk responded that it had, but nothing new had come to light. The point was that the committee had had a specific charge to come up with its observations.

Senator Gunn said that based on the example which Senator Norfolk had given and the information in the earlier library committee report, there was some danger in having each college doing its own thing and allowing each dean to decide so that one could have



situations on campus where some people have so much money and other people were below a published minimum.

The Chairman reminded Senator Gunn that members should be speaking to the motion to delay rather than to the substance at the present time. He gathered though that she was not in favor of delaying because she wished to deal with the substance.

Senator William Rich thought that the May 96 date on the document was a mistake. The recommendations had been adopted by the committee within the last week. The May 96 referred to a previous meeting at which the proposal the body had before it had been largely but not completely drafted. There had been changes made last week.

The Chairman thanked Senator Rich for his clarification. Since there was no further discussion, he called for a vote, and the motion passed with two opposing it.

**VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Senator Malhotra wanted to find out from Senator Marquette whether the PBC had looked at this issue of salary compression and salary inequity, or if at some point they planned to do so. There was no point talking about salary compression and bringing about more salary equity if you had no dollars to do it.

Senator Marquette replied that there was a recommendation before the committee from the academic administration for salary increases for next year. Whether or not we would be able to fund them was still up in the air. Obviously, if there was money for salaries, then it would be possible to do something about equity issues depending upon how we were doing it. As an aside, he noted that he was conducting a study of the salary equity issue through the Institute for Policy Studies (Institutional Research), so there would be a detailed analysis of what had been going on. That was a result of requests from other committees that were currently in the process. It would be as detailed as he could make it from the data available.

The Chairman asked Senator Marquette to refresh his memory as to the date when the Senate would receive the budget of the University. Senator Marquette said that the PBC was shooting for April 15 or approximately the second Friday in the month, which would give the body two weeks before the May meeting.

The Chairman wanted to caution the Senate that it was likely that the Executive Committee would call the body into session on the Thursday immediately following the 15th in order to begin deliberations on the budget. It was very likely that we would meet each Thursday from then until the end of the semester to be certain that we got it done, so he advised members to mark their calendars accordingly.



March 6, 1997

Page 14

**IX. ADJOURNMENT** - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn, which was made by Senator Bee and seconded by many. The body voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 3:59 p.m.

*Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin*



## APPENDIX A

### REPORT

#### Incomplete Grades

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee received an expression of concern from Buchtel College with regard to the current university policies and practices in giving grades of Incomplete to undergraduate students. The Executive Committee referred the matter to the APCC for deliberation and recommendations.

The committee requested and received documents from the Buchtel College discussion of the matter as well as a copy of the form and statement of policy and guidelines now used in Buchtel College in administering and processing Incomplete grades for undergraduates. Dean Francis attended a meeting of the committee and shared his experiences and perspective on the matter.

The concerns expressed regarding Incompletes for undergraduates included the following:

1. Grades of Incomplete are often given for reasons not consistent with the current wording of the policy. Incompletes are sometimes given even though a student is failing or has not completed substantially all of the work for a class. Students have requested an incomplete rather than dropping a course to maintain a minimum load necessary to meet financial aid requirements or other scholarship or assistance requirements.
2. Students often delay or fail to complete requirements within the time period specified by the policy. Students have waited until the following term to "retake" the course or part of the course for which work is missing or inadequate. Students often have not yet completed the work by the end of classes for the following term.
3. Instructors' efforts to be lenient sometimes compromise the policy removing Incomplete grades. An instructor may submit a grade change for an Incomplete that has turned to an F after the time limit has expired. Instructors may thus be requesting grade changes for inappropriate reasons.
4. Current practice sometimes results in misunderstanding and incomplete information as an Incomplete runs its course. The instructor and student may have different recollections of what was stipulated in the granting of an Incomplete. An instructor may no longer be employed at the University when a student raises a question or makes a claim. There is at present no procedure



to record essential information at the time an Incomplete is given. Thus, other administrative officers may not have the records and documentation to assist them if there is an issue with regard to an Incomplete or an Incomplete turned to an "F."

With these concerns in mind, the committee notes the following:

1. It is evident that there are problems and difficulties with the current practices for giving and processing grades of "Incomplete" for undergraduates.
2. The primary source of the problem is more in the administration of the current policy than in the policy itself. The policy as written sets forth the circumstances in which it is appropriate to give an "Incomplete" grade as well as the time by which it must be removed. Difficulties arise when these provisions are ignored or violated.

The committee finds no reason to recommend any change in the current policy wording.

The committee does, however, encourage the Provost, Deans, Department Chairs, School Directors, course and program coordinators and other appropriate administrators to call the current policy to the attention of faculty, to work with faculty in developing operational guidelines [appropriate to the unit or program] for assigning grades of "Incomplete" and to develop and implement the forms for recording the necessary information about the agreement between the student and instructor regarding time and work requirements for removing a grade of "Incomplete" when it is given.



**Incomplete Grade Documentation**

INSTRUCTORS ARE REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THIS FORM. PLEASE REVIEW THE GUIDELINES ON THE BACK OF THIS FORM. IT IS THE PREROGATIVE OF THE INSTRUCTOR TO ASSIGN INCOMPLETES.

**PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE INFORMATION**

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Term/Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Social Security Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Credit Hours: \_\_\_\_\_

Student's Passing Grade to Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reason for Incomplete: \_\_\_\_\_

Requirements Necessary to Remove "Incomplete Grade": \_\_\_\_\_

Requirements to be completed by: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Date)

Instructor Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Student Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Department Chair Signature (INFORMATION ONLY) \_\_\_\_\_

Arts and Sciences Dean Signature (INFORMATION ONLY) \_\_\_\_\_

Copies should be submitted to:

- Instructor
- Department Head
- Student

incform

(OVER)



The grade of INCOMPLETE (INC) at The University of Akron indicates that a student has done passing work but for good and acceptable reasons could not complete all of the required work. the INC must be removed by the end of the following semester, not including summer sessions, or the INC converts to an F.

The INC is a problematic grade that can be misused. Students failing courses will sometimes request INC and permission to sit through courses again unofficially without paying tuition and fees. They expect to receive all new grades. Assigning an INC under these circumstances essentially allows students to be retested for the purpose of changing their grades without complying with the University's repeat for change of grade policy.

Please follow these guidelines when assigning an INC:

- the INC is a temporary grade given to a student who has completed most of the course and has a passing grade
- the student is unable to complete the course for reasons beyond his/her control, such as a serious medical problem or a major family crisis (subject to verification)
- a request to do additional work for the course or the pressures of a normal academic work load are not sufficient reasons to give an INC
- The student who receives an INC is not permitted to sit through the entire course again unofficially as one of the conditions of changing an INC to a letter grade
- before the INC is assigned, the student and the instructor must sign a statement indicating the reason for the INC and the specific work to be completed
- at grade reporting time the instructor must file the signed statement with the department and the office of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences
- a reasonable deadline for removing the INC must be included in the agreement
- ordinarily the grade of Permanent Incomplete (PI) is an inappropriate final grade with which to remove the INC
- the final grade must be reported to the registrar by the published deadline

Reverse side: Incomplete Grade Documentation Form



# GRADE POLICIES AND CREDIT

## Grades and the Grading System

A student will receive grades on various types of classroom performance during the process of most courses and a final grade at the end of the term. At the end of the term, the Office of the Registrar mails grade reports to a student's home address; summer grade reports are mailed for both summer sessions at the end of the second summer session.

Individual tests are usually graded with percentage or letter marks, but official academic records are maintained with a grade-point system.

This method of recording grades is as follows:

Grade	Grade Points Per Credit
A	4.00
A-	3.70
B+	3.30
B	3.00
B-	2.70
C+	2.30
C	2.00
C-	1.70
D+	1.30
D	1.00
D-	0.70
F	0.00
AUD (Audit)	0.00
CR (Credit)	0.00
NC (Noncredit)	0.00

The following grades may also appear on the term grade reports or on the official academic record. There are no grade points associated with these grades.

**I - Incomplete:** Indicates that the student has done passing work in the course but that some part of the work is, for good and acceptable reason, not complete at the end of the term. Failure to make up the omitted work satisfactorily by the end of the following term, not including summer sessions, converts the "I" to an "F". When the work is satisfactorily completed within the allotted time the "I" is converted to whatever grade the student has earned. (If instructors wish to extend the "I" grade beyond the following term for which the student is registered, prior to the end of the term they must notify the Office of the Registrar in writing of the extension and indicate the date of its termination. It is the responsibility of the student to make arrangements to make up the incomplete work. The faculty member should submit the new grade to the Office of the Registrar in writing.)

**IP - In Progress:** Indicates that the student has not completed the scheduled coursework during the term because the nature of the course does not permit completion within a single term, such as work toward a thesis.



## **APPENDIX B**

### **Proposal for Amendment to the Faculty Manual 3359-20-037 D(3)(e)(f)(g) and (h)**

#### **Current wording:**

- (d) An adverse recommendation initiated by the college dean may be appealed to the college appeals committee which will report its findings to the dean. In cases involving termination, the review will be timed to comply with the schedule described in Rule 3359-20-034 of the Administrative Code, Terminating Employment.
- (e) If the dean continues to make an adverse recommendation, the faculty member may appeal to the Faculty Rights and responsibilities Committee, which will report its findings initially to the Provost.
- (f) A faculty member may then appeal directly to the Provost who shall respond in a timely fashion.
- (g) An adverse recommendation initiated by the Provost may be appealed to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee which will report its findings initially to the Provost.
- (h) After exhausting the above steps a faculty member may appeal to the University President who shall respond in a timely fashion.

#### **Proposed wording:**

- (f) Beyond the college, the appellant may appeal to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee an adverse recommendation from the Dean, and to the President a subsequent adverse recommendation from the Provost. The President of the University is the grievant/complainant's last point of appeal and shall inform all parties of his/her decision within thirty days from receipt of any grievance or appeal.
- (g) The grievant/complainant may appeal any adverse recommendation from either the Dean or Provost to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee. However, during any grievance/appeal process, any grievant/complainant may appeal to the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee only once.



- (h) Within two weeks of its final action, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee shall forward any findings and recommendations to the administrative officer issuing the adverse recommendation under appeal.
- (i) Copies of all documents, findings and recommendations issuing from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee in connection with an accepted grievance or appeal shall be forwarded through all subsequent levels of administrative review to the level of final recommendation.

**Proposal for amendment to the Faculty Manual 3359-20-036 C(6)(c) and (d)**

Current wording:

- (c) Within two weeks after the review, the committee shall complete its deliberation of the matter and shall decide whether to reject the complaint or to submit recommendations to the President. The decision to report to the President and each recommendation to be made to the President requires a simple majority vote of the full committee.
- (d) In any event, the decision and recommendations of the committee shall be transmitted to the President with copies to the parties, the Provost, and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate. The President shall inform the committee of any action in the matter within thirty days of receiving the decision and recommendations.

Proposed wording:

- (c) Within two weeks after the review the committee shall complete its deliberation of the matter and shall decide whether to accept or reject the complaint. The decision to report [to the President] and each recommendation to be made [to the President] requires a simple majority vote of the full committee. Within two weeks of its final action, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee shall forward a copy of any findings or recommendations to the grievant/complainant and to the administrative officer whose recommendation is under appeal as well as to the administrative officer at the next level of administrative review.
- (d) The administrative officer receiving any findings or recommendations from the committee shall inform all parties of his/her decision within thirty days after receiving the Rights and Responsibilities Committee documents.



March 6, 1997

Page 22



APPENDIX C

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost  
Akron, OH 44325-4703  
216-972-7593 216-972-8699 Fax

**February 26, 1997**

**TO:** Faculty Senate

**FROM:** Dr. S. Graham Kelly, Associate Provost for Curricular Issues  
and Student Affairs *S. Graham Kelly*

**RE:** March 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

The following curriculum proposals are without objections and have been approved by the Provost:

ED-96-05

AS-97-02  
AS-97-03  
AS-97-04  
AS-97-06  
AS-97-12  
AS-97-13  
AS-97-14  
AS-97-16  
AS-97-17  
AS-97-18  
AS-97-19  
AS-97-20  
AS-97-25  
AS-97-26  
AS-97-27  
AS-97-28  
AS-97-29  
AS-97-30  
AS-97-31  
AS-97-32  
AS-97-32A  
AS-97-33  
AS-97-38  
AS-97-39  
AS-97-42  
AS-97-43



February 26, 1997

March 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

Page 2

AS-97-44  
AS-97-45  
AS-97-46  
AS-97-47  
AS-97-48  
AS-97-52  
AS-97-53  
AS-97-54  
AS-97-55  
AS-97-56  
AS-97-57  
AS-97-58  
AS-97-59  
AS-97-60  
AS-97-61  
AS-97-62  
AS-97-63  
AS-97-64  
AS-97-65  
AS-97-65A  
AS-97-65B

BA-97-11  
BA-97-32

CT-97-01  
CT-97-02  
CT-97-03  
CT-97-04  
CT-97-05  
CT-97-06  
CT-97-07  
CT-97-08  
CT-97-08A  
CT-97-08B  
CT-97-08D  
CT-97-08E  
CT-97-09  
CT-97-10  
CT-97-11  
CT-97-12



February 26, 1997

March 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

Page 3

CT-97-13

CT-97-14

CT-97-15

CT-97-16

CT-97-20

CT-97-21

CT-97-22

CT-97-23

CT-97-24

ED-97-01

ED-97-02

ED-97-08

ED-97-09

ED-97-10

ED-97-11

ED-97-12

ED-97-13

ED-97-14

ED-97-15

ED-97-16

ED-97-17

ED-97-18

EN-97-03

EN-97-07

NU-97-01

NU-97-02

NU-97-03

NU-97-03A

WC-97-10

WC-97-11

WC-97-12

WC-97-13

WC-97-14

WC-97-15

WC-97-16

WC-97-17



February 26, 1997

March 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

Page 4

Unless objections are received, it is anticipated that the following proposals will also be approved by the Provost:

AS-97-35  
AS-97-36  
AS-97-36A  
AS-97-36B

BA-97-10  
BA-97-13  
BA-97-15  
BA-97-16  
BA-97-31

CT-97-08C  
CT-97-08F  
CT-97-08G  
CT-97-08H  
CT-97-08I  
CT-97-18

ED-97-03  
ED-97-04  
ED-97-05  
ED-97-06  
ED-97-07

EN-97-10  
EN-97-14

FA-97-01  
FA-97-02  
FA-97-03  
FA-97-04A  
FA-97-04B  
FA-97-04C  
FA-97-05  
FA-97-06  
FA-97-07  
FA-97-08  
FA-97-08A



February 26, 1997

March 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

Page 5

FA-97-09  
FA-97-10  
FA-97-11  
FA-97-12  
FA-97-13  
FA-97-14  
FA-97-15  
FA-97-16  
FA-97-17  
FA-97-17A  
FA-97-17B  
FA-97-17C  
FA-97-17D  
FA-97-17E  
FA-97-18  
FA-97-18A  
FA-97-18B  
FA-97-19  
FA-97-20  
FA-97-20A

UC-97-01

WC-97-01

WC-97-09

Unless Faculty Senate acts on these proposals at its March 6, 1997 meeting,  
they will become record.

ald\curr97\fs970306



2/24/97

**KEY LIBRARY STATISTICS**

	<b>1990-91</b>	<b>1995-96</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Consumer Price Index (CPI)	407.3	469.5	15.3%
Total Budget	\$4,595,812	\$5,099,374	10.9%
Budget for Collections	\$2,175,260	\$2,241,542	3.0%
Personnel Budget	\$1,615,020	\$2,099,073	30.0%
Operating Budget	\$ 805,532	\$ 758,759	-5.8%
--Student Wage Budget	\$ 365,800	\$ 250,400	-31.5%
Collection Size in Volumes	835,110	998,459	19.6%
Periodicals Subscriptions	6,167	3,495	-42.3%
Books Purchased	20,794	24,323	17.0%
Volumes Added (includes items cataloged from backlog)	22,344	37,297	66.9%
Hours Library Open	96.5	101.5	5.2%
Circulation	295,302	212,818	- 27.9%
ILL/OhioLINK Transactions	25,487	73,163	187.1%
Faculty and Staff Employed	74	72	- 2.7%

APPENDIX D



## Selected OhioLINK Institutions FTE/Materials Expenditures 1994-1995

	MATERIALS BUDGET	FTE ENROLLMENT	\$ TO FTE
Univ. of Akron	2,072,948	16,773	123.59
Bowling Green	2,049,047	16,321	125.55
Cleveland State	1,481,467	11,603	127.68
Kent State	2,214,755	17,099	129.53
Miami Univ.	2,142,002	15,361	139.44
Ohio Univ.	3,083,161	18,759	164.36
Univ. of Toledo	1,862,905	18,077	103.05
Wright State	1,527,450	11,568	132.04
Univ. of Akron Ranking	4/8	4/8	7/8

Source: State Library of Ohio, Academic Library Statistics 1994-1995

11/18/96  
ufohioLINK.chr



2/24/97

**LIBRARY INVESTMENT PER STUDENT  
SELECTED OHIOLINK INSTITUTIONS  
1994-1995**

	<b>NUMBER OF FTE STUDENTS</b>	<b>TOTAL BUDGET</b>	<b>\$ PER STUDENT</b>
University of Akron	16,773	\$ 4,939,846	\$ 294.51
Bowling Green	16,321	6,668,684	408.60
Cleveland State	11,603	4,026,173	346.99
Kent State	17,099	7,344,400	429.52
Miami University	15,361	5,995,045	390.28
Ohio University	18,759	8,734,001	465.59
University of Toledo	18,077	4,963,337	274.57
Wright State	11,568	3,696,929	319.58
University of Akron Ranking	4/8	6/8	7/8

Source: State Library of Ohio, Academic Library Statistics

office\wpwin\wpdocs\invest95  
kk



### 1994-1995 LIBRARY EXPENDITURE SELECTED OHIOLINK INSTITUTIONS

	NUMBER OF FTE STUDENTS	TOTAL BUDGET	MATERIALS EXPENDITURES	SALARIES	VOLUMES
Univ. of Akron	16,773	\$4,939,846	\$2,072,948	\$1,957,674	961,172
Bowling Green	16,321	6,668,684	2,049,047	3,411,993	1,936,805
Cleveland State	11,603	4,026,173	1,481,467	1,652,249	892,331
Kent State	17,099	7,344,400	2,214,755	3,600,505	1,889,188
Miami University	15,361	5,995,045	2,142,002	2,723,773	1,563,098
Ohio University	18,759	8,734,001	3,083,161	3,810,584	1,696,516
Univ. of Toledo	18,077	4,963,337	1,862,905	2,415,500	868,378
Wright State	11,568	3,696,929	1,527,450	1,471,866	549,733
Univ. of Akron Ranking	4/8	6/8	4/8	6/8	5/8

Source: State Library of Ohio, Academic Library Statistics 1994-1995

11/18/96  
ulchart.pb



# **1994-95 LIBRARY EXPENDITURES MID-AMERICAN CONFERENCE INSTITUTIONS**

	NUMBER OF FTE STUDENTS	TOTAL BUDGET	MATERIALS EXPENDITURES	PROFESSIONAL SALARIES	NONPROFESSIONAL SALARIES	VOLUMES
Univ. of Akron	16,772	\$5,080,038	\$2,213,140	\$1,214,859	\$742,815	1,530,736
Ball State	17,532	6,269,738	1,849,511	1,479,619	2,106,932	1,460,969
Bowling Green	17,723	6,919,757	2,077,753	1,948,524	1,772,355	1,963,805
Central Michigan	17,000	4,876,696	1,404,153	1,758,611	950,695	1,065,661
Eastern Michigan	24,000	7,557,411	1,670,000	1,649,918	1,644,586	815,601
Kent State	17,099	6,441,047	2,181,550	1,666,799	1,933,706	1,889,188
Miami University	15,737	6,933,788	2,288,035	1,369,200	1,371,177	1,468,927
Ohio University	19,545	7,856,217	2,272,002	1,625,532	1,342,604	1,712,668
Univ. of Toledo	18,928	5,325,962	2,172,534	1,069,312	1,105,097	1,701,853
Western Michigan	26,555	6,758,070	2,035,822	1,318,267	1,843,858	1,385,024
Univ. of Akron Ranking	9/10	9/10	3/10	9/10	10/10	5/10

American Library Directory 1996/97. 49th ed. New Providence: R.R. Bowker, 1996

v Schools, Medical Schools, independent branch campuses are included.



# THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

## Library Costs & Collections

Fiscal Year	Serials Cost	Number of Periodicals	Serials Inflation Rate	Books Cost	Number of Books	Books Inflation Rate
1995/96	1,438,601	3495	10.8%	938,067	24,323	2.1%
1994/95	1,278,572	3600	10.4%	934,568	27,790	(2.0%)
1993/94	1,200,449	3722	9.6%	\$881,475	21,066	4.2%
1992/93	1,367,068	4826	12.2%	740,430	18,031	6.4%
1991/92	1,344,907	5375	11.7%	726,728	17,365	5.3%
1990/91	1,342,379	6167	9.5%	834,835	20,794	7.2%
1989/90	1,194,984	6424	9.5%	1,002,770	23,757*	5.3%
1988/89	1,078,495	6369	9.1%	945,647	23,509**	6.0%
1987/88	981,688	6238	9.9%	334,026	12,926	9.9%
1986/87	869,518	6394	8.9%	331,189	10,829	5.9%
1985/86	773,595	6413	8.6%	438,803	14,497	4.7%
1984/85	648,299	6455	9.4%	377,554	11,208	5.9%

- \* Budgets Supplements, mid-year and end-year; for books
- \*\* Approval Plan began; significant discounts



**APPENDIX E**

**Report of Research Faculty Projects Committee**

**Minutes of March 7, 1997**

The Research (Faculty Projects) Committee met in the McColleston Room on Friday, March 7, 1997 at 9 a.m. Members present were: Dr. Stephen Aby, Dr. Roger Bain, Mr. Andrew Borowiec, Miss J. Fitzgerald, Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. Lazarus Macior, Dr. D. Malhotra, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Daniel Sheffer, Chair, Dr. Victoria Schirm, Dr. Phillip Schmidt, Dr. Jerry Stinner, Dr. Mark Tausig, and Dr. Michael Williams. Members absent were: Dr. Celal Batur, Mr. Earl Ertman, Dr. J. Clayton Fant, and Dr. William McGucken (on leave),

Dr. Schmidt, who chaired the meeting briefly until Dr. Sheffer came, noted the scoring range, with 1 being excellent to a 4 as poor and 5 as ineligible.

A total of 16 proposals were submitted, reviewed, and ranked for the spring 1997 competition.

There were 10 proposals funded, totaling \$33,630.

7 - Arts & Sciences	5 Geology, 1 Biology, 1 Chemistry
3 - Engineering	2 Civil Engineering, 1 Biomedical Engineering

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Dr. Schmidt, chair of the subcommittee studying the issue of additional salary opportunities for Summer Fellows, reported that a final recommendation to the full committee would be made at the April 12 meeting. Dr. Schmidt reported that the subcommittee felt additional funds should be sought to provide an increased dollar amount for the Summer Faculty Fellowships. The subcommittee proposed the following:

That the Faculty Senate propose that 10% of Indirect Costs Recovery monies be reallocated from the General Fund to fund additional Summer Faculty Research Fellowships.

If such additional funding is available, the Faculty Research Committee create two categories of research fellowships:

Senior Faculty Fellowships of \$10,000 for tenured faculty at the rank of Associate Professor or higher.

Faculty Fellowships of \$8,000 for all other faculty.



March 6, 1997

Page 34

There was a discussion by the members of this sub-committee report. The matter was tabled for the business meeting to be held next month.

The committee will next meet on Friday April 11, 1997 at 9:30 a.m. for the spring business meeting. The McCollester Room is not available for this meeting. As soon as I have the specific room, I will advise you.

Meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Dan Sheffer, Chair

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON  
INTERNAL GRANTS AWARDED BY  
RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE

Spring, 1997

ACCT #	FRG #	NAME	TITLE OF PROJECT	AMOUNT
2-07343	1380	Dr. Roger Bain Geology	"Recognition of Tectonic Sedimentation events in Pennsylvanian-age Strata of Southern Colorado."	\$ 3,444.20
2-07344	1381	Dr. Enriqueta Barrera Geology	"Evolution of Lake Erie's Environments since 10,000 B.P."	3,300.00
2-07345	1382	Dr. Lindgren Chyi Geology	"Precious Metal Recovery from Boiler Bottom Ash and Slag."	3,482.70
2-07346	1383	Dr. LaVerne Friberg Geology	"Characterization of Chlorite Formed in Rocks of Variable Metamorphic Grade from the Black Hills, South Dakota."	3,293.60
2-07347	1384	Dr. George Giakos Biomedical Engineering	"A Low-Cost but Effective Hybrid Photoamplifier for Imaging Application."	3,500.00



March 6, 1997

Page 35

2-07348	1385	Dr. Craig Menzemer Civil Engineering	"Preliminary Investigation into the Strength of Aluminum Angles Fastened by a Single Leg."	3,500.00
2-07349	1386	Dr. Amy Milsted Biology	"Response of female WKY and SHR/y rats to steroid hormone manipulation."	3,500.00
2-07350	1387	Dr. Lisa Park Geology	"Taphonomic Analysis of Fossil Small Mammals from the Panaca Formation of Nevada."	2,820.50
2-07351	1388	Dr. Chrys Wesdemitis Chemistry	"Molecular Recognition Studies by Mass Spectrometry."	3,500.00
2-07352	1389	Dr. Ping Yi Civil Engineering	"Safety Study for Elderly Drivers at Unsignalized Intersections."	3,289.00
				<hr/> \$33,630.00

10 SPRING 1997 RESEARCH GRANTS



## APPENDIX F

### **Report of Student Affairs Committee**

The meeting was convened at 2:00 p.m. in Spicer Hall, Room 120, on February 27, 1997. The following Senators and faculty were present: Senator Rebecca Gibson, Senator Barbara Bucey, Senator George Prough, prof. Don Laconi, Dr. Caryl K. Smith, Prof. Lynne Pachnowski.

Approval of the agenda was moved by Senator Prough and approved by the committee.

Senator Rebecca Gibson was voted as "Chair" for the Student Affairs Committee for the 1996-91997 academic year.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

- \* Dr. Caryl Smith reported that Associated Student Government is requesting that The University of Akron "Ban" smoking in all University buildings. She stated that the students discussed the issue and immediately voted. The vote results stated were "passed." It was the students' intention to immediately send all information to The University of Akron Board of Trustees for approval without going through the "proper channels" prior to submission to the Board. Dr. Smith stated that she did indeed try to inform Student Government of these channels, yet her information was not received as positive input. Senator Barb Bucey volunteered to speak to Associated Student Government at their next meeting concerning University procedures with this type of concern.
- \* Student scholarships were discussed concerning how they would be distributed throughout the University. Senator Bucey stated that she would be attending a scholarship meeting on Monday, March 3, 1997, and would report back to the committee.
- \* A student conduct policy was distributed to the committee for Mr. Frank Axell, assistant to the dean, for student conduct. Due to prior commitments, Mr. Axell was not able to be present to discuss this proposal; and it was tabled until the next committee meeting scheduled for March 1997.
- \* No additional concerns were discussed, and the meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Rebecca Gibson, Chair



## APPENDIX G

### Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Salary Inequity

May 1996

Members of the committee: Richard Elliott (Chair), Frank Griffin, Bill Rich, Tim Norfolk, Ruth Clinefelter, Dennis Kimmell

- I. In light of the data examined, the committee feels that perceived problems with salary equity, including the issue of salary compression, are significant on the campus.
- II. In order not to usurp the responsibilities of the deans, Provost, department chairs, and other administrative officers of The University of Akron, the committee offers the following recommendations:
  - A. The members of the Council of Deans, including the Provost, should be charged with creating their own individual plans for addressing the problems of salary equity and salary compression.
  - B. The Faculty Senate should appoint an ongoing equity committee, whose responsibilities should include:
    1. Monitoring of the process by which the Provost, deans and department chairs propose to address salary equity issues;
    2. Investigating of salary equity issues upon request of faculty members;
    3. Compiling further data on salary issues, both within the campus community and also with respect to other comparable institutions, and serving as a resource on such issues for the responsible parties on campus.