

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

5-2-1996

Faculty Senate Chronicle May 2, 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.



1995-96, No. 10

May 2, 1996

43 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 2, 1996	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 2, 1996	23
A. Report of <i>FACCOBOR</i>	23
B. Report of <i>Executive Committee</i>	24
C. Report of <i>University Well-Being Committee</i>	25
D. Report of <i>Graduate Council</i>	26
E. Report of <i>Academic Policies, Curriculum & Calendar Committee</i>	28
F. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	34
G. Report of <i>Reference Committee</i>	36
H. Report of <i>Student Affairs Committee</i>	39
I. Report of <i>General Education Advisory Committee</i>	41
J. Interim Policy on Stipends and Overload	43

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
MAY 2, 1996**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, May 2, 1996, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty of the fifty-six members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Clements, Hoover, Moss, Peeples, Sibberson and Smith were absent with notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **APPROVED SUMMER 96 GRADUATION LIST**
- * **APPROVED TWO RESOLUTIONS REGARDING EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING WITH THE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE**
- * **APPROVED RECOMMENDATION FROM UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE REGARDING HEALTH CARE BENEFITS FOR PART-TIME FACULTY**
- * **APPROVED A MOTION THAT UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE CONTINUE TO INVESTIGATE STRS WITHDRAWAL BY PART-TIME FACULTY**
- * **APPROVED FOUR SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE AND DEFERRED ACTION ON A FIFTH**
- * **APPROVED AMENDMENT TO SENATE BYLAWS TO ADD TWO SENATORS ELECTED FROM SEAC TO THE BODY**
- * **APPROVED RECOMMENDATION FROM REFERENCE COMMITTEE TO ASK BOARD OF TRUSTEES TO ABOLISH SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**
- * **DEFERRED CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS FROM REFERENCE COMMITTEE REGARDING COMBINING OF LRPC AND BPCC INTO ONE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE**
- * **ENDORSED RECOMMENDATION FROM BPCC REGARDING THE USE OF RESERVED TECHNOLOGY FUNDS**
- * **DEFERRED DISCUSSION OF INTERIM STIPEND AND OVERLOAD POLICY UNTIL THE NEXT SENATE MEETING**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman asked for any changes to the agenda. Senator John Green wanted to move that two resolutions, which were now being handed out, be added after Item D under "Reports." Since there was no objection, these items were added to the agenda. The Chairman also wanted to add approval of the Summer 1996 graduation list to the agenda after his remarks. He wanted to place it early enough in the agenda to insure that the Senate would get to it. This was also approved, and then the body approved the amended agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF MARCH 7 AND APRIL 4 - Secretary Gary H. Oller said he had no corrections. Senator Diane Vukovich pointed out that on page 28 there were minutes not only from the Student Affairs Committee meeting of March 28, 1996 but also March 10, 1995. The Chairman commented that they were so good they had been printed a second time. It would be noted that the March 10, 1995, minutes did not belong there. Since there were no additional corrections, the body voted its approval of the two sets of minutes.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman wanted to touch on a topic which had been on many minds; namely, the situation with the North Central Association. There had been a team on campus this week from that body comprised of Dr. Clyde Jacob, Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Central Oklahoma and a member of the previous visitation team, Dr. Sheila Kaplan, President of Metropolitan State College of Denver, and Dr. Steven Spangele, Associate Director of the NCA. The visit had gone very well, and at the debriefing Dr. Jacob had said that the University's accreditation was not in any jeopardy and that there was no possibility of probation or other accreditation action by the NCA. The team had found the atmosphere on our campus markedly more positive than during their last visit, although they did identify some areas of concern. He was not going to list those because he wanted to stick to good news. A written report from the team would be available on campus in about a month, so the body would hear all about those then. None of them were unexpected. The team was going to recommend that the University file a monitoring report with the NCA next January essentially on those items of concern that they would be listing for us. They had indicated that no visitation by the NCA was likely before the University's comprehensive review in the Fall of 1997. This essentially put the University back on schedule for the regular comprehensive review.

Next, on behalf of the Executive Committee, the Chairman moved that the Faculty Senate approve the list of graduates for the Summer 1996 commencement subject to their successful completion of all degree requirements. This was seconded by many and then was approved by the body.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - There were none.

V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me elaborate a little bit on what the Chair had to say about the North Central visit. Needless to say, I slept better last night than the night before because I won't say that this is a serious, serious thing but it is something that should cause concern for the campus community, because probation as far as an institution is concerned is a very serious thing. I found the team to be very willing to work with the people we had assigned to prepare for this, and I want to give special thanks to Dr. Bill Beyer and Dr. Mark Auburn for the work they did in preparation for this visit. The areas of concern, and I'm going to snatch a little bit, Mr. Chair, are things we have to tool up on as far as an institution is concerned. No. 1 is the governance issue that comes up, and this is basically my responsibility to oversee the institution to make sure that Board members are schooled and are in service on what their role is supposed to be. And you have to keep in mind that when you serve on a North Central team, and I've served on some 25 of them myself, when you go on a campus you always compare what's going on on that campus and compare it with what you're doing at home, and if they're not exactly the same, there's got to be something wrong with the one you're visiting. I didn't find that this was the case with this particular team because they were very objective, and I made the point that you've got to remember that any time you have a lay board, and I use lay because of the fact that they are not professional educators, they deal with the University probably two or three times a month and other than that, they have other things they do in addition to being Board members. It's my responsibility to see to it that we have regular sessions where they are schooled in what the faculty is doing, what we're doing in the areas of research and most importantly, what their role is as far as the policy-making body of the institution. So we are planning some retreats in this area so that we're up to snuff on this. The second concern they had and we have to get better in this area, there's no doubt about it, is the hiring policies and practices we have, and we're going to address this to make sure we do everything in proper sequence and everything is filed the way it should be. This is just simply the case of doing the job we are assigned to do as far as human resources are concerned, hiring of people and so on. We can take care of this, but other than that, they were very complimentary; they feel we have made some strides and are going in the right direction. And I just re-emphasize what I said last month - this is a good institution; we simply have to get it back on track.

Let me make a couple of comments about the upcoming budget - I asked Dr. Helmick to come this afternoon in case there are any questions that I probably won't know the answers to. Currently the University has approximately \$49 million in centrally held accounts such as group insurance, utilities and technology fees; this is in the letter I sent to the campus community. We've identified 1.65 of this million that we can reduce permanently without any damage to the University, and this will go toward making up the \$3 million I asked that we cut from the budget for next year. So this leaves a balance of \$1,350,000 that we're going to cut from the administrative operations, and this still leaves us with a balance that we'll be able to work with and we should not have any trouble getting through the academic year. Next year we're going to have to take another hard look at it because, as you know, we're still looking at enrollment, at how many new students we're going to get and most importantly, we're looking at the retention - how many students we have right now that we're going to keep. But after the North Central evaluation, now I think we can get back to the things that are fun about being in higher education. So let's all go ahead, do our jobs, make sure we do a good job in the classroom, do a good job administering and running the University the way it should be run and I know that we're going in the right direction. I'll respond to questions any of you have."

There were no questions for President Ruebel.

REPRESENTATIVE TO FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR, OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS - (Appendix A)

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Executive Committee Budget Report (**Appendix B**). Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met on the 9th and 24th of April and had done the following: set the agenda for today's meeting, agreed that the Chairman should send a note of welcome to the new members of the Board of Trustees, received and took under advisement a document from I. Miller, Dean of Engineering, regarding the creation of a university-wide retention, tenure and promotion committee, and met with the team from Sasaski Associates regarding the status of their proposed long-term plan for the campus. The Committee was also recommending that given the possibility of certain item of business that might come up relating to the budget, the reorganization of aspects of the campus, and other things which the body might not be able to finish today, a meeting of the Senate be tentatively scheduled for the first Thursday of Summer Session One, June 13, at 3:00 p.m. in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center. If it turned out that there was no reason to meet, the Committee would cancel the meeting.

Finally, Secretary Oller wanted to formally thank Mrs. Marilyn Quillin for all of her help this year in a variety of areas relating to the functioning of this body, and, most importantly, in the area in which he did his work; namely, getting out the Chronicle. Because of having two meetings a month on several occasions, this had been a massive job, and Mrs. Quillin had always done her work in the most efficient and cheerful fashion. He wanted to thank her publicly for that.

The Chairman next turned to the two resolutions which had been added to the agenda. The first was moved by Senator Jesse Marquette and seconded by Senator Green. It read as follows: "The Executive Committee is directed to meet with President Ruebel to discuss the status of and potential remedies for the alleged hiring irregularities noted in the Faculty Senate Resolutions of December 7 and 14, and January 19." Senator Marquette said that he thought that given the amount of effort this body had put into the question of these hiring irregularities and the recent transition in administration, it would be a very good idea for the Executive Committee and the new administration to formally get together and discuss how to handle these issues. This was certainly in the spirit of what we had been through the last several months and was a good idea in order to have a clear understanding of exactly how things were going to be resolved.

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

Senator Green moved acceptance of the second resolution and Senator Marquette seconded this. It read as follows: "Given the need for stability at The University of Akron, the Faculty Senate urges President Ruebel to approach the search for the next president with caution and deliberation. Specifically, we recommend that: 1) a search committee be appointed in the fall of 1996; 2) the search committee spend the 1996-97 academic year developing a job description for the next President and preparing the search; 3) the search committee begin the search no earlier than the fall of 1997, with the goal of hiring a new President, if possible, by the fall of 1998."

Senator Green reminded the body that at the last meeting of the Board of Trustees, there had been a resolution put forward by the Board to start a search committee which had raised some

confusion both in the community and on the University campus. Given that this body might not meet again this semester, it seemed to be a prudent time to offer its advice on the matter of the search. Briefly, the advice that this resolution offered was three-fold. First, since the Board had committed itself to the formation of a search committee, it recommended that this be carried out expeditiously and be in place by the fall of this year. Secondly, it recommended that the search committee be charged with spending the 96-97 academic year developing a job description for the President and preparing for the search. There was certainly no reason to hurry into a search, and it would be a good idea to lay the ground work, plow the field, and all those other agricultural metaphors that applied to this particular problem. Thirdly, it recommended that the committee be charged to begin a search in earnest in the fall of 1997 with the goal of hiring a President possibly for the fall of 1998.

Since there was no discussion, the body voted its approval of the second resolution with one abstention.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Jerry Drummond, the Chair, presented the report of the Committee (Appendix C). There were two items to present to the body. The first was the question of health benefits for part-time faculty. The Committee did not yet have the full report of a consultant, Peat Marwick, but Mr. Marwick had asked the three insurance providers who served the University - Kaiser, Hometown, and Mutual Health Services - to consider the possibility of covering part-time employees. Three proposals had been received. Mutual Health Services had required that there would be medical underwriting as a condition for participation (some applicants could be refused coverage due to medical history) and also wanted some subsidy from the University. Hometown, if the sole provider, required a 50% participation rate of eligible employees plus a 50% subsidy of the premiums by the University. Kaiser-Permanente did not have any required participation level and did not require any medical underwriting.

Senator Drummond went on to say that Mr James Cosgarea, a member of the Committee who represented the part-time faculty, had followed through on this with the health benefits office. There would be no premium costs to the University since, essentially, the part-time faculty member would be responsible for the premium. The University would probably only incur some charges for processing the forms and so on. Therefore, the Committee recommended that the University move to allow purchase of health care for part-time faculty under the plan provided by Kaiser-Permanente. The Committee also wanted to credit Mr. Cosgarea, the benefits administration staff, and Mrs. Desnay Lohrum for following this through. It was a decent plan and was about 1/3 savings off the open market plan.

Senator John Hebert wanted to know what this would imply financially on the part of the University. Senator Drummond responded that the premiums were not subsidized whatsoever. Eligible part-time faculty would be responsible for the entire cost of the plan. Eligibility, by the way, would require employment that current semester as well as one of the previous three semesters. The only cost to the University would be processing forms through Desnay Lohrum's office. Because this was a community-based health plan, that is the whole community that Kaiser-Permanente served (not just the University community), the University would be relatively free from any impact if the part-time faculty had a lot of expensive claims. Apparently, about 50% of the

part-time employees would satisfy the eligibility requirements. Desnay Lohrum was very comfortable with this plan and had said that if the University was going to do this, this was the time and the appropriate plan.

Senator Ruth Clinefelter, supporting the plan, said this was the second time that the Faculty Well-Being Committee had introduced and passed the idea of health benefits for part-time faculty. In fact, this body's predecessor, University Council, had also passed it and there had been some bitterness over the years from part-time faculty that the University never did go ahead with it. It was certainly time that we did so.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate approved the Committee's recommendation.

Continuing his report, Senator Drummond stated that the Committee had also been charged with investigating why the University had failed to permit withdrawal of STRS funds by part-time faculty under special circumstances. The main question appeared to be whether or not there was a link between STRS withdrawal and a possible claim for unemployment compensation. Mike Sermersheim, in the office of General Counsel, had talked with the Committee. He was aware that some other universities were allowing this. However, his main problem was that should a part-time faculty member want to withdraw funds from STRS, the University Controller had to sign a statement saying that the part-time faculty member had no reasonable reassurance of employment the following semester. There had been a recent ruling by the State of Ohio Unemployment Compensation Board of Review that had denied unemployment compensation over the summer to a part-time faculty member at this University due to the fact that the person had "a reasonable assurance of employment in instructional capacity in the next academic year term." What concerned the General Counsel was the similarity of language in the two situations. He understood that they would rather not test it. The language was similar enough that they believed if the form were signed and then brought up with the Unemployment Bureau, it could possibly cause the University financial problems dealing with the unemployment. The Committee had not yet discussed all of this. Did the Senate wish it to continue to look into the matter? The General Counsel's view was that if these people wanted to take out their STRS for an emergency, he would like to have them do that. He just did not want to have the University culpable for the resulting unemployment.

Senator Peggy Richards wanted the Committee to continue to pursue this and get it nailed down in some way. There was an inconsistency between the universities as to whether or not part-time faculty could withdraw their STRS. The original case which had brought this to the Senate's attention last September had resulted in one person who had over 20 years of service with the University leaving its employment because she was told the only way she could have the money was to resign from the University, even though she was not assured of a position in the fall. Senator Richards then moved that the Faculty Well-Being Committee continue to investigate the matter of STRS withdrawal by part-time faculty, and this was seconded by Senator Paul Fowler.

There was no discussion of this motion, and the Senate voted its approval with one abstention.

GRADUATE COUNCIL - (Appendix D)

ACADEMIC POLICIES, CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Assistant Provost Graham Kelly, the Chair, first presented one curriculum item, BA-96-05 (Amended), from the College of Business to amend mathematics requirements. The proposal had passed Institutional Research review, had been approved by the Provost's office, and had the unanimous support of the Curriculum Subcommittee. There was no need for Senate action; this was presented for the body's information.

The second item on the report (**Appendix E**) which Senators had been sent was a motion regarding a by-law change which had not yet been presented to the full APCC. Therefore, it could not yet be presented to this body but it might be at a future meeting.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Drummond, the Chair, presented the report of the Committee. (See **Appendix F**). The Committee had been charged with looking at campus maintenance, and it had started to discuss the issue. There was apparently a report which was being prepared on the status of maintenance crews. The Committee did not yet have a copy, but this would be the first topic of discussion in the fall. He next reported that the University had made \$3,162.09 on recycling paper. Also, the Committee had received a classroom survey regarding priorities of dealing with renovations of some classrooms, and it would be working on that in the fall. The Committee had not yet taken up the item of looking at a campus building to go off-line, but Senator Buchthal humorously had suggested that the Committee report that it had voted to take Kolbe off-line. Also, the campus master plan being developed by the Sasaski & Assoc. people had been proceeding. Senators who were interested could come to his office and read that voluminous document.

Senator Drummond then presented five actions which the Committee was recommending to the Senate. The first was space for Criminal Justice Technology in the Polsky Building. There was a substantial need for space for training seminars, etc., and the program had requested that they be allowed to convert open space in the Polsky Building for classroom use. The space was now being used as a lounge and informal study area. The dean and division chair responsible for the program were in favor of the proposal, and the Committee unanimously recommended the request. The second was a request to take Room 2 in the Buckingham Center, currently assigned to Minority Affairs, and exchange it for Room 6 - Room 6 was now a dedicated classroom. If Minority Affairs were moved to it, it would have contiguous space. The room currently assigned to Minority Affairs (Room 2) would then become a classroom; it was larger than the present classroom so no classroom space would be lost. The Committee unanimously recommended this change also.

The third recommendation regarded the continued use of JAR 151 by the Office of Admissions. This was needed for meetings with prospective students. The Office of Admissions wanted to use the room until 1998-99 which would be ostensibly when the new Student Services Building would be finished. They had offered to schedule some classes in GSC to offset the loss of the classroom space in JAR 151, so the Committee also recommended approval of this. The fourth recommendation was that Student Affairs be assigned the area in Gallucci Hall now being occupied by the Crystal Room. The Honors Program did not object to this, and the space would be used as a general purpose meeting room, an informal study area, and an expansion of the convenience store already located in Gallucci. The Committee recommended this with the proviso that the meeting room could be scheduled for classroom use when it was not specified for any other use. The last recommendation was that the College of Business Administration be allowed to occupy the second

floor of the Broadway Building. This would occur after Human Resources had moved to the Polsky Building. The college needed space for student study and for offices for student organizations. This space was not suitable for classrooms. Since no one else wanted the space and because of its proximity to the CBA, the Committee recommended that the CBA's request be approved.

The Chairman asked for discussion of the five recommendations from the Committee. In regard to the first recommendation, Senator Paul John wanted to know which lounge and informal study area in Polsky's would be converted to a classroom. When Senator Drummond said that it was on the second floor outside of Room 223, Senator John wondered what the cost would be and who would be paying. Senator Drummond replied that there was no listing as to cost, but furniture from North Hall would be moved over. He had the impression that the cost would be taken from college funds.

Senator John then moved to separate consideration of recommendation one from the other four, and this was seconded. There was no objection to this. The Senate then first considered the last four recommendations. Since there was no discussion, it voted its approval of the four. The Chairman then returned to recommendation one.

Senator John objected to this recommendation because he had been unaware of it and believed that it had never been brought before the C&T faculty. He thought that it should be brought before the C&T faculty for discussion since it appeared that college budget money was possibly going to fund it. He moved to defer the Senate's discussion of this until its first meeting in the fall so that the C&T faculty would have the opportunity to discuss the renovation. This was seconded by Senator Carol Gigliotti.

The Chairman asked Senator Drummond whether there had been any indication of the urgency of this renovation. Senator Drummond replied that the rationale for the renovation had been that Criminal Justice Technology needed space for their criminal management class, their advanced police officer training seminars, police academy training, etc. So there was a substantial use for this, but he did not know how urgent the need was. The Committee had approved this because it was a substantial program that was growing and needed space. He had no idea whether or not the request had first been presented before C&T.

When Senator Kenneth Siloac noted that since there was a paucity of study areas on campus, it might be a good idea for C&T to look at this again, Senator Drummond answered that the Committee had been told that this was not a heavily used study area. The only thing that was to be heard from this area was laughter.

Senator John commented that this was because C&T made learning fun and this was why their students were always so happy. He had no objection to the spirit of this recommendation, but he did object to the fact that the C&T faculty had not been made aware of this. Given budget restraints and his own program battling for money, he wanted more familiarity with what was going on before proceeding.

Senator Fowler understood from what had been said in the CFPC meeting that there was some urgency in doing this by fall because of some shift in the police academy. He was not sure what it

was all about, but all of the furniture was going to come from a different location, and walling off the space would basically mean one wall with a door in it.

Senator Marquette wanted to speak against the motion. If there was a communications problem in the C&T College, this was something which its faculty and dean needed to resolve. He was not sure that when a division chair, a dean, and the relevant committees had approved this and made a recommendation to the Senate, it was a good idea to derail it. Since the objection was not to the activity but to the lack of communication, he was not sure that it was appropriate for the Senate to interject itself into that kind of discussion.

Senator C. Gigliotti did not object to the program getting space, but she was familiar with the area under discussion and it was an area where students did congregate on a regular basis. She would hate to see that area taken away. The building had an awful lot of space in it. Perhaps they could use some other space. The interaction which the students had in that area, whether it was studying, talking or laughing was important.

Senator Clinefelter observed that Polsky's was supposed to be essentially a classroom building, yet the University was continually moving offices into it.

Senator Buchthal wondered whether Senator John would be willing to amend his motion to say that this would be deferred until the Senate's next meeting in June since, if there were some resolution by then, there would still be a chance that the classroom could be provided by the fall.

Senator John replied that he would not be willing because he doubted that the C&T faculty would have time to meet and discuss this before next fall. He reiterated that he did not object to the spirit of the recommendation, but he wanted to know whether or not a real analysis of the space use had been made.

Senator Marquette once again wanted to object to the motion. This was not an appropriate action for the Senate. There had been much discussion of micromanagement lately. Although the fact that this had not been discussed with the C&T faculty was a problem, he did not believe that it was appropriate for this body to decide whether or not to derail the idea of reassigning a classroom. It was not the proper role of the body to modify the recommendation at this level on these grounds.

Senator Joseph Padovan disagreed with Senator Marquette. The College of Engineering had just gone through two management shifts and lost something on the order of 11,000 sq. ft. of space. This had happened because of rampant misinformation. He understood the problem of getting a program running, but it was the responsibility of the dean of a given unit to make sure that everyone in that unit was clear on what they were doing. He couldn't help but think that this was where the problem was with C&T. He was favor of the motion in the context that until all parties involved in the college were clear on what was happening, it could not be voted on in the Senate. This was the responsibility of the dean.

Senator Nicholas Ranson stated that although this was unusual, he was rising to speak in support of Senator Padovan. His major reason for so doing was that he would be very loathe indeed to close down and turn over for another usage any space where clear and unambiguous laughter had been identified.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the motion to defer.

There were two last items which Senator Drummond wished to discuss with the body. The first was a request for space in Crouse Hall for the Geology Department. Geology was in need of space for labs and faculty offices in Crouse Hall. However, the Committee did not want to reassign classroom space, and the office space in the building was helping the College of Education. Both of the units had been termed by space utilization to need the space that they had requested or already had. In order to fulfill the needs in the best possible way, the Committee had unanimously recommended that Geology be permitted to convert 660 sq. ft. of classroom space in Crouse Hall to offices and labs contingent upon the replacement of classroom space at some other location on campus. The Committee was not sure where that would be, but it wanted to put this through so that Geology would know that it was hunting for the space. The same situation pertained for the School of Social Work. It was in need of space and its original request had been for Rooms 408 and 410 in the Polsky Building. However, C&T had noted that it would have need for these rooms. The Committee supported the School of Social Work getting some space and would be searching for this space as well. He did not know whether this required any action of the Senate, but he wanted those units to know that this was not on the back burner and the Committee was looking for that space.

The Chairman thought this would not require any motion on the part of the Senate. The Committee, by its very nature, was empowered to seek such space.

Senator Carole Newman, as one of the members of the College of Education who used classroom space in Crouse Hall, said that finding other classroom space on campus to replace what would be lost in Crouse was not really satisfactory for them. People from the College of Education were "bag people" who dragged their stuff across campus. When one taught a methods course, one had to bring materials which were used in delivering instruction in elementary and secondary levels. There was not nearly enough classroom space within Zook Hall. Crouse was the closest building which they could access. It was a real hardship to be assigned classes in JAR, or Polsky's, or Schrank because it was physically impossible to schlep all the stuff everywhere they went. She hoped that the needs of Education would be considered, since an even swap of Crouse's classroom space for space elsewhere really would not be satisfactory.

Senator John wanted the Committee to be aware of a proposed move which would affect a number of different programs. Polymer Science needed more space and was shoving Biomedical Engineering out of Olson. They in turn wanted the fourth floor of Schrank Hall North, and that was the location of his program - drafting/computer drafting. He had not found out about it until after Plans A,B, and C had been discussed. He and his colleagues had met with Dr. Graham Kelly and discussed their objections to this, but he did not know whether the Committee had been made aware of any of this rumbling.

Senator Drummond replied that the Committee knew that rumblings were going on, but it had not received any routing form or anything else about the matter. Senator John said that he would make sure that the Committee did receive the appropriate information.

REFERENCE COMMITTEE - Senator Green reported for the Committee. (See Appendix G). Since there were no objections, it was decided to take up its recommendations now although two of

them were already listed under "Unfinished Business." The first item was an amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws to give Senatorial representation to the Staff Employees Advisory Committee. It would amend Section VII(B) and read as follows: "5. The Staff Employees Advisory Committee shall elect two Senators from its membership." This had been presented at the last meeting and it was now appropriate to discuss and vote on the matter. Senator David Brink noted that to make everything neat and tidy there should also be an addition to Section F, Elections of the Bylaws which would read: "6. Conduct of nomination and election to the Senate from staff employees will be the responsibility of the Staff Employees Advisory Committee." Senator Green accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Senator Hebert asked who other than faculty was represented in the Faculty Senate. The Chairman replied there were students, both undergraduate and graduate, contract professionals, and part-time faculty representatives. Adding Staff representation would give the body its last logical constituency. There might be others, but he could not think of any. Senator Richards proposed professor emeriti as an additional constituency.

Senator Hebert thought that perhaps the body should consider a name change because it seemed that it was going back to being University Council without administrators.

Senator Richards said it was for that reason that she wanted to speak against the motion. Staff members perhaps could be better served if they had a position on the University Well-Being Committee. This would give them a chance to have representation in University functions where almost everybody else had an elected representative. When this body had been University Council, its representation had been heavily weighted in administrative positions. Another concern which she had with this motion was that it had not set any qualifications as to what level the staff representatives would come from.

The Chairman asked Mr. James Wallace, the Chair of the Shared Governance Council whether he wished to speak. He asked permission, which the body granted.

Mr. Wallace said that the Shared Governance Council understood that the granting of staff representation on the Senate would probably be the end of the Shared Governance Council. When the time came he wanted to speak to that issue, but the Council did see that the staff had a vested interest in things that went on in the Senate and therefore did have a right to be involved in certain decisions. One thing which the Council had discussed was putting limitations on what issues staff representatives could have a vote. Staff making academic decisions might be offensive to some members of the Faculty Senate. Perhaps the staff could be limited to being allowed to vote on policy decisions concerning health benefits, tuition increases, and raises. This was what he had been asked to convey to the Senate by the Shared Governance Council.

In light of Mr. Wallace's comments, Senator Oller moved to add an additional sentence at the end of the motion which would read, "These staff representatives shall vote on all Senate matters except those pertaining to academics and the curriculum." This was seconded.

Senator Buchthal asked for clarification regarding what staff were being represented here. The Chairman said that on the basis of the language of the motion, the representatives would be coming from SEAC so it would be anyone who qualified for membership to that body. He did not know

what those qualifications would be and asked whether there was anyone from SEAC in attendance who could answer the question. Mrs. Holly Mothes replied that SEAC represented the full-time non-bargaining unit staff, classified and nonclassified, both here and at Wayne.

Senator Richard Gigliotti spoke against the motion. He was in favor of the staff having their needs fairly represented within the University, but he would feel more comfortable if the Senate insured that staff representation would be on the committees that eventually fed into the Senate because then their views could be fully heard at the point where it was relevant. It would be very awkward to have members of this body who were restricted from voting on certain issues.

Senator Marquette thought that it might be a little confusing, but he was willing to put up with it. In the past, he had spoken against adding additional representation beyond full-time faculty. He thought that on academic and curriculum matters these positions should be non-voting. Frequently there were serious disagreements on these matters, and it was not appropriate for staff to vote on them. He did not think contract professionals or students should be voting on them either, but he was not willing to amend this amendment.

Senator Ranson said that if the body did approve staff representation he saw no real way in all honesty to limit them to certain functions. There were either members in toto or they were not members. It had to be one way or the other.

Senator R. Gigliotti asked for clarification regarding SEAC. Since the language of the motion said that the representatives would be elected from SEAC's membership, ~~how large was that committee?~~ When Mrs. Mothes answered that there were nine members, Senator Gigliotti wanted to know how they were chosen. Mrs. Mothes replied that they were elected from the total classified and non-classified non-union staff. They were nominated by staff members, and then a ballot was sent out and everyone voted on them. In answer to Senator Richards' question about union representation, Mrs. Mothes answered that they were represented by collective bargaining. (12)

Senator Carmen Keener said that as a student representative she felt privileged to have a vote in the body. There were times when she was not quite sure what was being voted on, but then she would look around and see that many of the faculty representatives were not sure either. She thought that it would be moot and a token membership to give staff representation but without full voting rights. For this reason, she was against the motion.

The Chairman reminded the body that Senator Oller's amendment permitted the SEAC representatives to vote on all matters except those pertaining to academic issues and curriculum.

Senator Hebert, finding himself in the awkward position of agreeing with Senator Ranson on an issue, thought that if the body decided there should be representation, it should not be limited. The other non-faculty representatives were not limited, so these should not be either.

Senator John called the question. There was no objection, but Senator Ranson asked that the amendment be read one more time. After Senator Oller obliged, the Senate voted and the amendment to the original motion was defeated.

Senator Padovan commented that there were many constituencies in the University and the Senate was going to have to face the fact that they all would want representation on this body. What we now had was a House of Representatives; it was no longer the Senate of the faculty. There were now 8 representatives for outside constituencies out of roughly 70 Senate members. He could envision the union staff soon asking for representation. He would rather see the whole process deferred until the Executive Committee really evaluated what constituencies we wanted in the Senate. This would be better than doing it in a piece-meal fashion.

Senator Green responded that the Reference Committee had considered these questions, and he wanted to answer on their behalf. He began with some historical background. The term "Senate" was a term of convenience to describe a shared governance structure which would represent the different constituencies primarily of the faculty from the degree-granting colleges. It had evolved out of the University Council which had represented constituencies in a different way and which had included a large number of administrators. The principal objection to University Council had been that powerful administrators sat on the same body with representatives of the faculty, and this had led to unfortunate results. When the Senate had been created, those non-administrative constituencies which had been on University Council were grandfathered into the Senate. The only constituency that did not receive Senate representation was staff employees. This was because they reported to a thing called the Shared Governance Council. He would defer to others but what had been presented to the Reference Committee was that the Shared Governance Council did not work and its purpose was unclear. If we were going to have bodies that represented important constituencies, it seemed to him that all important constituencies should be represented. This was why the Reference Committee had agreed that it would be appropriate to include this last constituency.

Senator Richards wanted to know whether Senator Green had spoken with any members of the Shared Governance Council. Senator Green replied that he personally had not, but other members of the Committee had. It was the Committee's strong sense that it was not a successful body, but it would be prepared to hear alternative points of view.

The Chairman asked Mr. Wallace whether he would care to respond. Mr. Wallace said that he had a few points to make. First of all, when the Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance had originally presented its proposal to the University Council, it was simply for a Faculty Senate with full-time faculty membership. Part-time faculty and other group representation were added in at the last moment. There had been no attempt to exclude anyone. As for groups not being carried forward into the new body, he believed that deans had had representation on University Council and no longer did here.

Mr. Wallace went on to discuss his second point regarding the Shared Governance Council not working. That body had never really known what it was supposed to do. When it was first constructed, it was left alone to figure out what its purview might be. However, when it tried and came forward with something that it wanted to do, it was told that it couldn't do it. When it came forward with something else, it was told that the General Counsel would have to look at that, and a year later it still had not heard from that office. This had happened several times. On one occasion, former President Elliott had drawn a graph, which Ron McDonald still had, which put the Council in between the Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees as a sort of reference committee. The Council had been moved to a number of locations on campus, and it had received no financial support. It

had never been given any real guidance as to its mission. In effect, it became a leftover of what had been an original concept that had been presented to University Council but had been so drastically altered in the end that no one knew what to do with it. When he had spoken to the NCA the other day, one of things that he had suggested was that the University needed a body like the Council. It needed a place where everybody had an equal voice and where 15 people could sit down for an hour and discuss what was going on and perhaps get more information than they could through normal administrative channels. Perhaps the Shared Governance Council was not the right body to do this, but the Faculty Senate needed to consider what it should do to give guidance to another body which could fulfill that function.

Senator Hebert said that he wanted to support the motion, although if the body were starting from scratch he would not, because he wanted to see a Faculty Senate consisting of faculty. Given where we were now, the most expeditious, prudent thing to do was to bring the staff into this body and give them a voice since this body had in a sense replaced what had been University Council. He still suggested that the body consider changing its name.

Senator Marquette concurred that when the Faculty Senate had been created the first proposal had been for a Senate restricted specifically to the faculty. He personally still felt that was what should have been created, but it was not. Therefore he agreed with Senator Hebert and thought that the staff representatives should be added. However, this should not be done without killing the Shared Governance Council. The whole idea of the Council had been basically one of those camels that had gotten created in order to assuage some hurt feelings. Even if staff employees were included in the Faculty Senate, it should still remain a faculty senate in name because it was dominated by the faculty. This was something that we should never let out of our sight.

Senator Clinefelter agreed with Senator Marquette's points about the background of the Senate's creation but also wanted to note that the emeriti faculty who had representation on the University Council had been left out of the Senate.

Senator Siloac commented that President Ruebel was planning to announce a reorganization of the University. Mr. Wallace had spoken about the problem of a governance structure which no one had heeded. It might well be that the President would want to give some consideration to a Shared Governance Council. In fact, it might be that this body should defer discussion of these two issues until there had been some counsel from the President and he moved this which was seconded by Senator Virginia Gunn.

President Ruebel said he would have his reorganization plan ready by the middle of June. The question of the Shared Governance Council and the confusion regarding its mission was one of the concerns of the North Central although not a serious one. Although this was an oversimplification, the major thrust of this body should be to make recommendations to the President dealing with things that went on to the Board of Trustees for the legislation of the institution. He would be considering all of this in his reorganization.

Senator Green said that all of the motions which the Reference Committee had been presenting had one central purpose and that was to simplify the shared governance structure. Our experience over the last several years had shown that the initial shared governance procedures under which we had been operating were too complicated. All of these motions were to simplify things. This would

fit well with whatever reorganization President Ruebel might be considering. Whatever that reorganization might be, it would certainly work better with a simpler structure. Assuming that these first two recommendations, staff representation and the abolishment of SGC, were passed by the body, the next recommendation to be presented from the Reference Committee would urge that the BPCC and LRPC be combined and reconstituted as one University committee to simplify the procedure further. Therefore, he wanted to speak against Senator Siloac's motion. There was a time to wait and a time to act; it seemed to him that this was the moment to act. The Senate had a lot of experience with the present system and realized that it was too complicated. That was the reality and it was important to represent all the important constituencies and find a way to develop these recommendations for the President in as expeditious a fashion as possible.

Senator Devinder Malhotra wanted to share his confusion and seek a clarification. Was it correct that the Committee had looked at these proposals as a package? If that was the case, why were they being presented separately? There was the possibility that the first would be passed but not the second, and in that case the objective would not be gained.

The Chairman reminded the body that it was discussing Senator Siloac's motion to defer which included both recommendations one and two.

Senator Marquette opposed the motion. It was important to do this now and simplify these things. Basically, the Shared Governance Council was a bad idea from the beginning, and he would argue strongly against the idea that there should be any place on this campus where the staff, contract professionals and everybody sat down as an equal body with the faculty. The faculty was the core of the institution, and he did not believe that it was appropriate to adopt any kind of procedure where each of these other groups in some excess of democracy would now be able to have an equal voice with the faculty. That was inappropriate. We were creating a body that had representation from these other groups, but they were not supposed to be equally weighted with the faculty. That was totally in opposition to what the academy ought to be about and certainly what the Senate ought to be about.

Senator Gunn was in favor of the delay because there had just been a transition in terms of government at the top. The new President had been on duty less than two weeks, and the body should have time to listen to his recommendations. None of us knew exactly how things should be rearranged. We had gone for three years under this system; a few more weeks while the head of the University made some recommendations to which the body could respond would not hurt anything. She felt quite strongly about this and also thought there was a need for some kind of shared governance where everybody who made this University work had a chance to interchange ideas and feed that on to the Executive level.

The Chairman observed that if the Senate were to approve the entire package, it would go to the President and could in fact be sent back to the body.

Following up on the Chairman's observation, Senator William Rich pointed out that it was this body which made recommendations to the President and not the other way around. If this body thought that the situation should be resolved in the way that the Reference Committee was proposing, that was what it should say. That would not guarantee that it would happen, but it would

be the Senate's recommendation to the President who could consider it and ultimately do as he determined best. Therefore, he was speaking against the motion.

Senator Hebert called for the question, and since there was no objection, the body voted by voice and the Chair held that the motion had failed. Senator Siloac asked for a division of the house, and the motion failed by a vote of 12-26.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted on recommendation one from the Reference Committee, and it passed by a vote of 28-11.

Senator Green then introduced the second recommendation with a rationale which read as follows: "The Faculty Senate requests that the Board of Trustees abolish the Shared Governance Council and replace it with the amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws granting the Staff Employees two Senators. Rationale: With the granting of Senatorial representation to the Staff Employees, all University constituencies will be represented in the Senate. Under such circumstances, the Shared Governance Council will be superfluous." The rationale had been added at the suggestion of several members of the Committee so that when this went on to the President and the Board, some sort of explanation as to why the Senate would like this to take place would be available.

The Chairman stated that he had a letter which had been given to him by Mr. Henry Netting from Mrs. Sophie Kus-Patena, Chair of the Contract Professionals Advisory Committee. Since it pertained to this issue, with the indulgence of the body he wanted to read it aloud. The letter read as follows: "I understand at today's meeting the Faculty Senate will be proposing to eliminate the Shared Governance Council. As you are aware, the purpose of the Shared Governance Council is to provide a forum for discussion on issues of importance to the members of the campus community and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate or appropriate planning committee regarding these issues. This is a unique group since it is composed of various constituents representing the campus community, such as part-time faculty, students, Diversity Council and contract professionals. It has an equal distribution of membership and does not represent the majority of one group. This unique mix of members provides for open and honest discussions and dialogue. If possible, we ask that Faculty Senate consider continuing the concept of shared governance; if not as it presently exists, as perhaps an advisory body to the President. However, if this is not a possibility, then we ask the Faculty Senate to make an attempt to either appoint a contract professional (if one is not elected) to available Senate committees. I truly believe that an effective team approach is one that involves all participants regardless of status or rank. These teams create more involvement, ownership and new ideas to solve existing problems. We ask the Faculty Senate to please reconsider disbanding the Shared Governance Council at this time. Thank you for your consideration in this matter."

Senator R. Gigliotti wanted to speak in favor of the motion. An individual who worked in his department had been a member of the Council from its beginning, and every time she returned to the office after attending a Council meeting would report to him that the members had done nothing, did not know why they were there, had no real charge and even if they did, did not know to whom they were supposed to report. He felt sorry for her because she thought she had to attend those meetings but would always come back saying the same things.

Mr. Wallace reiterated that the Council had received no charge. With no clear mission, it was very difficult to move forward. He believed the person from Sociology who was consistently at meetings was contributing to discussions. It was a forum for open discussion. The concept of shared governance was a valid one. Certainly it was important that in the end the Faculty Senate should be making decisions, but to say that staff, contract professionals, part-time faculty or students should not have equal say at some point as an advisory group was elitism. He and Dr. Marquette had argued about this for two years in the Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance, and it was not going to change.

Senator Rich thought it was important that members of various constituencies be able to get together and talk about issues, and it was probably important to have some opportunity to do that in a forum that was not so heavily dominated by faculty. His concern about the Shared Governance Council was that it was not within the Faculty Senate structure but apart from it. It was either just a fifth wheel which was what it had been, or it potentially represented a counterweight to the Faculty Senate to be used by a higher level administrator as a way of justifying not paying enough attention to the Faculty Senate. He proposed as a solution that the Senate do as the Reference Committee recommended and eliminate the Shared Governance Council, but once all these groups were represented within the Faculty Senate that there be a caucus of constituencies that served at least most of the intended and desirable purposes of the Shared Governance Council. But that would be a body within this body; they might confer with each other and come up with ideas, formulate joint positions, whatever, and present them to this body. Ultimately, this should be the governance body with representation from those groups, but since most of the decisions were related to academics, it should be primarily a faculty body.

Senator Clinefelter, as a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance, remembered that when that committee had been considering what should be under the new governance, it had been told that the President was used to working with a Faculty Senate, a shared governance group and Diversity Council. She agreed that people needed to be represented and have a place to talk and discuss things. She was not sure that the original structure with the other two groups - Senate, Shared Governance, Diversity - had worked out. For example, she had heard nothing lately from the Diversity Council. Originally, an elaborate committee system had been attached to this to link the different groups. She thought it was time to make a fresh start because the original structure did not seem to have worked out.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the recommendation 2 from the Reference Committee.

Senator Green then presented the remaining new package of amendments to the Senate Bylaws being recommended by the Committee. Since they were amendments to the Bylaws, the body could not vote on them today, but he wanted to explain them. These amendments had come from the Committee at the request of the Senate regarding the combining of planning and budget into a single committee. The Committee had already been sent a motion brought from the College of Education by Senator Barbara Moss to alter the membership of the LRPC. The Committee had put these two things together and the result was the package of motions which the body had before it. Recommendation III created in the section of the Bylaws that delineated University committees a new University committee called the Planning and Budgeting Committee which essentially combined the functions of the LRPC and BPCC. Recommendations IV and V merely altered other

aspects of the Bylaws to be consistent with the changes in recommendation III. Recommendation VI was not an amendment but a resolution which asked the President to request of the Board of Trustees to abolish the LRPC and BPCC as separate bodies.

Senator Green went on to explain what the new Planning and Budget Committee would do as outlined in the subsections of recommendation III. Item no. 1 explained the function of the Committee which basically was to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate which the Senate would act upon and pass on to the President having to do with planning and budgeting. Item no. 2 described the membership which read as follows: "The membership of the Planning and Budgeting Committee will be as follows: one member of the Board of Trustees elected by the Board, the President, the Provost, the Vice-President of Business and Finance, one dean elected by the Council of Deans and one Faculty Senator from each of the constituencies that elect Faculty Senators..." Some colleagues had just spoken very eloquently about how there was a need for one place in the University where everybody was represented equally; this body would do that. The membership as proposed here was basically the same as the combined membership on the LRPC and BPCC except for one dean instead of three.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson wanted to offer an amendment to section III.D.5 of the recommendation which at the moment read as follows: "The committee may form subcommittees as per the Faculty Senate Bylaws, with the proviso that the Chair or Vice Chair of any subcommittee be elected from among the senatorial members of the subcommittee." She had talked to members of the LRPC and BPCC who had told her that much of the work of those committees had been done in the subcommittees. Unfortunately, there had not been enough people to get all the serious and important tasks done expeditiously. She was concerned that by combining the two committees into one, there would be even fewer people to do all of the work that would be required in the subcommittees. For this reason she moved to amend III.D.5 as follows: "The committee may form subcommittees as per the Faculty Senate Bylaws with the proviso that the Chair or Vice-Chair be elected from among elected senatorial members of the subcommittee. THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MAY APPOINT EXTRA MEMBERS, SENATE OR NON-SENATE, TO THOSE SUBCOMMITTEES AT SUBCOMMITTEE REQUEST. APPOINTED MEMBERS WILL HAVE VOTING PRIVILEGES ONLY IN THE SUBCOMMITTEE." This was seconded by Senator Tim Norfolk.

Senator Erickson pointed out that this amendment would deal with some of the questions regarding the work load of the committee as well as questions arising out of the loss of hard-won expertise. There were faculty members on LRPC and BPCC who had worked very hard. For example, Arts and Sciences had Senators Marquette and Midha on those two committees, and in the proposed new combined committee with one member from each unit, only one of those individuals would be able to serve. It would be a shame to lose the expertise of the other, and appointment to a subcommittee would be a way of retaining it. This was a method which we used for choosing non-Senate members of the Senate committees such as the Libraries Committee on which she served. Those non-Senators could vote in the committees; the added members of the subcommittee who were not members of the full Planning and Budget Committee would be able to vote only in the subcommittee on which they served. This would help get the work done.

Senator Buchthal thought that it would be appropriate to lay both the Reference Committees recommendations and Senator Erickson's amendment over until the next meeting so that they could

be published in the Chronicle and members had a chance to look them over and comment. Therefore, he moved to defer consideration of both until the next meeting, and this was seconded by Senator Chand Midha.

Since there was no discussion, the body voted its approval of the motion to defer.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE - (Appendix H)

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Marquette, Vice-Chair, reported that the Committee would be working on structuring a simplified planning calendar for the coming year. This was the primary issue it needed to deal with as it prepared its discussions of the University's resources.

developmental
BUDGET AND PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE - Senator Midha, the Vice-Chair, reported that the Committee had met on April 29 and passed a motion based on a recommendation from CCTC regarding the allocation of \$378,500 of the reserved technology funds. It read as follows: "The BPCC recommends allocating \$378,500 of the reserved technology funds to be distributed among the colleges in accordance with the recommendation of the CCTC contained in CCTC Chairman David Witt's memorandum of January 12, 1996. It is recommended that each college receive an amount equal to the number of its regular, full-time faculty members multiplied by \$500. These funds may be expended only for computing and communication technology. Each college receiving these funds is responsible for achieving the goal of item I.A.2.a of the CCTC Five-Year Plan by the end of the five-year replacement cycle specified in the Plan: a network connection, and a personal computer work station that meets the University's minimum standard, for each regular, full-time faculty member. Subject to these conditions, it is recommended that the Deans be granted discretion to determine their respective colleges' priorities and to allocate the funds accordingly." He added that Provost Moore, Chair of the Committee, had been asked to investigate certain other academic units which might not have regular, full-time faculty like ~~governmental~~ programs and similar other ones as to whether they should be included for this allocation also.

Senator Clinefelter asked whether or not requests for classroom services were included in this. Senator Midha responded that to the best of his knowledge this was another area being investigated by the Provost's office.

Senator Rich added that if he understood Senator Clinefelter's question correctly, the money could be used for putting computing and communications technology into the classrooms. Over the course of five years the colleges were required to achieve the goal of the 5-year plan. Since many colleges had already gone at least part of the way using their own funds, they could choose to use some of the money for the classrooms.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted and endorsed BPCC's recommendation.

Senator Midha also wanted to report on the issue which had been raised at the March 6 meeting regarding budget revisions without the consideration of the BPCC and the Senate. He had received a memo from President Ruebel dated April 10. In this memo the President essentially implied that the situation had arisen because of special circumstances and a lack of communication. He had

assured Senator Midha that in the future if any changes were to be made, that communication would be relayed to the Provost, the Chair of BPCC, and he in turn would inform BPCC members and the Senate. Senator Midha said that he would happy to share this letter with anyone who wished to see it.

Senator Midha also stated that the Committee was supposed to discuss the recommendation from the part-time faculty regarding benefits and the different levels. Because of the sudden resignation of Leslie Wagner in the Provost's office, all of the material necessary for that discussion was not available so it had been postponed. A report on this from Senator Fowler had been disseminated today to Senators for informational purposes and perhaps it could be discussed at the body's next meeting.

Senator Fowler asked the body to send him any comments on that report in the next month. He would happy to look at them and perhaps revise or rewrite part of the report, if necessary, so as not to waste time in the Senate.

Senator William Taggart believed that BPCC was to look into the question of reallocating funds to compensate C&T for assuming some of the university advising duties. Had it had a chance to look at that issue yet?

Senator Midha replied that unfortunately because of a lack of communication, the Committee had been unable to get all of data from the Vice-President of Finance and therefore had not gotten into the reallocation issue at all. It was his intention to pass this on either to next year's BPCC or the new Planning and Budget Committee.

GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - (Appendix I)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman stated that the two items of unfinished business had been dealt with during the Reference Committee's report. The only one remaining was the Interim Stipend Policy which was now open for discussion. (See Appendix J).

Senator Newman said that the proposed policy had generated a great deal of interest in her college, and she wanted to share with the body some of the things with which her colleagues were concerned. There were several concerns with item b) regarding overloads not being considered unless there were regular classroom loads for faculty members. This would penalize the doctoral faculty. There was no way of working with doctoral students if that eliminated faculty from overload consideration. It was also a disincentive for junior faculty who in her college had three hours of time for research and writing to help them move along the tenure track. Also, there were a number of people who had student administrative duties, and with the college's shrinking constituency, those duties had to be assumed by somebody. This also had a potential for adversely affecting some the programs due to the loss of utilization of expertise when a faculty member who had alternative load would be precluded from assuming some the necessary assignments because they would have to bring their load up to 12 hours before even being considered for doing an overload.

Senator Newman went on to say that her college was going to be offering masters degree courses at Wayne, but this policy would eliminate a number of full-time faculty from being involved in this. There was also a concern about item a) which seemed to require rather excessive explanations from the dean as to why the overload assignment was necessary and how it addressed the mission of the unit. Also, there was a question about item e) "differences between course unit credit and load must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President." Did that include those courses which extended beyond the 12 hours? It was the perception of the faculty member asking the question that we should teach only 12 credit hours a semester, no more, no less.

Senator Hebert reported that this policy had been discussed at a faculty meeting of the CBA and the same concerns which Senator Newman had just raised were brought up. The recommendation from the CBA was to leave this issue to the deans and just have some sort of mechanism by which they reported all this to the Provost. The Provost would have oversight, but the deans would have discretion in terms of overload and stipend-type policy.

Senator Malhotra said that he had been a member of the Provost's Stipend Overload Committee and would try to answer some of the concerns expressed by Senators Newman and Hebert. In regard to item b), the objective here was that to be a full-time faculty member one had to have 12 hours per semester of load which could be distributed in various ways. For example, if you were instructing doctoral students, you would get some release time for that, or in some departments you would get release time for research. If a faculty member received release time from classroom instruction or whatever activity, whether instructing doctoral students or research, that faculty member should not be able sell the same release time back to the University and get paid for it for classroom instruction. This was why item b) was put into the policy. In regard to the issue of leaving it up to the deans, former Provost David Jamison had been concerned that the overload policies were widely different in different colleges and thought that there should be some uniformity where certain guidelines could be developed. Since there was a work load policy at the levels of the University, the college, and the department, there should also be an overload policy at those levels as well. There should also be a sufficient amount of flexibility so that each dean might be able to address unique circumstances in their own colleges in consultation with the Provost's office.

Senator Adele Webb reported for the College of Nursing which was also concerned about item e). Her college had courses which had heavy clinical components where the instructor was out in a hospital for eight hours at a time. Almost all of their undergraduate courses had a difference between credit and load. The college did have a workload policy that had been approved by the Provost in 1994, but this reopened it again. She moved an amendment to item e) which read as follows: "Differences between each college's approved work load and the requested overload must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President and Provost." This was seconded.

Senator Buchthal was concerned that the last known University work load policy with which he was familiar had been put forth by former Provost Noel Leathers with the infamous summer formula and how you weighed teaching versus research hours. It contained statements like no overload could be paid if someone received assigned time for research or administrative duties. As far as he knew, that policy had never been superseded. However, it appeared that new deans had come who were not familiar with that load policy or in order to get around it, used the infamous stipend instead of paying overloads. He had heard of instances in which faculty members who had received course reductions for being members of this body then turned around and received

overload pay for teaching the course for which they had received the reduction. If that was the case, then there were abuses here. This was an interim policy to get something in place; it was not written in stone. On the other hand, he was not sure that Provost Moore was bound by former Provost Leathers' load policy, but maybe he was. None of the provosts after Leathers - Marini, Ruebel, Auburn, Jamison - saw fit to change it. Maybe this was something which we now needed to debate, but in the meantime he was willing to support this interim policy until next fall when APCC would present a draft of a permanent one.

Senator Monica Harrison wanted to speak to the concerns of the Wayne faculty regarding the policy, but the Chairman asked her to wait until after the body had dealt with Senator Webb's amendment.

Senator Green moved that the body postpone discussion of both the amendment and the policy until the next Senate meeting, and this was seconded by Senator Midha.

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

VII. NEW BUSINESS - There was none.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - There was no discussion.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - Senator Harrison wanted to know which Senators should attend the June meeting, the present members or those who had just been elected. The Chairman answered that this Senate did not end until the first meeting of the new academic year when the fourth Senate of The University of Akron would be convened. The short answer to her question was the present membership. There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded. The body voted its approval and the meeting ended at 5:15 p.m.

APPENDIX A

Report of Faculty Advisory Committee to the Ohio Board of Regents

The Faculty Advisory Committee to the Ohio Board of Regents met on Wednesday, May 22, 1996. Discussion focused primarily on (1) the technology plan currently being developed for the Board of Regents and (2) a proposal to tie the funding of the public law schools to the mean undergraduate grade-point averages of their entering classes.

On the subject of the information technology plan, various members of the Faculty Advisory Committee expressed the following concerns: First, enhanced technology, including distance-learning technology, will not reduce the need for faculty, as some of its proponents apparently suppose, and therefore it should not be expected that investments in technology can be funded by cuts in academic personnel. Second, the primary focus of the technology plan should be on technology as a tool for enhancing teaching and research. Third, technology cannot replace human contact without significant diminution of the quality of education. And fourth, technology can be expected to expand the possibilities and enable improvements in the quality of teaching and research, but is unlikely to reduce the level of investment required for higher education.

On the subject of tying law school funding to the mean undergraduate grade-point averages of their entering classes, the Committee adopted the following resolution at my urging: "The Faculty Advisory Committee opposes the Board of Regents' adoption of any policy that ties funding levels to an institution's admissions criteria, such as the mean undergraduate grade-point average of the entering class of a professional or graduate program." The Committee concluded that such a policy would create a powerful incentive for professional or graduate programs to rely excessively on a single admissions criterion to the detriment of both the quality and the diversity of the student body.

Finally, it was announced that drafts of several planning documents are now available for review on the Board of Regents' World Wide Web site, which is located at "<http://www.bor.gov/>". These include both the draft master plan and the draft technology plan. The Board of Regents staff invites comments on those documents. Comments on the master plan should be sent to Howard Gauthier (e-mail: gauthier@summit.bor.ohio.gov) by early August. Paper copies of these documents have been sent to the presidents and provosts of the state universities.

Respectfully submitted by
William Rich, Representative to Faculty Advisory
Committee to the Ohio Board of Regents

APPENDIX B

Report of Executive Committee

FACULTY SENATE BUDGET STATEMENT

March 31, 1996

	<u>YTD Budget</u>	<u>YTD Actual</u>
Total Compensation	\$21,466.70	\$21,637.58
Supplies and Services	74,161.35	7,571.34
Other, total	3,153.60	1,428.16
 ACCOUNT TOTALS	 \$98,781.65	 \$30,637.08

Respectfully submitted by
David Brink, Vice Chair

APPENDIX C

Report of University Well-Being Committee

The Committee met on March 28, 1996, and other business was conducted by polling individual members on specific items.

The topic of health benefits for part-time faculty has been considered. The study on this is complete and although the full report of the consultant (Peat Marwick) has not been given to this Committee, the three providers presently serving the University (Kaiser, Hometown and Blue Cross/Mutual Health Services) were asked to consider the possibility of extending coverage to a portion of the part-time employees at the University. The outcome of this process has been the receipt of three proposals by these providers that will allow the part-time employees to purchase a health care plan. Mutual Health Services has stated that they would require medical underwriting as a condition for participation (i.e., some applicants could be refused coverage due to medical history) and likely some subsidy of the premiums by the University. The Hometown proposal included the requirement of a 50% subsidy of the premiums by the University and would expect 50% participation of eligible employees if they are the sole provider of the part-time option. Kaiser does not have any required participation levels and will not require any medical underwriting or University subsidy. Mr. James Cosgarea, a member of the University Well-Being Committee representing part-time faculty, has followed the development of this plan and believes it to be a good choice for the part-time employees who would qualify. Since no premium cost will be borne by the University with the Kaiser plan (we will process some forms, etc), and since the cost to the part-time faculty member will be substantially lower than the cost of health care on the open market, the Committee recommends that the University moves to allow the purchase of health care by part-time faculty under the plan provided by Kaiser Permanente. The staff in Benefits Administration deserves credit for going ahead with the study and finding a suitable plan.

Bill Taggart has chased down some information on the present level of satisfaction with our health-care providers and found that, while there are some instances of dissatisfaction, there is not a groundswell of discontent. At this time, 77% of those covered have chosen Mutual Health Services (73% @ the 90% level, 1% @ the 80% level, 3% @ the 70% level), 14% the Hometown Medical Plan (HMO), and 9% Kaiser Permanente.

As charged by the Senate, the Committee has looked into the refusal of the University to permit part-time faculty to withdraw funds from STRS under special circumstances. Specifically, we aimed to determine whether or not there is a position statement from Unemployment Services on this issue, if the problems of The University of Akron are in the area of new claims, appeals, or successful claims, if other schools are experiencing claims due to an STRS link and if we should seek to get a ruling on the situation from Unemployment Services. The main question appears to be if there is or is not a definite link between STRS withdrawal and the claim for unemployment compensation. Michael Sermersheim in the Office of General Counsel of the University has said that their office is aware that CSU will allow part-time faculty to withdraw STRS funds in the summer if they do not sign an employment document in the spring. KSU states that they allow withdrawal of funds if the teacher leaves or retires but they believe that successive withdrawals will be flagged. The main problem as seen by General Counsel is that in order to be able to withdraw funds from the STRS account, the

University Controller must sign a statement that the part-time faculty member has no reasonable assurance of employment in the following semester. A recent ruling by the State of Ohio Unemployment Compensation Board of Review denied unemployment compensation over the summer to a part-time faculty member at this University due to the fact that the person had a "reasonable assurance of employment in an instructional capacity in the next academic year or term." The similar language seems to lend credence that STRS withdrawal and claims for unemployment compensation could go hand-in-hand.

Roetzel and Andress reports that in 1995, nineteen instructors at The University of Akron applied for unemployment benefits over the Summer or over Christmas break even though they had a reasonable assurance of employment in the next term. Because of the cost of paying claims or contesting them, the General Counsel's office does not want to open any possible loophole that would further impose costs on the University. The Committee has not had time to discuss all of these items thoroughly, but we do want to know the wishes of the Senate on whether or not we should continue to pursue information that could reconcile the two parties.

Respectfully submitted by
Jerry Drummond, Chair

APPENDIX D

Report of Graduate Council

The Graduate Council met five times since the Fall 1995 Graduate Faculty meeting. Regular business of Council was conducted on December 11, 1995, and on January 22, February 26, March 25, and April 22, 1996.

Members of Graduate Council whose terms ended this academic year include Drs. M. Kay Alderman, Paul Kuzdrall, Karen Reed, Diana Reep and T.S. Srivatsan. Additionally, Council member William Miller resigned his position, leaving two years of his three-year term to be filled. The above Council members formed a nominating committee and their nominations are circulating. Official ballots will be distributed on May 6, 1996. At the April 22 meeting, outgoing members of Graduate Council received plaques from the Graduate Dean expressing his appreciation for and commemorating their service on Council.

The Curriculum Committee, chaired by Ted Conway, concluded most of their business during the Fall 1995 semester. However, one tabled curriculum proposal for an applied politics degree program was reconsidered and following a discussion with the proposers, was approved by the committee. The Curriculum Committee reviewed a total of 51 curriculum proposals and approved 49; two curriculum proposals were withdrawn by the respective college.

The Membership Committee, chaired by M. Kay Alderman, approved 80 faculty for new or continuation Graduate Faculty status during Spring 1996. This committee amended and began the approval process for the graduate faculty reciprocity agreement with UA, KSU, CSU and YSU. Additionally, the committee was responsible for the reformatting of the application for full-time regular graduate faculty membership. The Membership Committee completed their year's work with the formulation of a scale of required publications for new faculty hires. That scale will be formalized and presented for graduate faculty review at the Fall 1996 Graduate Faculty meeting.

The Student Policy Committee assisted in revisions to the "Grievance Procedure for Graduate Students." The content of the revisions were approved by Graduate Council and will be presented to the graduate faculty for approval at the Spring 1996 meeting. An issue regarding the acceptance of international three-year baccalaureates was clarified by the committee. The Student Policy Committee found that procedures for acceptance of these degrees exists. They agreed that the procedures are appropriate and should remain in effect without adjustment.

Respectfully submitted by
Karen S. Reed, Vice-Chair

Page 20

APPENDIX E

April 25, 1996

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Graham Kelly, Assistant Provost



RE: Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee;
Report for Faculty Senate Meeting on May 2, 1996

Curriculum Items

(1) BA-96-05 (Amended)

Curriculum proposal BA-96-05 (Amended) is presented for approval by Faculty Senate.

The proposal passed Institutional Research review and has been approved by the Provost.

Unless the proposal is disapproved by the Faculty Senate at its meeting on May 2, 1996, the proposal will become record.

(2) Curriculum Review Process

The following motion is presented for approval by Faculty Senate:

The Curriculum Review Committee recommends a Senate by law change as follows: In order to override a decision of the Curriculum Review Committee, a 2/3 majority vote of the Faculty Senate is required.

Att.: BA-96-05 (Amended)

aid\curr96\fs9605.02



Office of the Dean
College of Business Administration
Akron, OH 44325-4805
216-972-7041



DATE: November 15, 1995

TO: Office of the Provost
Institutional Research Office
Collegiate Deans
Curriculum Review Committee
(or the Curriculum Subcommittee of APCC)

FROM: Dean Stephen F. Hallam
College of Business Administration

RE: Curriculum Proposal No. BA-96-5 (Amended)

The faculty of the College of Business Administration has approved the attached curriculum proposal submitted by the Department of Finance. I am now submitting it for university review.

Any objections to the proposal must be made by December 13, 1995 (4 weeks from the date of submission).

Objections must be reported in writing and copies sent to:

- S. Graham Kelly, Office of the Provost
- Dean of college in which proposal originated
- Chair of department in which proposal originated

If you have any questions or desire clarification of the proposal, please contact the originating department.

Att.

c: Academic Department Chairs (summary page only)
Faculty Senate (summary page only)

CURRICULUM PROPOSAL SUMMARY SHEET**Proposal number:** BA-96-5**Department(s) generating the proposal:** College of Business Administration**Effective date (term/year):** Fall, 1996**Brief summary of proposal:** Change Degree Requirements

Add 3450:289A Math for Business I (3 credits) and 3450:289B Math for Business II (3 credits) as an alternate pre-business math requirement for business degrees.

This proposal includes the following (mark an x by all that apply; you may delete those items which do not apply):

 X Change in degree requirements (list the degree(s) affected and summarize the changes; Program Change Form must accompany proposal)

All baccalaureate degrees in College of Business Administration

Bachelor of Science in Accountancy

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration

Bachelor of Science in Industrial Management

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Finance

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Marketing

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Advertising

Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/International Business

Add 3450:289A Math for Business I (3 credits) and 3450:289B Math for Business II (3 credits) as an alternate pre-business math requirement for business degrees.

*During the phase-in of these courses, students who have completed 3450:145 Algebra (4 credits) may complete 3450:289B Math for Business II to satisfy their requirement.

**Students contemplating and/or committed to going on to graduate school are recommended to complete 3450:215 Concepts of Calculus I also.

Building, would be for a general meeting room, expansion of the convenience store in Gallucci, and for an informal study area. The Honors Program does not object to the assignment of space in this way. The Committee unanimously recommends that the space be assigned to Student Affairs provided that the meeting room may be scheduled as classroom space when it is not used otherwise.

College of Business Administration to Occupy Second Floor of Broadway Building

The college needs space for student study and for offices for student organizations. Since converting the space to classrooms is not economically feasible, because of the proximity to the CBA building, and since there are apparently no other entities attracted to this space, the Committee unanimously recommended that the CBA request be approved. The change would not occur until Human Resources moves to the Polsky Building.

Request for Space in Crouse Hall for Department of Geology

Geology is in need of space for labs and faculty offices in Crouse Hall. The problems are that the Committee does not want to reassign classroom space in the University and that the other office space in the building is held by the College of Education which, according to Space Utilization, needs to retain the space they have. In order to fulfill the needs of all parties in the best possible manner, the Committee unanimously recommended that Geology be permitted to convert 660 ft² of classroom space in Crouse Hall to offices and labs. This is contingent on replacement of the classroom space at some location on campus.

Request for Space in the Polsky Building From the School of Social Work

Due to an increase in full-time faculty as well as an increase in outside funding, the School of Social Work has requested space in the Polsky Building. Their original request was for rooms 408 and 410, but C&T has noted that these rooms are slated for future training labs for their college. The Committee unanimously recommends support for the School of Social Work in its search for space and will seek a solution that will not infringe on the Community and Technical College.

The Committee received a Classroom Survey from Jeff Ryan that itemizes renovation needs for a number of classrooms on campus. The Committee has been asked to make comments on this list which essentially sets priorities for the rooms most in need of work. Funds for this work will likely be taken from plant funds.

The Committee has not yet taken up the possibility of taking a building off-line for the purpose of cost savings. This will be held over to the Fall.

The work on the Campus Master Plan is proceeding with some slowing of the process due to the recent administrative changes. If anyone wants to see the document as it now stands, please feel free to call the Chair of the CFPC.

APPENDIX G

TO ALL FACULTY SENATORS: PLEASE REVIEW THE FOLLOWING AND BRING WITH YOU TO THE SENATE MEETING ON THURS., MAY 2:

Reference Committee motions to amend the Faculty Senate Bylaws and to recommend additional changes.

I. Amend Section VII(B) (Apportionment') of the Faculty Senate Bylaws to include the following language:

5. The Staff Employees Advisory Committee shall elect two Senators from its membership.

II. The Faculty Senate requests that the Board of Trustees abolish the Share Governance Council, and replace it with the amendment to the Faculty Senate Bylaws granting the Staff Employees two Senators.

Rationale: With the granting of Senatorial representation to the Staff Employees, all University constituencies will be represented in the Senate. Under such circumstances, the Shared Governance Council will be superfluous.

III. Amend Section IV (University Committees') of the Faculty Senate Bylaws to include the following language:

D. Planning and Budgeting Committee

1. The Planning and Budgeting Committee is the University Committee charged with making recommendations to the Faculty senate regarding all aspects of University planning and budgeting. The committee has four principal responsibilities:

a. To make recommendations regarding the University planning and budgeting calendar, which will specify the timing and process for the development of the official University plan and budget, and forward these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action in a timely fashion.

b. To develop recommendations for the University planning assumptions, and forward these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action in a timely fashion, consistent with the University planning and budgeting

calendar. Included under planning assumptions is the official mission statement of the University.

c. Assemble recommendations for the University plan from the relevant college, department and unit plans, and forward these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action in a timely fashion, consistent with the University planning and budgeting calendar.

d. Propose recommendations for the University budget based upon the relevant college, department, and unit budget proposals and coordinated with the University plan, and forward these recommendations to the Faculty Senate for action in a timely fashion, consistent with the University planning and budgeting calendar.

2. The membership of the Planning and Budgeting Committee will be as follows: one member of the Board of Trustees elected by the Board, the President, the Provost, the Vice-President of Business and Finance, one dean elected by the Council of Deans, and one Faculty Senator from each of the constituencies that elect faculty Senators (all constituencies listed in Section VII(B) of the Faculty Senate Bylaws).

3. The Senators from each constituency will elect a representative to the committee from among its elected Senators prior to the September meeting of the Faculty Senate each academic year.

4. The President will serve as Chair of the committee, and the Vice Chair will be elected by the committee from among its Senatorial members. A meeting of the committee may be called at the request of a majority of the committee.

5. The committee may form subcommittees as per the Faculty Senate Bylaws, with the proviso that the Chair or Vice Chair of any subcommittee be elected from among the Senatorial members of the subcommittee.

6. The Vice Chair of the committee will report to the Senate at regularly scheduled Senate meetings. The Vice Chair will present to the Senate the committee's recommendations regarding the planning and budgeting calendar, planning assumptions, the University plan, and the University budget, consistent with the planning and budgeting calendar. The Vice Chair will also regularly report to the full committee on the actions and comments of the Senate.

7. The Faculty Senate will act on the committee's recommendations regarding the planning and budgeting calendar, planning assumptions, the University plan, and the University budget calendars in a timely fashion, consistent with the planning and budgeting calendar.

8. All of the committees' recommendations to the Senate will be subject to debate and amendment as per the Faculty Senate Bylaws. The Senate may: 1) approve the recommendations as proposed and forward them to the President; 2) amend and approve the recommendations and forward them to the President; or 3) refer the recommendations back to the committee for clarification and

revision. Should the Senate refer recommendations back to the committee that pertain to the planning and budget calendar, University planning assumptions, the University plan, or the University budget, the committee will bring revised and clarified recommendations back to the Senate at a time designated by the Senate.

IV. Amend Section I ("Duties") to replace A through E with:

A. To review, debate and act upon the recommendations of the Planning and Budgeting Committee with regard to the planning and budgeting calendar, University planning assumptions, the University plan, and the University budget, and forward the resulting recommendations to the President.

Redesignate the remaining lettered items in Section I in alphabetical order.

V. Delete Section VII(G) and (H) (Election of members of the Long Range Planning, and Budget and Planning Coordinating Committee).

VI. The Faculty Senate requests that the Board of Trustees abolish the Long Range Planning Committee, and the Budget and Planning Coordinating Committee, and replace them with the amendments to the Senate Bylaws creating a Planning and Budgeting Committee as a University committee.

Rationale: With the creation of the Planning and Budgeting Committee, the planning and budgeting process will be simplified in a way that represents all University constituencies and includes the relevant administrative personnel. Under such circumstances, the Long Range Planning Committee and the Budget and Planning Coordinating Committee will be superfluous.

VII. Pending the adoption at the September 1996 Senate meeting of the amendments to the Faculty Senate Bylaws creating the Planning and Budgeting Committee, the Executive Committee is directed to appoint a "Temporary Planning and Budgeting Committee," to approximate as closely as possible the future membership of the Planning and Budgeting Committee. This committee will cease to exist at the September 1996 Senate meeting.

May 2, 1996

Page 41

grant applications had returned (after playing catch-up as a result of the government shut-down) to the normal two-week turnaround time.

D.Vukovich thanked the committee members for their dedication and commitment and expressed the hope that all would choose to continue with the committee next year.

Respectfully submitted by
Diane Vukovich, Chair

APPENDIX I

Report of General Education Advisory Committee

At its February 15, 1996, meeting GEAC voted to accept a revision to the Physical Education Exemption Policy requested by the Department of Physical and Health Education. The new policy reads:

"All students are required to meet the physical education requirement of the general education program. Exemptions may be given for (1) a military veteran, (2) physical education majors (5550), and (3) for demonstrated medical or psychological reasons as certified by a physician and approved by the Dean of University College on a case-by-case basis."

This revision ends the previous policy of exempting students over the age of 25 from the physical education requirement. It will take effect for students entering the University in Fall, 1996.

At its March 14, 1996, meeting the Committee accepted additional courses to include as options to meet the General Education Physical Education requirement. These will broaden the choices students have to meet the requirement. Some of the courses require physical activity while others focus on issues of personal health/wellness, nutrition, first aid, etc. In addition to the already accepted physical education courses, the following courses will meet the General Education Physical Education requirement:

May 2, 1996

Page 42

5550:150	Concepts of Health and Fitness	3 cr.
5550:194	Sports Officiating	2 cr.
5500:211	First Aid and Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation	2 cr.
5570:101	Personal Health	2 cr.
7400:133	Nutrition Fundamentals	3 cr.
7400:490	Workshop in Home Economics: Stress Mgmt.	1 cr.
7900:119/120	Introduction to Modern Dance I	2 cr.
7900:124/125	Introduction to Ballet I/II	2 cr.
7900:130/230	Introduction to Jazz Dance I/II	2 cr.
7900:144	Introduction to Tap Technique	2 cr.

Respectfully submitted by
Dudley Turner, Chair

APPENDIX J

Motion to adopt the Interim Policy on Stipends and Overload and direct the Policy subcommittee of APCC to draft a permanent policy for consideration at the Senate's October 1996 meeting.

3359-11-x Interim Policy on Stipends and Overload

Stipends are to be granted for primarily administrative functions requiring substantial increases in responsibility and for activities not included in the ordinary load of teaching, research and professional service for full time faculty. Overloads are to be used to relieve temporary shortages in the availability of teaching faculty. Responsibility for approving and administering stipends and overload requests vests with the Senior Vice President and Provost. Budget responsibility vests with the unit making the request.

- a) Requests for stipends or overload must include a rationale for the stipend or overload. A stipend request must indicate the specific responsibilities or activities for which the stipend is compensation. An overload request must indicate how the request is responsive to the teaching mission needs of the unit. All requests for stipends or overload must identify the funding source.
- b) Overload will not ordinarily be awarded unless the faculty member receiving the overload is already teaching 12 credits of classroom or laboratory instruction in the semester for which overload is requested.
- c) Overload of more than 3 load hours per semester will not ordinarily be approved.
- d) Stipends will ordinarily conform with compensation ranges established and published by the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- e) Differences between course credit and load must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- f) No stipends or overload will ordinarily be granted for service activities.
- g) The above are intended to provide guidance for the regulation of stipends and overload in most circumstances; in critical or exceptional cases, units may appeal to the Senior Vice President and Provost for approval of stipends and overload not conforming to these guidelines. Such appeals must be made in writing and approved by the Senior Vice President and Provost prior to offering the stipend or overload compensation.