

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

6-13-1996

Faculty Senate Chronicle June 13, 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.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of June 13, 1996	1
Appendices to Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of June 13, 1996	16
A. Report of <i>Executive Committee</i>	16
B. Report of <i>Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee</i>	18
C. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	19
D. Report of <i>Research Faculty Projects Committee</i>	20
E. Report of <i>General Education Advisory Committee</i>	22
F. Interim Policy on Stipends and Overload	24
G. Planning and Budgeting Committee (Final approved version)	25

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 SPECIAL FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF JUNE 13, 1996

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, June 13, 1996, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Thirty-five of the fifty-six members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Clements, DePaul, Echols, Green, Griffin, John, Keener, Kimmell, Redle, Rich, Ross-Alaolmolki, Sibberson, Smith, Stinner, Webb and Wright were absent with notice. Senators Frederick, Padovan, Ranson, Siloac and Stuyvesant were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED A RECOMMENDATION AND RESOLUTION FROM
CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE**
- * APPROVED AN INTERIM POLICY ON OVERLOADS AND STIPENDS
ALONG WITH A DIRECTIVE TO POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE OF
APCC TO HAVE PROPOSAL FOR PERMANENT POLICY FOR
THE SENATE'S OCTOBER MEETING**
- * APPROVED A PROPOSAL TO MERGE LRPC AND BPCC AND CREATE
A NEW PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE**
- * APPROVED A MOTION TO CARRY OVER UNFINISHED BUSINESS
FROM THIS SENATE TO NEXT YEAR'S SENATE**
- * DEFEATED A MOTION TO RESCIND A DECISION MADE AT MAY 11
MEETING REGARDING SPACE ALLOCATION AT POLSKY BUILDING**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman asked whether there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda. Since there were none, the Senate voted its approval of the agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF APRIL 11 AND MAY 2 - Secretary Gary H. Oller said that he had no corrections to the April 11 minutes but had two for the May 2nd. On page 19 at the end of the paragraph relating to the BPCC report, the line which began "governmental programs..." should read "developmental programs..." On page 12 in the fourth full paragraph beginning "Senator R. Gigliotti asked for clarification regarding SEAC," in answer to his question, it was stated that there were nine members of SEAC. After the meeting it was noted that the correct number is actually twelve.

Since there were no other corrections, the body approved the amended minutes.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman stated that his remarks would be extremely brief. There was business to wrap up from the academic year, but he hoped that the Senate did not make a habit of having business slop over into the summer. However, the items to be considered today were fairly important, and he begged the body's indulgence.

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. First, let me express my gratitude to the Senate for the cooperation I have received since returning to the campus on April 1st. I want you to know that I truly appreciate it. It hasn't been real mind-boggling, but let me tell you that I've been busy and I don't expect anything special for that. But I'm helping everyone from so-and-so's brother-in-law to get more financial aid to helping Aunt Tillie get a job and so on. This is one of the benefits of having everyone know you. Let me make a few points for the Senate. First, I'm recommending that Dr. Randy Moore continue as Senior Vice President and Provost and I would like for Dr. Moore to continue in this position as long as I'm in the position as the President because I do feel that we need stability in these two offices, and Dr. Moore has agreed to do this. Therefore, I will take this to the Board of Trustees at the next meeting because I do feel it's very important that we stabilize that particular position and because through the reorganization, this particular office is going to take on many more responsibilities.

Speaking of the reorganization, I will take this to the Board Committee a week from Monday and then to the Board for approval on the 25th. We will start implementing the reorganization on July 1. Now this doesn't mean that on July 1 everything's going to change, because it will not. What we're going to do is ease into the reorganization, and the last office that will be completely reorganized will be that of the Senior Vice President and Provost because that will be the largest area. But in the area of the Chief Financial Officer for instance, there will be some changes that we will start implementing right away. One that comes to mind is that we will have the majority of the auxiliaries that report now in the area of Student Affairs to report to the Vice President for Finance because I feel, not that I don't trust anyone, that the money person should handle the money. So we will start implementing that right away on July 1. The preparation of the 1996-97 budget has proceeded as outlined in May; however, I am asking the Board to defer the salary increases to be retroactive until August. Now let me tell you why - I simply have not had time to look at all of them. So the salary increases will be coming through; you won't get them until August but it will be retroactive back to July. The part-time health insurance will be on the June Board agenda, and I would anticipate that this will go through without any problem.

A final note - I'm gathering data right now from the finance office and also demographic data as far as the ERIP is concerned which will include the ages of the people retiring in the last window, the departments they're coming from and so on, because where I'm at in my thinking right now and if all the data indicates that we would be sound in doing this, is that I'm in a position to recommend

to the Board of Trustees that we extend the ERIP one more window. The reason for this is and logic would tell us that this would happen - the first window did not fill up, the second window was just about full and the third window we're got a real brain drain on the institution. I know that many of the people retiring who are looking at the last window would not take the last window if there were another one. I feel that the Board of Trustees will go along with this; however, I have to get all the demographics in order and the ERIP program has not hurt us financially at all, but I want to make sure that we protect all the academic programs. As it looks right now from reviewing the numbers, I don't want to lose that many people all at once in the last one. So if we could spread this out over two more years, it makes more sense to me."

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Provost Randy Moore apologized for being late but noted that it was a long way from Buchtel Hall, even though some of it was downhill - in many ways. He wanted to tell the body about one thing which the Council of Deans in conjunction with the Faculty Senate would be working on over the summer and early fall. This was better lines of communication between the two groups. For a long time the two bodies had been operating independently. There would be a proposal coming from the Senate that would go to the President, and the Council of Deans might or might not see that. The Council of Deans would come up with a recommendation that would go to the President, and this group might or might not see it. In some cases it was perfectly reasonable for some of these proposals not to be seen by the other group since they might have no interest in them. He was going to be working with some of the Executive Committee and others to come up with some kind of system or program so that the groups could help each other out, both from the faculty standpoint (this group) as well as some evil administrators' standpoints (his office). Rather than ending up with opposing or alternate recommendations, the two groups could talk, educate each other and possibly come up with one recommendation that everyone could benefit from. He had already met with Senators Jesse Marquette and John Green; he would be continuing to meet with them and others over the summer to develop this. It was in everyone's best interest to do this and have the two groups communicate more.

Secondly, he noted that for the past eight or nine months while Interim Provost, he had been clinging to the position of Dean of Arts and Sciences as a fall-back. President Ruebel had asked him to stay on as Interim Senior Vice President and Provost, and he had agreed to remain in the position for two years. During that time he did not want to leave Arts and Sciences with his shadow over it. Therefore, that college would be starting a search for a new dean in the fall. He concluded by stating that he would be willing to take questions.

REPORT OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - See Appendix A.

REPORT OF FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - See Appendix B.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - (Appendix C) Senator Jerry Drummond, Chair, reported that the Committee had met on June 12 regarding a special matter. This was an item which had been brought up at the May 2 meeting relating to the space that was to be found for the Department of Geology. The proposal at that time had been to convert 660 sq. ft of classroom space in Crouse Hall to offices and labs which the Geology Dept. needed. There had been an objection from the College of Education because they needed to have classroom space fairly close to Zook and the center of campus.

Asst. Provost Graham Kelly appeared to have a solution to this, and the Committee had voted on it yesterday. The proposal was to reallocate Crouse 319 to the Dept. of Geology beginning Summer II, 1996. This was currently a general purpose classroom rated for 44 students. It was also recommended that Carroll 50A be reallocated to become a general purpose classroom. It was currently the Photography Studio and upon renovation it was expected to be rated for at least 45 students. The Photography Studio would be moved to Carroll Hall 58. This room was part of University Media Productions and its availability had been confirmed by the College of Fine and Applied Arts. The College of Education had no objections to this, and the College of Fine and Applied Arts appeared to have satisfied all interested parties. An additional benefit was that Crouse 209, which had been allocated for temporary storage to the Dept. of Geology, was going to be returned to classroom use. The Committee had voted unanimously that this recommendation be forwarded to the Senate.

The Chairman stated that this recommendation was now before the body for discussion.

Senator Carole Newman wanted to thank the Committee for taking the needs of the College of Education into consideration.

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

Senator Drummond also wanted to present a resolution which he had reworded slightly and hoped would meet with the Committee's approval. It read as follows: "The Faculty Senate wishes to reemphasize our need to retain classroom space on campus and to oppose, in general, conversion of classroom space to other use. We would also propose that the future work at the Polsky Building put the construction of classrooms at a high priority. We propose that the 5th-floor space originally planned for a conference center be designed such that rooms are also designed to be used as quality classrooms."

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

Senator David Hoover had a question for Senator Drummond. This was in regard to the Criminal Justice proposal which had been discussed in the Senate last month regarding the construction of a new wall in the Polsky Building. That had been deferred to the fall meeting. Was there some way to get that moving just a little quicker?

Senator Drummond acknowledged that he had received a memo from Senator Hoover about this but the Committee had not talked about it.

The Chairman commented that if the CFPC was unable to bring this forward, Senator Hoover could bring it up as an item of new business later in the meeting.

Senator David Buchthal reminded the body that at the last meeting when this issue had come up he had asked the proposer to move discussion of the matter to this meeting so that there would be a chance to get something done before fall. The proposer had refused to modify his proposal and therefore it was put on the agenda for next fall. Therefore, the CFPC had not handled this yesterday at its meeting because of the Faculty Senate's resolution.

REPORT OF RESEARCH FACULTY PROJECTS COMMITTEE - See Appendix D.

REPORT OF BUDGET PLANNING AND COORDINATION COMMITTEE - Senator Chand Midha, Vice-Chair, reminded the body that at the last meeting he had mentioned that the BPCC had approved the recommendation of CCTC that \$378,500 be spent on reserve technology funds according to their proposal. He had forgotten to mention at that time that BPCC also had approved that \$150,000 should be set aside for one-time for a media arcade for the library. He had also received a note from Provost Moore that another \$158,000 from the technology money be set aside for our on-line catalogue. He had discussed this with Provost Moore who had previously talked about it with Dean Williams. This recommendation had been sent to President Ruebel.

Senator Midha also reminded the Senate of the report presented by Senator Paul Fowler on compensation and benefits of part-time faculty to the BPCC. The Committee had not yet had time to discuss it, but copies had been sent to the Senate for informational purposes. He asked Senator Fowler whether he had received any comments from the faculty regarding this report.

Senator Fowler said he had not received any comments from faculty but that he had gotten a few from some of the institutions which his sub-committee had surveyed. Essentially what this sub-committee had done was put together a small survey to gain some information as to what some of our sister institutions were doing across the Mid-Atlantic Conference and across Ohio schools with respect to part-time faculty. What it had found was that The University of Akron was somewhat behind in the treatment of part-time faculty, not only in compensation but in semester versus annual contracts, for instance. There were other institutions which offered benefits. A couple paid 50%; a few institutions paid 75% of the benefits of the part-time faculty who were under annual contracts. What the sub-committee was proposing was nothing new. The 3-tier proposal had been batted about since 1992. There was one correction which needed to be made to page 5 of the report. The first level of the tier under benefits would be identical to the second level under benefits - "The option to purchase a specified selection of benefits, a faculty member would pay 100%."

REPORT OF GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - (Appendix E)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman said that the first item of unfinished business was the interim policy on stipends and overload. The body had been discussing section e) which read: "Differences between course credit and load must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President and Provost." Senator Adele Webb had offered an amendment to that section which read: "Differences between each college's approved workload and the requested overload must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President and Provost." This discussion could now be continued.

Senator Buchthal wondered whether any college had received an approved workload from a Provost in the last 15 years. He asked President Ruebel whether any college had submitted any change to the Leathers' workload policy to him for approval when he had been Provost.

President Ruebel replied that the last load policy he remembered was the one drawn up by Jack Watt and Noel Leathers, and all of the colleges had lived within that policy.

Senator Buchthal said if that was all that we had, we seemed to be arguing here about nothing. If there had been no change since the early one, what difference did it make?

Senator Devinder Malhotra, who had been a member of the stipend overload committee, wanted to know exactly what the Leathers' policy was. Obviously, different colleges had been acting very differently with regard to overload and stipends. There was no uniformity and no procedure by which prior approval was to be sought. There may have been a policy, but his impression was that it was not adhered to very well.

President Ruebel stated that if you were not on the graduate faculty, your load was 24 hrs. a year, 12 per semester. If you were on graduate faculty and had 2 active Ph.D. students, your load was 9 hrs. per semester. If you taught at least one Ph.D. level course and had at least two active Ph.D. level students, your load was reduced by 3 hrs. also. At the end of each semester there was a uniform load report that would come from each college through the dean's office to the Provost's office, and this was where the overload was calculated. There was a limit of something like 6 hrs. per year.

Senator Buchthal added that if you had assigned time for research or administration, you were not eligible to get overload pay for teaching until you had taught the full load. Also, if you were on an external grant, you were not allowed to have overload pay either.

Senator Malhotra thanked the President for that clarification. Based on the information which the stipend overload committee had reviewed, the policy just described had been violated often. People had overloads that went much beyond 6 hrs., and people had overloads who were reassigned or given other activities.

Senator Oller asked whether there was someone from the College of Nursing who could explain the intent behind the amendment.

Senator Dorothy Dobrindt thought that what was being objected to was that their course hours did not equate to lecture hours. If they had a five credit course, that did not mean there were five lecture hours. The College had a heavy clinical component; it had so many load hours for a certain number of clinical hours, a certain number of learning resource hours. This amendment was just to clarify that; it had nothing to do with the overload per se.

Senator Newman said that the College of Education had some question about the overload. Not unlike other colleges, ERIP had taken a large number of people out of their ranks. As a part of the college's urban mission, it was attempting to expand its program, both on and off campus. Like everyone else, they were being asked to do more with less. In the college, doctoral load people did teach 9 credit hrs. As it stood right now, there seemed to be a disincentive for working with doctoral students because then you could not get involved in some of these other programs which might be exciting and fruitful for the University unless you were, in essence, doing it as a volunteer. There also seemed to be an implication that working with doctoral students was not teaching, when, in fact, it might be some of the hardest teaching to do. Faculty in her college who were on doctoral load were working with fairly large numbers of students (9 to 11). She had four people writing right now. Her colleagues' concern was that if you had to be in the classroom for 12 hours and there was no other way to get an overload, then you were being dissuaded from being a part of some of these growth

opportunities which the college had. It was also sending a message that perhaps working with doctoral students was not where one should be spending one's time.

The Chairman noted that this was not germane to the discussion of the amendment to section e), but Senator Newman should hold the thought.

President Ruebel said that if there was a feeling going through the faculty that there was a disincentive to working with Ph.D. students, we had big trouble. He urged the Senate to come up with some kind of policy because this was not the direction in which he wanted this institution to go.

The Chairman asked the body to focus for the moment on item under discussion - the amendment to section e). Senator John Hebert asked for a clarification of the wording of the amendment. Did it mean that if one was teaching what was considered a full load in one's college, then one would be eligible for overload?

The Chairman answered that this was not the case. In the original proposal, item e) read: "Differences between course credit and load must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President and Provost." He interpreted that to mean that if one was receiving two load hrs. for what was listed in the bulletin as a 1-credit hr. course, one would need the Provost's approval to receive those two credit hours. The proposed change which was presently on the floor was to change the language to read: "Differences between each college's approved work load and the requested overload must receive prior approval from the Senior Vice President and Provost." It did seem that "overload" was the wrong word to use here. It seemed that the word should be "load." Would the mover accept that as a friendly amendment?

Since Senator Webb was not in attendance, the amendment to change "overload" to "load" was moved by Senator Virginia Gunn and seconded by Senator Buchthal.

There was no discussion and the Senate voted its approval. The Chairman thought the intent was that if you had gotten prior approval for something, you did not have to go back every time it was done. Since there was no further discussion, the body voted on the change in language to section e) and it was approved.

Continuing to discuss the main motion, Senator Malhotra wanted to clarify some of the Committee's work in regard to the issues that had been raised in discussion previously. What the body had before it was a resolution asking approval of an interim policy. Presumably, at some point there would be a committee of either this body or at the University level which would be formed to create a permanent policy. In regard to section b), there were two issues being raised. One was, what kind of release time should one get for different activities? That was part of the work load policy, whereas here all one was suggesting was that if you indeed got release time for an activity, then you should not be in a position to sell back that release time for additional teaching and get compensation for it. There seemed to be some sort of conflict of interest, and this was the intent of section b). It was not there to determine for what activities one should or should not get release time. For example, if the College of Education wanted 3 hrs. for doctoral students and 9 hrs. of teaching, that would be consistent with b) here. The Committee had never addressed any issues as to how colleges should determine their release time from the normal work load.

The Chairman reminded Senator Malhotra that the motion before the body would not only establish an interim policy but also would direct the Policy Subcommittee of APCC to begin work on a permanent policy. Senator Malhotra replied that his point was that there would be time to go back and deal with some of these complex issues while the permanent policy was being worked out.

Senator Hebert wanted to propose an amendment to item b). The current language said that an overload would not ordinarily be awarded unless the faculty member receiving the overload was already teaching 12 credits of classroom or laboratory instruction in the semester for which the overload was requested. He had heard what the arguments were, but he wanted to propose an amendment which read: "The overload will not ordinarily be awarded unless the faculty member receiving the overload was already teaching a full load according to the college work load policy in the semester for which the work load was requested." (This motion was seconded at the end of Senator Hebert's speech.) He gave an example of what he meant here - in the College of Business, if you were doing research, you would teach for 9 hrs and get 3 hrs. of release time. If you were not, you would teach 12 hrs. The College happened to be trying to do some outreach activities by offering classes on Saturday. In the spring he had taught one of these classes, and it was a section of the same course that he was teaching during the semester. He had received an overload for that. So he had taught twelve hours and was still doing his research, but he took exception to the fact that people were saying he was selling back his time to the University. He had not viewed it that way at all. Either a part-time faculty member would have been hired to do that course or a full-time faculty member would have to do it. Actually, what had taken place was that he had less time for other activities. He had been in the process of writing a book, but he did not think he had let down on that and other activities at all. It had made a difference with regard to the other things he did, but it certainly did not make a difference to the extra activity he had with regard to teaching. It had not affected his research because he had agreed to do this as he was already teaching one section of that course and obviously did not have to do other preparation. He thought there were plenty of circumstances where things would benefit the University if the policy were modified so that if you were teaching above and beyond the normal work load, you could do it.

Senator Buchthal was certain that Senator Hebert had worked hard and given full measure for what he had received. However, he thought that the idea of faculty members getting assigned time for research or administration and then taking on additional burdens did not bode well for their research or their efforts or their long-term health or the health of the institution. If there were a college or department where everyone was teaching 15 hrs. on overload, that would indicate that either the unit was woefully understaffed or that maybe the standard load should be 15 hrs. and no one should get overload pay. Once you got into a situation where the majority of people in a unit were teaching 15 hrs., that would become the defacto standard for not only that unit but maybe for the whole campus. Everything ought to be done to limit faculty to 12 hrs., and if that could not be done, it ought to raise a red flag that the unit had to seriously think about whether it could offer everything it proposed with the available resources or it had to think about some major reallocations of resources.

Using an education analogy, Senator Barbara Moss wanted to point out that perhaps the whole class was being punished for the sins of a few individuals. It was really important to keep policies flexible enough that individual colleges could address particular situations. Her situation was similar to an earlier speaker. She had 15 doctoral students at various stages in the process, and she taught a 9 hour load and received 3 hrs. release time. A few years ago she had been asked to go to a school and teach a group of teachers who were working on masters degrees for which she had received overload pay. From that group of teachers, she was able to recruit some doctoral students. Had the college sent out

a person who did not have doctoral level status, it might have been less likely to recruit those students. Also, her stipend for that overload had been calculated on part-time salary. She did not think that punishing everyone or making a policy so rigid that one could not take into account any individual circumstances was wise. Therefore, she was in favor of Senator Hebert's amendment.

Senator Marquette thought that b) right now read in a manner that allowed people to address these issues because it said that overload would not ordinarily be awarded. These matters would go to the Provost if there were an extraordinary request. It did in fact require that there be some place where this was clarified. There had been clear violations of the existing policy, and under those circumstances there was a situation where some of the class did need to be punished. Following the analogy, what this policy was recommending was to refer the issue to the teacher and see whether or not the supposed justification for this overload could be backed up with some reasonable data. It did not say that you could never do this - it said that ordinarily it could not be done, but it would be up to the Provost to decide. Therefore, he opposed the amendment.

The Chairman pointed out that g) did give units the right to appeal to the Provost for approval regarding situations not conforming to these guidelines.

Senator Newman knew there probably had been gross misuse of the policy in a number of cases. However, she was concerned that in her college they were in a crunch situation where in order to deliver services for their students, there were many instances where people were being asked to do things that might not ordinarily be the case. If for every one of these their administrators had to write a justification, she felt that it was not going to happen because it was going to be a time crunch for them. If the College could get justification by explaining the situation it was in and using that to cover a number of situations, it might work. But if there had to be a separate administrative response for every single case, she was fairly sure that these efforts and services just would not be performed.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson understood Senator Newman's concerns. However, she thought that g) did deal with those concerns, since it said that units might appeal for approval for overloads and stipends not conforming to those guidelines. It did not say that you had to provide specific appeals one by one, repeating and repeating. This could cover the general justification.

Senator Buchthal thought that administrators should have to generate paperwork for each and every exception. If they did not, no one would know how understaffed the unit was. Failing to run the red flag up the pole on each one of these things would give the impression that the college could continue understaffed and there was no real crisis involved. He had no doubt that legitimate exceptions would be granted, but as long as things were done secretly and there were rumors being generated from college to college or faculty to faculty, there were going to be problems. Put it out in the open; make an administrator write a letter to the Provost and say that he needed permission to do such and such. Until this was done, the necessary corrective measures would not be addressed.

Senator Carol Gigliotti agreed with Senator Buchthal. If the full load was 12 hrs. and a person was given 3 hours of release time for whatever purpose, then if that person could still teach an extra 3-credit course, it seemed to her that the individual did not need the 3 hrs. of release time in the first place. If there was an extenuating circumstance, perhaps it would be covered in the policy where special

permission could be requested. We could be shooting ourselves in the foot if we were to consistently teach 15 hrs. with three hrs. release time because ultimately we would wind up with that as the regular load.

Senator Hebert noted that the discussion was revolving around requesting these stipends and overloads before the fact, and there were other alternatives. One would be to simply have the deans report all overloads and stipends which were taking place to the Provost's office and have those reviewed by the Provost. Part of the problem in the past had been that we did not have provosts who were strong enough to stand up to the deans and slap them down when they got out of hand. Interim Provost Moore asked whether that was a request.

Senator Hebert answered that he could take it any way he liked, but he thought we could have reporting of what was going on in other ways rather than having to request all of this all the time up front. The Provost could look at a report and say to Dean X that he was overdoing things. If the dean persisted, perhaps he would not get as much funding the next time around. There were other possibilities besides building in legislation.

The Chairman noted that unless Senator Hebert was proposing an amendment to his own amendment, he was probably out of order on this issue.

Senator Tim Norfolk said he was perplexed, because in the Arts and Science College it was his understanding that there never had been such a thing as overload. He had been here twelve years, and the situation had always been that one could teach more but not get paid anything. Going back to the days when his department had been severely short-handed (1300 majors for 20 faculty in addition to all the other duties), you could only have release time if you had external funding. Otherwise you were just expected to do your job. In talking about needing extra money for this or for that, one could always justify extra money or extra time. However, it was either part of your job or it was not. If a department was consistently requiring too much work, then maybe it needed to be bigger.

The Chairman pointed out that there were several colleges such as his own, Engineering, which did not provide overload under any circumstances.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted by voice and the motion failed. Senator Hebert asked for a division of the house, and the motion failed 14-20. The body then voted on the entire interim policy and the directive to the APCC Policy Subcommittee to begin drafting a permanent policy for consideration at the Senate's October meeting, and it gave its approval (for final version, see **Appendix F**).

The next item of unfinished business was consideration of the proposal for the creation of a Planning and Budgeting Committee. The body had been discussing an amendment to the proposal moved by Senator Erickson. It was to be added to section III.D.5 and read as follows: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee may appoint extra members, Senate and non-Senate alike, to those subcommittees at subcommittee request. Appointed members will have voting privileges only on the subcommittee." This motion to amend was now again on the floor and open for debate.

Senator Erickson stated that this amendment would deal with some of the problems of work load raised by merging the LRPC and BPCC. The work for both these committees took much time. By merging the two, we would be cutting in half the number of people involved. Since much of the work went on at the subcommittee level, the amendment would allow for additional membership at that level to get the work done. A second issue in merging the committees was the loss of valuable expertise. She gave the example of Senators Marquette and Midha from Buchtel College who had respectively been the Vice-Chairs of LRPC and BPCC. If this proposal was passed, one of them would have to go. Her amendment would allow individuals with this kind of important expertise to be added to the subcommittees.

Senator Moss, speaking as a representative of the Reference Committee in the absence of Senator Green, said that the intent of the proposal was to streamline the processes. She did not see why either of the Senators previously mentioned by Senator Erickson could not be used in an advisory capacity.

Senator Norfolk noted that the point of the amendment was that the appointed members of the subcommittee would actually have voting privileges on the subcommittee. They would not be acting just in an advisory capacity.

Since there was no further discussion, the body voted its approval of Senator Erickson's amendment.

On the basis of some previous discussion, Senator Norfolk moved to amend section III.D.2 regarding membership on the committee. The amendment would replace the section reading "...one dean elected by the Council of Deans,..." to read ".... three deans elected by the Council of Deans,..." This was seconded by Senator Drummond.

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

Senator William McGucken thought that sections III.D.7 and 8 could easily be stricken. The document described the functioning of the Planning and Budgeting Committee. Item 7 really described the functioning of the Faculty Senate. Item 8 told what the Senate could do, and we knew that the Senate could approve recommendations or amend or refer. These were unnecessary and he moved that they be stricken. This was seconded by Senator Norfolk.

Senator Marquette opposed the motion, especially regarding item 7. One of the problems we had had all along was to make the planning and budget process work effectively. This meant dealing with recommendations in a timely fashion. Item 7 was requesting that if it was necessary, this body would have two or three meetings in between its regular ones in order to get this done. Things could not be dragged out from one monthly meeting to the next. As soon as this body failed to regularly respond in this process, it would be said again that the planning and budget process did not work. The administrators would take over again because, contrary to what had been said earlier, they loved to move paper, especially paper that had dollars signs attached to it in their direction. It was extremely important that these paragraphs be left in the document so that the centrality of the Senate could be maintained in the process.

Senator Malhotra wondered whether Senator McGucken would accept a friendly amendment because he agreed with what Senator Marquette had just said but also agreed with Senator McGucken

that item 8 was probably superfluous. Would he consider separating the two items and having them discussed one at a time?

Senator McGucken agreed. The Chairman said that with the consent of the body the two items would be considered separately. The elimination of item 7 would now be discussed.

Senator McGucken asked Senator Marquette, who was behind the designing of this, whether he would consider moving this paragraph to include it with the description of the Faculty Senate's functions. Senator Marquette said that this would be fine as long as paragraphs 7 and 8 were put some place in the Bylaws. Where they went was not an issue.

In light of that, with the unanimous consent of the body, Senator McGucken withdrew his motion to strike paragraphs 7 and 8 and then moved that they be moved to the appropriate place under the descriptions of the functions of the Faculty Senate. This was seconded.

The Chairman commented that either the Executive Committee or the Reference Committee would decide where the appropriate place was, and Senator Barbara Bucey, speaking for the Reference Committee, said there was no problem with that.

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

Senator Buchthal wanted to know whether the Reference Committee had given any thought to putting time limits on the number of times a person could serve on the Planning and Budgeting Committee. Senator Bucey replied that she did not think that it had. Senator Buchthal said that, if he was correct in assuming that a Faculty Senator could only be elected for a certain number of terms (2), then that would be a defacto time limit on serving on this committee.

The Chairman commented that it was true that a Senator could only serve two consecutive terms, but after a year the individual was again eligible to be reelected. So it was possible for an individual to serve on this committee again when reelected. Therefore, it was possible for an individual in theory to serve at least six years on the committee.

In further discussion, the point was made that the whole committee would be reconstituted every year and would elect a new Vice-Chair also every year.

Senator McGucken wanted to offer another friendly amendment which would change the word "will" to "shall" in a number of appropriate places in the document. The word "shall" was preferred in the Faculty Manual, and his Webster's Dictionary said that "shall" was a word used in laws, regulations, or directives to express what was mandatory. He went on to enumerate the places (these are represented in the final version, see Appendix G). Senator David Brink also noted an appropriate "will" to "shall" change in Senator Erickson's earlier approved amendment. The Senate gave its approval to these changes.

Senator Peggy Richards wanted to raise her concerns about combining the two committees. She had been concerned about the voice of the deans being reduced to one from the two that had been on LRPC and the two on BPCC. This had been addressed by Senator Norfolk's amendment. Her biggest fear was that by combining the two committees there would be the potential that the focus of the new

committee would be driven by the budget and not by planning assumptions. Everyone, whether doctoral professor, part-time faculty or staff, was concerned with the budget, but putting the two committees together would allow the budget to supersede any planning assumptions rather than planning assumptions leading the University into the future with budget feedback and support. There was now a new administration that was academically oriented and was quite concerned with things operating correctly and properly. There was also going to be a new Vice President for Finance. If the two committees were kept separate and asked to meet together more often than once a semester, there would still be more representation for all units than they would have by reducing the committees to one. A charge could be given to them to meet at the beginning and the end of the semester in order to discuss the directions in which they were going. This would also give them a chance to keep the budget separate so that it would not be overriding planning assumptions. Therefore, she was against merging the two committees at this time. If the sorts of things which she had been suggesting were put into effect and the two committee system still did not work, perhaps in a year or so the body could think again about putting them together.

Senator Marquette, having been Vice-Chair of one of the committees, thought that things would work much better with one committee. The fundamental point about the whole process was that the budget was the plan. A plan without money attached to it was a fond hope. What would allow a reorientation of the functioning of the institution was insuring that the plan and the budget were constantly in tune. This was the problem that had occurred this past year and why the body had gone through a couple of meetings trying to coordinate stuff where the plan required budget assumptions. These problems could have been solved much more readily. The communication would have occurred in the one committee. There was no question that there was a need for subcommittees to do some of this work, and Senator Erickson's amendment had taken care of that. He had never been in favor of the concept of two committees in the first place. The plan was the budget; you did things with the budget. If there was no money attached to a plan, all one could do with it was file it. This proposal would streamline the process. It would be more effective for all of us, and we would have a central place for the academic mission in the institution if we combined these activities. Therefore, he was speaking in favor of the proposal.

Since there was no further discussion, the body gave its approval to the elimination of the LRPC and BPCC and the creation of a new Planning and Budgeting Committee (for final version, see Appendix G).

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Hoover wished to ask that the Senate reconsider the Criminal Justice Technology's proposal to convert open space in the Polsky Building for use as a classroom for several courses which it was teaching. This proposal had been presented last month, and there had been some confusion as to the funding. The cost of construction of the erection of the wall would be paid for by the Police Academy, and funding would not come from the college budget.

There was some confusion regarding the appropriate parliamentary procedure to follow in order to reconsider this item. (Don. R. Gerlach, the parliamentarian, was not able to attend.) As a member who had voted on the prevailing side at this last meeting, Senator Buchthal moved that the body reconsider this item today instead of waiting until the September meeting as previously approved, and this was seconded. As discussion began, the Chairman announced that this procedure could only be employed

at the meeting at which the motion had been passed. However, if Senator Hoover moved to rescind last month's action and if that was approved by a 2/3 majority vote, the body could then reconsider the matter. He did so and this was seconded.

The Chairman reminded the body that the decision which the Senate was trying to undo was to wait until the September meeting to take up this matter. The discussion should relate to rescinding that decision.

Senator Richard Gigliotti knew that at the last meeting there had been concerns raised about whether the faculty had had an opportunity to talk about the allocation of space. This seemed to him something which an administrator should deal with. Certain things went with the faculty and certain things did not. Administrators' hands would be tied if they could not make space allocations. He was not sure that it was the right of this body to be considering that.

Senator Buchthal said that he had been in favor of the original proposal but had been shot down by the argument that the C&T Faculty should have a right to discuss and object to a proposal to take space of which they had been unaware. They wanted an opportunity to lobby their dean and administrators about the change. When he had suggested that this be done before today's Senate meeting, he had been told that there would not be time to do so until September. Therefore, he had learned his lesson the last time and did not want to vote to rescind the action and make a motion and not give them a chance to lobby their dean about his recommendation. He would vote against the motion to rescind.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted on Senator Hoover's motion which failed to gain the necessary 2/3 majority.

Senator Drummond wondered whether the CFPC had to do anything regarding this issue before the September meeting. The Chairman said that it did not. Waiting until the September meeting merely gave our colleagues in C&T time.

The Chairman did have one additional item of new business. This was a motion that the unfinished business of the third Faculty Senate of The University of Akron become unfinished business of the fourth Senate of The University of Akron. This was moved and seconded. The purpose of this motion was to allow for items such as items which had just been discussed to be carried over. Without discussion the body gave its approval.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Fowler wondered whether the long report of the LRPC which had been filed on February 28 had gone to the Board and whether any or all of it had been approved.

Senator Marquette answered that the budgetary and planning components of that report had been approved by the Board. That had been the basis of the Board's actions on the budget. The reorganization had been basically approved by the President, who had made the changes he believed appropriate. He would be taking a reorganization to the Board which looked a lot like what this body had recommended. The Chairman added that the President had been keeping him informed on this issue on behalf of the Senate. The only real changes from what we had recommended related to titles.

On the basis of what the Senate had just approved, Senator Carol Gigliotti wondered whether the members of LRPC should still expect to have meetings over the summer.

The Chairman noted that the last paragraph of the proposal indicated there would be a temporary committee created by the Executive Committee to fill the role until such time, September hopefully, that we could elect a permanent committee. He thought it would be likely that a temporary committee with a few adjustments would look a lot like the old committee, so members should not clear their calendars of those scheduled LRPC meetings.

Senator Oller asked whether the Faculty Manual was finally going to be presented to the Board this month.

The Chairman answered that it would not be brought to them at this next meeting but at the August meeting. In response to Senator Malhotra's question about approval of the Senate's structure, the Chairman stated that this had definitely gone before the Board for approval.

Senator Midha had a question about the department chair review. This policy had been implemented over a year ago, and he had heard about different rules and regulations in different colleges. What was going on and how successful had this been?

The Chairman replied that the Executive Committee might be able to collect data on this with the Provost's indulgence. There had been several glitches identified with the department chair review process, and he suspected that a modified one would be presented as one of the first items of business for the fourth Senate. Certainly the possibility of a department adopting none of the specified recommendations by the required two-thirds was something we did need to fix. There had been some other suggested streamlining steps.

The Chairman did have something which he wanted to mention under good of the order. For many of our colleagues, this would be their last Senate meeting at least for a while. On behalf of the body and as Chair, he wanted to express his appreciation for the time, the effort, the stress, the grey hairs, etc. that had gone into their service to the University and to the Senate. He wished them well with the copious free time they would now have.

Senator Richards wanted to thank the body's elected Secretary, Gary Oller, who had done an outstanding job in producing a record number of Chronicles as well as a record number of pages, and who had done it so accurately that the minimum amount of changes that had been necessary each month had been really astounding. She thought that Senator Oller deserved special recognition for this. (Her statement was met with applause.)

IX. ADJOURNMENT - There was a motion to adjourn the meeting which was seconded. The body gave its approval and the third Faculty Senate of The University of Akron adjourned.

APPENDIX A**Report of Executive Committee****FACULTY SENATE BUDGET STATEMENT**

June 30, 1996

	YTD Budget	YTD Actual
Total Compensation	\$35,127.22	\$35,300.99
Supplies & Services	98,881.85	11,385.51
Total Other	4,204.74	1,926.47
<u>ACCOUNT TOTALS</u>	\$138,213.81	\$48,612.97

Respectfully submitted by
David R. Brink, Vice-Chair

FACULTY SENATE ATTENDANCE REPORT1995-96

NAME	EXCUSED ABSENCES	ABSENCES
Brink	2	
Bucey	3	
Cheung	1	
Clements	4	
Clinefelter	1	
Davis	2	
DePaul	4	
Dobrindt	1	
Echols	4	2
Ely	2	
Frederick		1

	EXCUSED ABSENCES	ABSENCES
Gigliotti, C.	2	
Gigliotti, R.	2	
Green	2	
Griffin	2	
Harrison	5	
Hebert	1	
Hoover	3	
John	3	
Keener	1	
Kimmell	4	
Lasher	1	
Malhotra	2	
McElwee	1	
Moss	2	
Newman	4	
Padovan	1	
Peeples	6	
Prough	1	
Ranson		1
Redle	1	
Rich	1	
Ross-Alaolmolki	1	
Sibberson	2	
Siloac		1
Smith	8	1
Stinner	1	
Stuyvesant		1
Webb	3	
Wright	5	

*Senators who are not listed attended all meetings.

APPENDIX B

Report of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee

Grievances were received by the Committee and assigned file numbers:

96-1. The Committee completed its consideration of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

96-2. The Committee completed its consultation of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

96-3. The Committee completed its deliberations because the faculty member opted to take ERIP.

96-5. The Committee completed its consultation of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

The Committee has three appeals outstanding:

96-4; 96-6; 96-7.

Respectfully submitted by
F. Bruce Simmons, Chair

APPENDIX C

Report of Campus Facilities Planning Committee

The Committee met on June 12 to deliberate on a special matter.

A recommendation by the CFPC was made at the Senate meeting of May 2 that the Geology Department be permitted to convert 660 ft. of classroom space in Crouse Hall to offices and labs. This was to be contingent on replacement of the classroom space at some location on campus. An objection was raised that pertained to getting classroom space close to the center of campus to fulfill the needs of the College of Education. The proposal below was negotiated by Assistant Provost Graham Kelly and appears to satisfy the previous objection. The details of the room allocation are as follows:

1. Reallocation of Crouse 319 to the Department of Geology beginning Summer II, 1996. This is currently a general purpose classroom rated for 44 students.
2. Reallocate Carroll 50A to become a general purpose classroom. This room is currently the Photography Studio and upon renovation it is expected to be rated for at least a class size of 45.
3. Relocate the Photography Studio to Carroll 58. This room was held by University Media Productions during its existence and its availability has been confirmed by the College of Fine and Applied Arts.

Since the proposal has been shared with the Dean's Office of the College of Education and no objection has been raised, the Committee unanimously voted to recommend to the Senate that this space reallocation be approved. An additional benefit appears to be that Crouse 209, which the Department of Geology has been permitted to use for storage, will now return to classroom use.

The CFPC also proposed the following resolution to be voted on by the Senate:

The Faculty Senate wishes to reemphasize our need to retain classroom space on campus and to, in general, oppose conversion of classroom space to other use. We would also propose that the future work at the Polsky Building put the construction of classrooms at a high priority. We propose that the 5th floor space originally planned for a conference center be designed such that rooms are also designed to be used as quality classrooms.

This resolution passed unanimously.

Respectfully submitted by
Jerry Drummond, Chair

APPENDIX D

Report of Research Faculty Projects Committee

MINUTES OF APRIL 8, 1996

The Research (Faculty Projects) Committee met at 9 a.m. in the Chestnut B room of Gardner Student Center. Members present were: Ms. Tana Alexander, Dr. Roger Bain, Dr. Andrew Borowiec, Mr. Earl Ertman, Dr. Jon Hawes, Dr. Lazarus Macior, Dr. Barb Moss (Co-Chair and Senator), Dr. Victoria Schirm, Dr. Dan Sheffer (Chair and Senator), Dr. Claire Tessier and Dr. Michael Williams. Absent with notice: Dr. Dolores Bower, Dr. J. Clayton Fant, Ms. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. William McGucken, Dr. Phillip Schmidt and Dr. Charmaine Streharsky. Absent without notice: Ms. Virginia Berringer, Dr. Brian Leonard, Dr. Isadore Newman and Dr. Nancy Somerick.

The purpose of the meeting was to conclude the current 1995-96 year's activities and to discuss the 1996-97 Guidelines

One request for a no-cost time extension was approved by the Committee which extended the award to January 31, 1997.

The following Committee Members' terms expire June 30, 1996: Ms. Virginia Berringer, Dr. Andrew Borowiec, Dr. Dolores Bower, Dr. Jon Hawes, Ms. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. Barb Moss (Co-Chair and Senator), Dr. Nancy Somerick and Dr. Claire Tessier.

After much discussion by the Committee, changes were recommended for the upcoming 1996-97 Guidelines:

I. Memo: To all Full-time Faculty, Deans and Academic Chairs

Paragraph two, third sentence, the sentence will now read: "Such faculty are eligible to receive no more than one award a year (twelve months from the last award) until tenured or five years at The University of Akron have passed."

II. The instructions found under **Proposal Preparation Instructions**, Required Proposal Format:

Item 1 *Non-Technical Abstract*, the sentence will now read: "In 200 words or less, written for laypersons without undefined acronyms and describe the project and focus on its significance."

Item 2.b. *Goal(s) and objective(s)*, the sentence will now read: "The research purpose must be clearly defined, along with the hypotheses being tested or the questions being asked."

Item 2.c. Procedures. the sentence will now read: "This section should provide a detailed description of what you propose to do, including: ..."

Item 2.3. *Goal(s) and objective(s)*, the heading of this section will be changed to now read: "Feasibility of the project."

Item 4.b. *Previous, Current, or Future Efforts to Obtain External Funding for this Research*, a last sentence has been added and will read: "If funding was received within the previous three years, and this is a similar project, explain how this project is different by including this explanation in the Final Report(s) (see Attachment III)."

III. Attachment I, Application/Checklist/Coversheet:

Checklist for Attached Proposal:

The item "Final Report" will be added stating that "if there has been funding from this Committee within the past three years, attach a copy of the Final Report for that project(s)".

IV. Attachment II, Budget Page:

Another section will be added titled "Stipends for Graduate Research Assistant" and will include the explanation: "Wages allowable only for Graduate Research Assistant at a rate no lower than minimum wage and no higher than \$10 per hour, depending on skill level."; "Type of duties/work"; "No. of hours"; "Hourly rate"; "Stipend Total"; and "Worker's Compensation for Graduate Research Assistant Wages at .7% (70 cents for every \$100 paid).

Dr. Sheffer will prepare a proposal for the Committee (to be reviewed at the September, 1996 meeting) to enable the faculty to receive monies for multiple sources of support in the summer.

Respectfully submitted by
Daniel Sheffer, Chair

APPENDIX E

Report of General Education Advisory Committee Annual Report - 1995-96

This year the GEAC has continued to monitor the progress of the General Education program, and engaged in the following activities:

* The Committee accepted a revision of the Physical Education Exemption Policy requested by the Department of Physical and Health Education. The revision ended the previous policy of exempting students 25 years of age and over from having to take physical education, and will take effect for students entering the University in Fall, 1996. Exemptions may still be given for military veterans, physical education majors, and 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. 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. The title of the area also was changed to reflect the broader scope, to "Physical Education/Wellness." In addition to the already accepted physical education courses, the following courses will meet the General Education Physical Education/Wellness requirement:

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	3 cr.
7400:133	Nutrition Fundamentals	3 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.

* The Committee granted 2-year approval of Mathematics for Business I and II, 3450:289A and 3450:289B, as special topic courses which could be taken to satisfy the general education math requirement. The course is intended for students majoring in Business and is an alternative to 3450:145 College Algebra. The course (3450:289A) will first be offered Fall, 1996.

* Planning and Assessment: The Committee continued developing assessment procedures in cooperation with the university assessment committee and the various units in the university that are involved in the General Education program.

* General Business: The Committee gave ongoing consideration to issues such as recovering costs associated with general education lab courses when course fees cannot presently be charged for general education courses; review of how general education funds were spent; and metric awareness.

* Addition of courses for more comprehensive selections in some areas (in addition to those listed above) effective for students beginning Fall, 1996:

3200:230	Sports & Society in Ancient Greece and Rome
3300:281	Fiction Appreciation
3700:150	World Politics and Government

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. Dudley Turner, Chair
Prof. Laura Johnson, Interim Chair, Spring 1996

APPENDIX F

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 each college's approved work load and the requested 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.

APPENDIX G

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 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.

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 shall 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, three deans 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 shall 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 shall 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 shall be elected from among the Senatorial members of the subcommittee. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee may appoint extra members, Senate or non-Senate, to those subcommittees at subcommittees' request. Appointed members shall have voting privileges only in subcommittee.
6. The Vice-Chair of the committee shall report to the Senate at regularly scheduled Senate meetings. The Vice-Chair shall 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.

***THESE PARAGRAPHS (7 & 8) WILL BE MOVED TO THE APPROPRIATE PLACES IN THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS RELATING TO THE DUTIES OF THE FACULTY SENATE.**

7. The Faculty Senate shall 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 shall 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 B through E with:

B. 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.