

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

7-24-1997

Faculty Senate Chronicle July 24, 1997

Heather M. Loughney

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.

OK

1996-97, No. 10

July 24, 1997

32 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of July 24, 1997	1
Appendix to Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of July 24, 1997	12
A. Report of <i>Executive Committee</i> - Presidential Search Procedures	12
B. Letter to Rainy Stitzlein, Chair, Board of Trustees from Executive Committee	20
C. Letter from Rainy Stitzlein, Chair, Board of Trustees to Executive Committee	21
D. Report of <i>University Well-Being Committee</i>	22
E. Report of <i>Graduate Council</i>	24
F. Report of <i>Research Faculty Projects Committee</i>	25
G. Revised UA Budget	29

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 MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE - JULY 24, 1997

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Secretary Gary H. Oller, acting as Chairman, at 3:15 p.m. on Thursday, July 24, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Senators in attendance were: Aby, Bucey, Chyi, Clinefelter, DePaul, Erickson, Fitzgerald, Gill, Green, Gunn, Hoover, Isayev, Jalbert, Malhotra, Markovich, Marquette, Midha, Mothes, Murray, Norfolk, Oller, Patankar, Pelz, Prough, Redle, Reed, Rich, Richards, Sheffer, and Woodley.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * ELECTED FIVE REPRESENTATIVES FOR A CONSTITUENCY COMMITTEE AS PART OF THE NEW PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCEDURES**
- * ENDORSED THE PRESIDENT'S REVISED BUDGET PRESENTED BY VICE PRESIDENT MCFARLAND**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - Secretary Oller explained that he was chairing the session because Chairman H. Michael Cheung was away on a boy scout hike somewhere in New Mexico and was unavailable for today's proceedings. Vice Chair Carol Gigliotti had resigned from the Senate last month in order to take up her new duties as an associate dean in the Community and Technical College. This left him as the remaining officer to preside. The main reason for this meeting was to look at revisions to the budget which the body had passed back in April now that the final budget from Columbus had been approved. There were two other items that the body might handle first, both coming from committee reports. These were from the Executive Committee and the University Well-Being Committee. Both were for informational purposes, but the Executive Committee also required an action of the Senate. He proposed for the agenda to present the two committee reports and then turn to the budget, and there was no dissent.

II. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - The Chairman stated that the Committee wished to report on two matters. The first was in connection with the upcoming search for a new President for The University of Akron. The Board of Trustees at its June meeting had approved a new set of procedures for the presidential search which differed substantially from the old procedure. There was a handout for Senators which listed those new bylaws plus additional material including a time line which the Board had put together for the search from June of this year through May of next year (**Appendix A**). The major difference in the procedure was that instead of a search committee consisting of 11 members from the Board, faculty, administration, students, etc., the search committee would now in effect be the entire Board in a committee of the whole. They were also creating a subcommittee of four voting

Trustees that would act as a presidential advisory and screening committee. This screening committee would be meeting with representatives from various constituency groups - the Council of Deans, department chairs, Faculty Senate, senior administration, students, and community leaders. These meetings would be starting now at the beginning of the process in order to discuss proposed criteria, the process and scheduling; they would meet again with those representatives at the end of the process when the three finalists chosen by the screening committee would be coming to campus. After the representatives had met with the finalists, they would choose one of their members to meet in executive session with the entire Board to discuss their group's evaluation of each of the finalists before the Board came to a decision.

According to these bylaws, the Senate was to choose five of its members to form its constituency. The Board's Presidential Advisory and Screening Committee had already begun to meet with various constituency groups - the Council of Deans, community leaders - and it wanted to meet with the Senate's group as soon as possible. Therefore, it was necessary for the body to elect five people to serve in this capacity.

At its meeting last week the Executive Committee had discussed these new procedures and had drafted a letter which had been sent to Chairperson Stitzlein on behalf of the Committee to the Board, which the Chairman then read to the body (**Appendix B**). He then read the reply of Chairperson Stitzlein (**Appendix C**).

Originally, the Executive Committee had planned to recommend to the body that it endorse its letter and the suggestions which it contained so that the five people which the body would elect to the constituency group could be advocates for those ideas when they met with the Screening Committee in the next month or so. This might still be a good idea, but at this point he wanted to open the floor for discussion on what the body might do before going on and holding the election for the five individuals.

Senator Devinder Malhotra thought that as a procedural issue, endorsing the letter now did not make any sense because the Chairwoman of the Board of Trustees had already answered no. Its endorsement would have been important because it would have put the weight of the Senate behind the letter in order for the Board to consider it. These issues could still be taken up once the Senate had elected the five individuals, and at that point the body could direct them as to what kind of arguments they should present to the Board.

Senator Jesse Marquette said the reality was that the Board was going to ignore us if they felt like it or pay attention to us if they felt like it. The last time we had chosen a President there had been faculty representation in the process, and look what had resulted. The Board had chosen to make the decision in that case as a minority decision. In regard to this new procedure he had received some negative reaction to his comment in the newspaper which had been partially out of context and incomplete. Nonetheless, he thought that the new procedures were good because the Board would finally be accepting responsibility for whatever action it took, and it would be taking the role by itself without the faculty to hide behind. This would be a new and different experience in some ways.

He thought that we needed to elect the best five people that we could to the advisory committee, because if the Board chose to listen to us we should have the best five people that we could come up with. If they chose not to listen to us, they would not. Some members might recall

that they did not listen the last time when a number of faculty had signed letters saying that Peggy Elliott was a bad candidate. It did not work then, and he did not think we should waste a lot of time worrying about the niceties here. They were the Board of Trustees, and they could do as they pleased. He personally believed that they would probably listen, but if they did not, it wouldn't matter whether there was faculty representation on the committee or not. He remembered the last time there had been a presidential search and the three members from the faculty had been chosen in University Council, and he had come out of that meeting and overheard a comment from someone with not too bright a vision of the future saying that we had not gotten ours on the committee, but at least nobody from Arts and Sciences had gotten on the committee either. We needed to function as a Faculty Senate and not a bunch of narrow constituencies. He did not care whether the five best people all came from one college or one each from different colleges, but we had to find people that had a reasonable voice that people would listen to. If we did not do that, what we would have was another mess. He strongly urged that we do the best with the names that were put forward and he moved that we proceed to elect the five best people. This was seconded by Senator Tim Norfolk.

The Chairman commented that after that particular University Council meeting in which the faculty representatives had been elected to the last presidential search committee, he too had heard the remark that Senator Marquette had just related.

Senator Peggy Richards said that in light of the admonishment which we had received last year from the NCA about how we worked as a governing body, it was important for the Senate to endorse the Executive Committee's letter even if it was after the fact. It would at least show that the Senate stood as a body in the request to be involved in the search for the President. She supported Senator Marquette's motion but asked that the body also endorse the letter.

The Chairman answered that perhaps the body could do that as a separate motion after it had decided on Senator Marquette's motion.

Senator Malhotra wanted to know what the procedure would be for electing the five Senators.

The Chairman replied that the only criterion in the Board Bylaws was that the representatives be current members of the Faculty Senate. We were in a funny situation in the summer in that there were people who were Senators now who would be going off in September when the new Senate for 97-98 convened. He had checked with Vice President Ted Mallo who had confirmed that the Board wanted people who were currently serving and would continue to serve through next year. We could elect people who were Senators now, but we would have to replace them in September. If we elected people who would begin their tenure in September, they would serving on the committee next month but would not yet really be Senators. Therefore, the Executive Committee thought that the simplest way to handle this was to elect from a pool of those people who were Senators now and who would be Senators through next spring. There was a handout sheet listing those people.

The Chairman went on to say that the Executive Committee had discussed how the five people would be chosen. Should they be from different units or not? Some had argued as Senator Marquette, that we should not worry about which units they represented. Others thought that we should limit it to one person from a particular unit. If we made the latter a criterion, the election could be held this way. If there were two candidates from Arts and Sciences, for example, and they

got the two highest numbers of votes, the highest would be elected and the next one would be skipped over to the next person with the third highest number of votes from a different college or unit. Ballots had been prepared set up in packets of five stapled together so that one name could be written on each of the papers. The Committee also recommended electing on the basis of a plurality of those here today and voting.

Senator Marquette reminded the body that his motion had been to elect five people at large and not worry about units.

Senator Karen Reed suggested a slight compromise to the motion so that there might be a limitation of not more than two from a certain group because clearly we did all have different areas of interest.

In the interest of expediting the proceedings, Senator Marquette accepted this as a friendly amendment.

Senator William Rich thought that the body should proceed to elect the members of this committee, but he did have a different perspective than Senator Marquette on the general attitude or approach that the body should take to this decision. He had found Senator Marquette's arguments in support of the Board's chosen procedure to be unpersuasive. He did not think that just because the previous search committee had included faculty and had produced a result that we now thought was unfortunate, that this was a powerful argument for excluding them from this search. The previous committee had included Board members, and they were not to be excluded now. The fact of the matter was that this search process did not directly involve any academicians; it involved Board members and students who were Board members but no academicians in the selection of our next President. That struck him as not only objectionable, but frankly, outrageous. The body should go on record even though he agreed with Senator Marquette that the Board had already made up its mind. If it did not, he would have to question what we were doing as faculty members and as members of the Senate. For that reason, at some point, either before or after we voted, we ought to adopt a resolution that expressed our objection to this at least for the record. Then our colleagues would know what the Senate's position was on this and might then proceed to cooperate in the procedure as the only thing that we could do at this point. At the appropriate time he would offer such a resolution.

Senator Norfolk said that the endorsement of the letter could include such a resolution.

The Senate then voted on Senator Marquette's motion which was to vote for five individuals and limit the number to two from a unit, and the motion was approved.

The Chairman then called for nominations. The following candidates were nominated: Senator Chand Midha (A&S) by Senator Malhotra; Senator Virginia Gunn (F&AA) by Senator Ruth Clinefelter; Senator H. Michael Cheung (Eng.) by Senator Peggy Richards; Senator Steve Aby (Univ Lib.) by Senator Judy Fitzgerald; Senator Michael Jalbert (C&T) by Senator Elizabeth Erickson; Senator Jesse Marquette (A&S) by Senator Holly Mothes; Senator David Redle (Bus.) by Senator George Prough; Senator Andrew Borowiec (FAA) by Senator Christina De Paul; Senator William Rich (Law) by Senator Ann Woodley; Senator Dolli Markovich (Staff) by Senator Mothes; Senator Karen Reed (Nursing) by Senator Kris Gill.

Since there were no further nominations, Senator Clinefelter moved that the nominations be closed, and this was seconded and approved.

The ballots were then handed out and the Chairman reminded the members to write one name on each of the five slips and not to separate them. He also said that the election would be decided by plurality and not majority, to which the body agreed.

While voting was taking place and the ballots counted, the Chairman went on to discuss the second item from the Executive Committee which had a bearing on the University Well-Being Committee report. That item related to a meeting which the Executive Committee had had with the new Vice President for Human Resources, James Prunty, last month at which he had presented the possibility of changing our health care benefits and replacing the Mutual Health comprehensive plan with a preferred provider organization. The Committee had received a 50-minute presentation from Vice President Prunty and Mrs. Desnay Lohrum on this issue. It had been the Committee's decision that it be sent to University Well-Being for study before making a presentation to this body in September. University Well-Being had an interim report (**Appendix D**) which members could read. He noted that the Committee was still working with Human Resources on this, and that there would be a formal presentation at the September 4 meeting so that the Senators could have an adequate sense of what this involved.

Senator Gill asked whether this PPO plan was already in the budget which was going to the Board. What did a presentation to the Senate in September mean, if this was already in a budget which would be approved in August?

The Chairman answered that perhaps it would be appropriate to address that during the revised budget discussion.

REPORT OF GRADUATE COUNCIL - (Appendix E)

REPORT OF RESEARCH FACULTY PROJECTS COMMITTEE - (Appendix F)

III. NEW BUSINESS - The Senate began to discuss the revised budget. Senator Marquette pointed out that the pertinent page of the handout was the one containing scenarios #5A and #3 (**Appendix G, p. 31**). Senator Richards added as point of information that the preceding page of the handout (**Appendix G, p. 29**) contained the PBC budget which the Senate had approved last April.

Senator Marquette stated that scenario #5A was the budget with the items ranked in the order and amounts now being recommended by the central administration. On the right after each item, the numbers within the parentheses preceded by # represented the order of rank priority for the item in the original PBC budget.

In order to start the discussion, Senator Clinefelter moved that the amended budget be approved. This was seconded.

Senator Rich commented that the major differences in terms of dollars between the earlier budget and this one came from a proposal to increase tuition by an additional 2% during the spring

(scenario #5A), which obviously meant that there would be more money to spend. But there were other changes besides different order of priorities. For example, even in scenario #3 (without the 2% tuition increase in the spring) there was the \$750,000 budgeted for Athletics. Athletics had originally asked for that amount, and the PBC had recommended essentially that they get a little less than half of that (\$350,000) and that they come up with the additional \$400,000 they needed for gender equity by reallocation within the Athletic Department budget. That is what had been in the budget which the Senate had approved earlier in the year. This revised budget now gave the Athletic Department all they had asked for (\$750,000). There was a corresponding decrease elsewhere in the budget in areas of academic initiative and operating funds of \$400,000. Obviously, money was money and it could have come from anywhere, but the point was that the earlier recommended budget was being cut by \$400,000 in academics and increased by \$400,000 in Athletics. Athletics was not being asked to achieve any of what they said they needed to achieve by internal reallocation.

The Chairman asked for permission to allow Vice President Paul McFarland to reply to that and to discuss the document in general. The body gave its approval.

Vice President McFarland gave some detailed explanation on the background and relationship of material in the handout regarding the various scenarios and versions which the budget had passed from the initial discussions through the Senate-approved budget to the revised one from the President which was being presented today. He went on to say that the legislature had given the University the ability to raise tuition by 6%. Back in the spring it had been assumed that it would only be 4%, 1% of which had to be restricted to financial aid if we were going to raise tuition above 3%. The Board had approved the 4% raise and restriction back in April, but now the President was going to ask the Board to rescind that restriction so that the 1% could be used for anything which we deemed appropriate. The legislature had envisioned tuition being raised to the cap in a two stage process. Since the Board had already approved the 4%, the President was going to ask them to raise it again by 2% effective in the spring semester next year since it was too late to do it any sooner. This meant that the tuition increase that our students would be paying over the next year would be 4.9%

In this new budget (scenario #5A), the \$850,000 was new money. The President and a group of advisors had met weekly since May to try to work out priorities. The result was a revised budget which had some things which were similar, some things which were new, some things which had been reduced, and in which there had been slight reordering of priorities.

Senator Norfolk, being fairly new to budgeting, had never heard of people getting everything that they asked for. In regard to comments of Senator Rich regarding Athletics and the additional \$400,000, he noted that they had received a 16% increase in their budget. Surely they could do more with less. Was there anyone else who was going to get a 16% increase in budgets anywhere?

Vice President McFarland answered that the Athletic Department was not asking for a discretionary 16% increase. Although the general counsel had said that this was not legally mandated, it was certainly required or was under the guidelines in Title IX or of the NCAA to have to do these things. The President was committed to the \$750,000. Also, when Senator Rich had raised this issue at the PBC meeting, his response had been that if one looked at items 13 and 14 which were new, there was a similar impact of needing new monies that were fungible. They could have come from this area as well as new academic initiatives and operating. There were all sorts of priorities here that were needed; some were new and some were changed. The President wanted to go with the \$750,000

without internal reallocation. Obviously, that could be adjusted in the future, but this was the way he wanted it now.

Senator Norfolk realized that he was bucking the President on this, but he had been here when the University had taken big state funding cuts and there had been a 10% across-the-board operating budget cut in the University, except for Athletics which had taken a 1/2 of 1% cut after having been increased by 30%. Therefore, we were dumping more and more money down that rat hole. Surely they could find some money internally.

Senator Rich said that the point he had made at the PBC meeting, and which he was not sure Vice President McFarland had been able to hear, was not that the dollars literally could be traced from one line to another but that the academic budgets were being increased at a lower level than what had been recommended by PBC and the Senate. The Athletic Department was getting more than what had been recommended - in fact, all that it had asked for - when the PBC and the Senate as well had concluded they could and should do some of what they did need by internal reallocation. This budget was being presented to us as it had been to the PBC as what the President intended to recommend to the Board. The PBC had made a set of recommendations and priorities which the Senate had approved; the President had changed them to some extent, and now he was informing us of those changes before taking them to the Board. This was a unilateral act on the part of the President. Senator Rich agreed with much that was in this budget and disagreed with some of it. He was not sure that this required or deserved any action by the Senate at this point.

Senator Barbara Bucey wanted to add her comments to what had already been said about Athletics. The idea which the PBC had had was that there had been some decisions of the Athletic Department that had not been appropriate. It was not as though Title IX was something new which had just appeared; it had been in place for years now. They had had opportunities to squirrel away money, make decisions, and make changes along the way. She was rather upset that they had done a poor job of managing what they already had. Now we were going to say that this was okay and save them by throwing more money at them. Fiscal responsibility was quite appropriate to expect from various departments and programs on campus.

Senator Bucey also wanted to comment on #6 (Faculty Salary Adjustment). In terms of the question of salary equity this was a good thing, but she was upset that this was only going to teaching faculty. There were teaching contract professionals in Developmental Programs. How were they going to be categorized? Were they contract professionals when it behooved the administration to consider them contract professionals and teaching faculty when it behooved them to include them in research grants, etc., (monies that were brought into the University)? She understood the plight of the faculty. For all of the work which they did, they were definitely underpaid. However, she wanted to share the results of a study regarding one area of contract professionals, advising, which had originally been done for the University Well-Being Committee and had recently been updated by Dr. Joseph Walton at the request of President Ruebel. All advisors were required to have masters degrees as a minimum requirement. Three of the advisors held doctorates, and three others were working on them. The advisors dealt with retention for 7,000+ students in University College. A study done by the College and University Personnel Association in 95-96 reported that the average salary for academic advisors was \$33,107. Out of the University's 9 advisors, 7 were under that amount, and 5, who had worked here from 11-16 years, were under \$30,000.

Since this was her last Senate meeting, Senator Bucey thought this was something that she needed to say. It rankled her that contract professionals were viewed as second-class citizens. If you looked at your departments, you would find contract professionals who handled labs, who advised students at a college level, who did work, research and other things, and yet they were considered to be less essential in relation to maintaining or retaining good quality individuals. We had lost large numbers of good staff because they wanted to get out and go to other universities to make more money. With their paltry salaries, including them in a salary equity pool to bring them in line with the rest of university personnel across the country would hardly make a dent in that \$1,500,000. She realized, as Senator Rich had already mentioned, that this issue was probably moot. The President was telling us what he was going to do, and this would be going to the Board. She just wanted some of these points to be on the record.

Senator Marquette, who had been privy to these discussions, did not want people to think that the administration had been quite as callous as Senator Bucey had been suggesting. The reality was that in the period between 1980 and 1996 the number of faculty had decreased by 50 while the number of contract professionals had increased by 100. So we had been putting resources into that area. We needed most desperately now to be more competitive in faculty salaries. What happened after ERIP both times was that the average salary remaining after retirement that we could spend was less than the current average salary of our assistant professors. This needed to be fixed so that we could become more competitive. If we did not, we would be in great difficulty.

Senator Bucey did not intend to describe the administration as callous, but she still wanted to know about the contract professionals in Developmental Programs. They were not classified as faculty, yet they did teach. How was this going to be addressed?

Vice President McFarland said that he would take this up with Provost Leathers.

Because of some confusion, the Chairman reminded the body that the motion before it was to approve the revised budget.

Senator Rich said he had been arguing against the motion. He did not think that this body ought to either approve or condemn it. There were things in it with which he agreed and with which he disagreed. It seemed to him that all the Senate really ought to do was receive this information, and that was why he was opposed to the motion.

Senator Marquette said he was not happy with it either, but we had spent a year and a half doing this. We had worked closely as a planning committee and also as a Senate with the attempt to create a process that worked. The President had made changes that he believed were necessary. He was, after all, the President. If the body did not endorse this with, if it liked, some reservations, when the administration went to the Board and asked for a 2% tuition increase and more money for faculty salaries but told them that this had not been endorsed by the Senate, we would look kind of silly. He was not happy with the Athletic budget either; he had made that point fairly clear, but he had lost. That happened, but one did not always get everything one wanted. There had been a determined attempt both in PBC and in terms of what the administration had done, to try and stay basically with our priorities as well as increase faculty salaries and do what needed to be done. Given the problems of the past few years, this was a pretty good outcome. It was not all that he would like. If

someone wanted to move reservations on the Athletic budget, he would be happy to support that. However, not to support this at all was just plain silly.

Senator Rich responded that this was the second time this year he had been accused in the Senate of being silly. He completely disagreed with what Senator Marquette had just said; his premises were right, but his conclusions were wrong. We did have a process which we had employed. The PBC had done what it was supposed to do; it had made a recommendation which was then considered and approved by the Senate. The President had then done what he was empowered to do, which was to take the recommendations and make his own which differed in some respects from ours. There was nothing in the process that said we were supposed to be able to go back and endorse what the President ultimately did based on what we had given him. It was not incumbent upon us to do that nor was it necessary to express disagreement with the President's budget either. On balance, he thought that if he were forced to choose, he would go with this. But there never was a reason for us to come back and make a decision about what the President was presenting to the Board. Our role had been to make a recommendation to the President; his role was to make a recommendation to the Board after considering ours. Everyone had done what was supposed to be done.

Senator Marquette pointed out that the Senate had said that it was supposed to come back and do this.

Senator Rich replied that the Senate had said that the PBC was supposed to come back to the Senate. What the PBC had done was merely meet and receive the information. The Senate did not now have the benefit of a PBC recommendation on this particular budget because it had been presented by the administration and the Chair of PBC as simply information for the Committee.

Senator Gill moved that the motion on the floor be amended to change the word "approve" to "endorse," and this was seconded by Senator Reed. Senator Gill went on to say that this would deal with the approval issue. As a faculty and as a shared governance body, we needed to say to the President or Board whether or not we endorsed something. We needed to look viable and rational in that sense instead of just receiving information and letting it happen.

Senator Marquette called the question. Since there was no dissent, the body voted on the amendment and it passed.

Senator Erickson said that when the Senate had gone through the budget process already discussed, the point had been that there really was no budget at that time because it was possible that the whole of the revenue projections on which the budget had been based would be changed. Under those circumstances it would need to go back through the process again starting with the PBC. Based on what had been said, it appeared that the process had not been followed the second time because the PBC had not actually made recommendations or voted on the President's budget.

Senator Marquette called the question, which was seconded. The body voted in favor of calling the question so it then voted on the motion which said that the Faculty Senate endorsed the revised budget as presented today by Vice President McFarland. The motion was passed.

Vice President McFarland noted that the tuition increase was going to be very difficult to get through the Board, which had a proclivity not to approve tuition increases very easily. Between now

and the Board meeting he cautioned members to keep this among themselves as much as possible. He and Provost Leathers would be working together to try and convince the Board members. He hoped that the Senators would try to give them the ability to do this and not have the information surface prematurely. They would be meeting with the Executive Committee of the Board next Monday to brief them on it, and the full Board meeting would be in two weeks.

Senator Norfolk wondered where the money was actually going that would be used for the supposed equity adjustment.

Vice President McFarland said that Provost Leathers would determine exactly where that would be. It would certainly not be anywhere across the board. The equity adjustment was the major reason for the tuition increase, and it would be a multi-year approach. In the future he hoped that we would be able to address the issue of those people who were left out of this so as to treat all our key staff equitably since we were all here for the teaching of students. Another multi-year need which the administration would be presenting to the Board was the Year 2000 conversion that identified almost \$3 million in needed expenditures. We had funded about \$1.3 million of it in the current year with \$640,000 coming out of operating funds and other coming out of capital funds. Getting back to the equity adjustment, the administration was calling it a market salary equity adjustment. This was going to be the official term for it. There were a lot of other ways to describe it, but this was what the administration had settled on.

The Chairman now presented the results of the election as follows:

* H. Michael Cheung	27
* Chand Midha	21
* William Rich	18
* Virginia Gunn	15
* Jesse Marquette	14
Steve Aby	12
Karen Reed	10
Mike Jalbert	10
Dolli Markovich	7
Andrew Borowiec	6
David Redle	6

* indicates elected

There were 146 ballots cast.

Senator Redle wondered whether the vote indicated that everyone was angry with him since he had been the Senator whose arrival gave the body a quorum to hold this meeting.

The Chairman now asked whether anyone wished to make a motion regarding the Senate's attitude toward the Presidential Search Committee and its procedures.

Senator Rich moved the following resolution: "The Faculty Senate objects strenuously to the Board of Trustees' exclusion of academicians from direct participation in the presidential search process as members of the search committee and expresses its lack of confidence in that process." This was seconded.

Senator John Green agreed with the sentiments expressed by Senator Rich but felt they would be counterproductive. If the problem with the new search process was that there was not sufficient involvement of academics in the process (with which he agreed), then this particular resolution would not help the matter. We had elected five members of the Senate who would begin to meet with the Board of Trustees and with the Presidential Screening Committee, and there was every possibility that by persuasion and discussion and development of trust that further involvement of the faculty and academics in the search process could eventuate. This particular resolution would harm that possibility. Senator Rich was very eloquent and expressed the outrage that many members of the campus felt, but we might as well reword the resolution to say that since we have no confidence in the search process, we did not want to be involved.

Senator Green went on to say that it would be much more appropriate to amend this motion to direct the representatives of the Senate to seek and expand involvement of the academic community at every phase of the search process. It came down to a question of whether we expressed our feelings or whether we really tried to be effective. As a political scientist, it was his business to study this sort of thing, and it had been found over and over again that expressions of outrage were mostly counterproductive. As much as they made people feel good, they mostly did not achieve the purposes they were intended to achieve. At this point, we were at a very delicate moment when we had every possibility of expanding the search process to include a lot more input from the academic community. Now that might not happen, but this particular resolution would virtually guarantee that it would not happen. Accordingly, he offered the following substitute motion which read as follows: "The Senate directs its representatives to the presidential search to seek and expand involvement of the academic community in the search process at every opportunity." This was seconded.

Senator Rich stated that he would not disagree with the inclusion of the language that Senator Green proposed to substitute, but it did seem to him that we needed to say something that expressed the fact that we objected to the way the search committee was currently constituted. What his motion said was that we objected strenuously, and if someone wanted to take out "strenuously" we could do that, but he did not know why. We did lack confidence in the process as it was currently described. He agreed that members of the committee should seek expanded involvement, and as one of those members he hoped to do just that. However, we still needed to object because the way the process was now designed, it was impossible for faculty to have confidence in it. Now it did not mean that things would not work out at the end of the process and that people would not like the result. It just meant that the way it stood right now one could not be confident in it. For that reason he did not think that his resolution was the kind of inflammatory statement Senator Green thought it was. It merely said that the way the process was presented to us gave us no confidence in it. It seemed to him that perhaps we ought to try to meld the two resolutions so that the constructive suggestion made by Senator Green could be adopted but we could still include language that put us on record as objecting to what we had now.

At this point both Senator Gill and Senator Reed pointed out that we could no longer continue because we had lost the quorum. The Chairman stated that we could continue as long as there was no call for a quorum count. Were they calling for a count?

When they replied that they were, a count was taken and the quorum had been lost. The meeting immediately adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE FOR PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| May, 1997 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Brief Board of Trustees on process, criteria, and schedule- Review By-Law changes- Mail to Trustees proposed By-Law changes |
| June, 1997 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Formal Board By-Law review and vote |
| July, 1997 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Advisory Group selects two or three potential recruiting firms for final selection by the Board |
| September, 1997 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Make final selection of recruiting firm after interviews by Advisory Group- Seek Board of Trustees approval to commence search within the framework of the process, criteria and schedule previously reviewed. |
| October/November, 1997 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Commence search |
| August, 1998 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">- New president selected and ready to begin incumbency with beginning of fall, 1998 term latest, overlapping with existing interim president. |

6/25/97

RECOMMENDED AND PRIORITIZED CRITERIA
FOR SELECTING THE NEW PRESIDENT OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

1. A proven leader from the academic profession, business community, or government. The person must have the leadership skills to build an effective academic/administrative team which will enhance the University's stature.
2. A person who has demonstrated constructive and open working relationships with boards of directors and/or trustees.
3. A person who is experienced with the strategic planning process and who can work within that planning process to define and articulate the vision and priorities for the University.
4. A person who is an effective, high level manager with demonstrated experience with the financial responsibilities of the position. A person with a firm grasp of the financial management process and its interactions with state governmental bodies. A person with experience in managing budget processes.
5. A person of strong intellect and top flight academic credentials who is comfortable with the complexities of achieving academic and administrative excellence, who possesses a high energy level, and who is emotionally stable. A person who can be effective in highly stressful circumstances and who can endure long hours when required.
6. A person who will bring the University to greater unity through well developed human relations skills and strong communication skills. A person who will relate to the hopes and aspirations of the students, faculty, and administrative staff.
7. A person who engenders respect; who has a moral and ethical life style.
8. A person who is an articulate promoter of the University in the broadest sense and who will also be a strong pace setter in the fund raising processes at the governmental and philanthropic levels.

- 2 -

9. A person who can work effectively with alumni organizations, the University of Akron Foundation, and Akron community leaders.
10. A person with the charisma and leadership to attract top scholars to the University of Akron faculty and student body, and sports.
11. A person who will promote the appropriate balance between academics, arts, and sports.

7/3/97

supres.eri

**SCHEDULE FOR INTERACTIONS WITH FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION,
STUDENT BODY AND COMMUNITY LEADERS****June-September, 1997****Conduct briefing discussions with**

- Council of Deans
- Faculty Senate
- Department Heads
- Key Administration Members
- Student leaders
- Key Community Leaders
- Beacon Journal Leadership

These discussions will enlist their support for the process and criteria overall and specifically for choosing smaller representative groups of the Senate, Department Heads, Administration, Student Leaders. etc.

September-October 1997

Reach consensus on the process with all involved constituencies. This will involve meetings with each constituency led by Lee Tobler as chairperson of the Advisory Group and other members of the Board of Trustees. Selections of representatives for each constituency to be completed by December.

January-April, 1998

Working with the recruiting firm, the Advisory Group will interview candidates and narrow the list to three.

April-May, 1998

- Each of the three finalists will be interviewed by the full Board of Trustees.
- Complete assessment interviews of the three finalists with all constituencies and prepare final recommendation to Board of Trustees.

June, 1998

- Board Action

7/3/97

aupres.sch

Bylaws of Board of Trustees Section of University Rules

[Adopted by BOT 6/25/97]

3359-1-05

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

- (A) The board shall elect a president of the university to hold office at its discretion, IN ACCORD WITH ITS AUTHORITY SET FORTH IN REVISED CODE 3359.03. THE FOLLOWING PROCEDURES SHALL SERVE TO GUIDE THE SELECTION PROCESS, UNLESS REVISED AS PROVIDED HEREIN.
1. THE ENTIRE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, INCLUDING STUDENT TRUSTEES, SHALL CONVENE AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE TO CONSTITUTE THE PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
 2. PURSUANT TO THE BYLAWS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES, THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD SHALL NAME FOUR VOTING TRUSTEES AS A PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY AND SCREENING COMMITTEE WITH THE FOLLOWING RESPONSIBILITIES:
 - (a) TO MAKE INITIAL AND ONGOING RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FULL COMMITTEE REGARDING THE CRITERIA, PROCESS AND SCHEDULING FOR THE SEARCH FOR THE PRESIDENT;
 - (b) TO RECOMMEND EXECUTIVE SEARCH FIRMS FOR CONSIDERATION BY THE FULL COMMITTEE;
 - (c) TO RECEIVE APPLICATIONS AND NOMINATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE;
 - (d) TO SERVE AS A FIRST LEVEL SCREENING FOR CANDIDATES, AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FULL SEARCH COMMITTEE.
 - (e) TO CONDUCT THOSE ACTIVITIES RELATED TO THE SEARCH AS MAY BE ASSIGNED BY THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE.
 3. IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEGITIMATE CONCERNS AND INTERESTS OF FACULTY, ACADEMIC AND SENIOR ADMINISTRATION, ALUMNI AND COMMUNITY LEADERS, THE SEARCH COMMITTEE WILL INVOLVE SUCH APPROPRIATE CONSTITUENCIES IN THE SEARCH PROCESS AS FOLLOWS:
 - a. PRIOR TO THE INVITATION FOR NOMINATIONS OR APPLICATIONS OF CANDIDATES, THE PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY AND SCREENING COMMITTEE SHALL HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO MEET AND DISCUSS THE PROPOSED CRITERIA, PROCESS AND SCHEDULING FOR THE SEARCH PROCESS WITH THE REPRESENTATIVE CONSTITUENCY AND ADVISORY GROUPS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO, THE COUNCIL OF DEANS, REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRS, FACULTY SENATE, SENIOR ADMINISTRATION, STUDENTS, AND COMMUNITY LEADERS, AS IDENTIFIED IN THIS SECTION.

- b. PRIOR TO THE SELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT, THE CANDIDATES (FINALISTS) WHO ARE DETERMINED BY THE SEARCH COMMITTEE TO BE WELL QUALIFIED TO LEAD THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON AS ITS NEXT PRESIDENT SHALL BE INVITED TO CAMPUS AND EACH OF THE FOLLOWING CONSTITUENCIES AND/OR ADVISORY GROUPS SHALL BE PROVIDED AN OPPORTUNITY TO MEET WITH THE FINALISTS AND PROVIDE INPUT.
1. COUNCIL OF DEANS. THE ENTIRE COUNCIL OF DEANS SHALL BE INVITED TO A MEETING WITH EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE BROUGHT TO THE CAMPUS. A REPRESENTATIVE CHOSEN BY THE COUNCIL OF DEANS SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORALLY WITH THE FULL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR COLLECTIVE VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE.
 2. DEPARTMENT CHAIRS. THE DEPARTMENT CHAIRS, AS DEFINED IN 3359-20-02(B)(5), SHALL ELECT FROM THEIR MEMBERSHIP FIVE REPRESENTATIVES WHO SHALL BE INVITED TO A MEETING WITH EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE. A REPRESENTATIVE CHOSEN BY THIS GROUP OF DEPARTMENT CHAIRS SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORALLY WITH THE FULL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR COLLECTIVE VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE.
 3. FACULTY SENATE. THE FACULTY SENATE SHALL ELECT FROM THEIR MEMBERSHIP FIVE REPRESENTATIVES WHO SHALL BE INVITED TO A MEETING WITH EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE. A REPRESENTATIVE CHOSEN BY THIS GROUP OF FACULTY SENATORS SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORALLY WITH THE FULL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR COLLECTIVE VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE.
 4. SENIOR ADMINISTRATION. THE VICE PRESIDENTS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF HUMAN RESOURCES, DIRECTOR OF AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EEO OFFICER SHALL BE INVITED TO A MEETING WITH EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE. A REPRESENTATIVE CHOSEN BY THIS GROUP OF ADMINISTRATORS SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORALLY WITH THE FULL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR COLLECTIVE VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE.
 5. STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES. THE PRESIDENT OF THE ASSOCIATED STUDENT GOVERNMENT, THE PRESIDENT OF GRADUATE STUDENT GOVERNMENT OR STUDENT BAR ASSOCIATION SHALL BE INVITED TO A MEETING WITH EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE. A REPRESENTATIVE CHOSEN BY THESE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORALLY WITH THE STUDENT TRUSTEES AND THE CHAIR OF THE PRESIDENTIAL ADVISORY AND SCREENING COMMITTEE, IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR COLLECTIVE VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO

EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE.

6. COMMUNITY LEADERS. THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE SHALL SELECT A GROUP OF COMMUNITY LEADERS, INCLUDING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON ALUMNI ASSOCIATION, TO MEET WITH EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE. A REPRESENTATIVE CHOSEN BY THIS GROUP SHALL HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS ORALLY WITH THE FULL BOARD OF TRUSTEES, IN EXECUTIVE SESSION, THEIR COLLECTIVE VIEWS WITH RESPECT TO EACH FINALIST CANDIDATE.

4. THE FOREGOING PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES SHALL NOT BE CONSTRUED TO LIMIT, REDUCE, MODIFY OR RELINQUISH ANY AUTHORITY, RESPONSIBILITY, OR DISCRETION OF THE BOARD TO EMPLOY THE PRESIDENT AND GOVERN THE UNIVERSITY CONSISTENT WITH THE POWERS CONFERRED UPON THE BOARD BY LAW. NOTWITHSTANDING ANYTHING HEREIN TO THE CONTRARY, THESE PROCEDURES SHALL NOT BE DEEMED TO BE MANDATORY, BUT SHALL BE CONSIDERED DIRECTORY IN NATURE; AND, MAY BE REVISED, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, UPON A MAJORITY VOTE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES AT ANY REGULAR OR SPECIAL MEETING, WITHOUT THE NECESSITY OF PRIOR NOTICE THEREOF.

- (B) The president is the executive head of all university colleges, branches, schools, and departments and thus, responsible for general supervision of all its interests. Within general policies of the board, the president shall lead in fostering and promoting education, instruction, research and scholarly activity, and public service as its primary aims. Each year the president shall submit to the board a report on the institution's activities, plans, current and future needs and other relevant data. The president shall attend all meetings of the trustees and address to them matters of institutional importance. The president is the official medium of communication between the university, the board and its committees, possessing the exclusive right to transmit proposals from the faculty and staff--either as a group or as individuals--to the board. This exclusive right of the president shall not abridge the right of trustees to communicate directly with faculty, staff, or other employees of the university; and, no employee shall incur any penalty or sanction whatsoever in connection with such communications.
- (C) By virtue of administrative assignment, the president is a member of the faculty senate and of each college faculty and thus, may preside at every meeting thereof, if the president so wishes. The president shall appoint all committees of the faculty senate unless their memberships are designated by rule. The president shall see that measures of the faculty senate, which have been properly submitted to and approved by the board, are implemented and shall ensure that directives of the board relative to internal administration are carried out.
- (D) The president has authority in all matters of student discipline in accordance with the rules and regulations of the board. The president shall oversee preparation of the annual budget and advise the board on all financial matters; shall preside at commencement and all other public academic occasions; and shall confer such appropriate degrees and honors as are granted by the institution. The president shall have authority and responsibility to oversee intercollegiate athletics and ensure compliance with NCAA and conference rules. The president shall oversee and foster relationships with legislative representatives, community, and municipal leaders, state and national higher education officials, professional associations, other educational institutions, business leaders, and other various publics of the university and higher education. The president shall assume a primary role in fund raising on behalf of the university.

- (E) The president is empowered to nominate all administrative officers, faculty, and staff members to the board for appointment. This responsibility also extends to recommendations on the vacation of professorships and other positions. With the board's prior approval, the president may appoint administrative officers as necessary to ensure the institution's effective operation. Although the president may delegate authority to appropriate officials, the president shall retain final authority and responsibility for administration of the University in accord with the bylaws and regulations of the Board.
- (F) The president is authorized and empowered to compromise, adjust, and settle any and all claims, actions, causes of action, demands, costs, expenses, and any and all other damages in connection with any lawsuit filed for or against the university in an amount not to exceed \$25,000, upon such terms and conditions as the president shall deem reasonable and best. All such settlements shall be made upon advice of the general counsel and shall be subject to any necessary approval of the attorney general and the court in which the action is pending, and such other requirements as are mandated by law. Further, the president is empowered to execute such agreements of settlement and perform such acts as are reasonable and necessary to effect this settlement authority.
- (G) When in the judgment of the president the safety and well-being of students, faculty or staff, or university property is endangered, or when necessary to comply with the requirements of federal or state laws or regulations or when circumstances require the promulgation of rules without the benefit of prior review and approval of the board of trustees and/or the faculty senate, the president, upon advice of the general counsel, is authorized and empowered to promulgate rules for the governance of the university and provide for filing of such rules in compliance with section 111 of the Ohio revised code. The president shall immediately inform the board of trustees and when appropriate the faculty senate of any rules promulgated pursuant to this authority.

Faculty Manual Section of University Rules

3359-20-02 Organization of the University

(B) Officers of Academic Administration

(1) The President of the University.

- (a) The President of the University is elected by the Board to hold office at its discretion. The President is the executive head of all university colleges and departments, and is responsible for the general supervision of all the university's interests.
- (b) ~~The President is selected as follows: The Board establishes a search committee of eleven members which includes four board members, three regular faculty members, the president of associated student government, the president of the alumni council, the president of the graduate student government or student bar association, and one academic dean elected by the dean of the graduate school, the deans of the degree-granting colleges, and the dean of university libraries. The board members are appointed by the board chairperson. The three regular faculty members (representing three colleges) are elected by the elected members of the faculty senate.~~

July 24, 1997

Page 20

APPENDIX B

July 15, 1997

Mrs. Rainy Stitzlein
Chair, Board of Trustees
The University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325-4706

Dear Madam Chair:

We, the members of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, are writing to express concerns raised by numerous colleagues in regard to the changes in the procedures for the selection of the President of The University of Akron. These concerns relate to the principle of shared governance under which the University operates. Cooperation between all elements of the University is essential to an effective ability to solve educational problems and develop academic excellence. Joint effort is most critical when an institution chooses a new President. The composition of the search committee under the previous procedures recognized that communal task. The new procedures seem to alter the community in two major ways; namely, removing faculty participation in the all-important selection phase and not including interaction of the finalists with the faculty and staff at large.

We note that the new section of the Board Bylaws 3359-1-05 (A) 4. states "...these procedures shall not be deemed to be mandatory, but shall be considered directory in nature; and, may be revised, in whole or in part, upon a majority vote of the Board of Trustees at any regular or special meeting without the necessity of prior notice thereof." In light of this opportunity for modification of the policy, we make the following suggestions in order to allay some of the faculty concerns.

We propose first that a subcommittee of the Presidential Advisory and Screening Committee be created consisting of five members of the faculty elected by the Faculty Senate. Its task would be to assist the Screening Committee in evaluating the academic qualifications and university experience of the candidates. Second, we propose that the entire faculty and staff be afforded an opportunity to meet with the finalists in order to ask questions, express concerns, and then make an evaluation which can be used by the Search Committee.

We recognize the primary role of the Board of Trustees at The University of Akron and that one of its most important functions is the appointment of a President. The document entitled "Schedule for Interactions with Faculty, Administration, Student Body and Community Leaders" mentions wanting to "reach consensus on the process with all involved constituencies." Our suggestions are presented in the spirit of that statement.

We thank you for your consideration in this matter.

July 24, 1997

Page 21

On behalf of the entire Executive Committee,

(signed)

H. Michael Cheung, Chair, Faculty Senate

Gary H. Oller, Secretary, Faculty Senate

Ruth Clinefelter

Elizabeth Erickson

Tim Norfolk

Peggy Richards

mq

cc: Marion A. Ruebel, President
Noel L. Leathers, Interim Senior VP and Provost

APPENDIX C

TO: H. Michael Cheung
Chair, Faculty Senate

DATE: July 21, 1997

FROM: Rainy G. Stitzlein

SUBJECT: CORRESPONDENCE OF JULY 15, 1997

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter, under date of July 15, 1997, submitted on behalf of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate of The University of Akron and expressing several concerns and suggestions related to the presidential search process.

It is my understanding that the substance of each of the suggestions made by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, as outlined in your letter, were previously considered but not recommended by the trustees who prepared and submitted the changes in the Bylaws which were adopted at the regular meeting of the Board of Trustees in June, 1997. Since the adoption, much favorable comment has been received by board members from faculty, administrators and community leaders related to the new modified process.

July 24, 1997

Page 22

As you know, the presidential advisory and screening committee is in the process of meeting with constituency groups, in accordance with the Bylaw changes recently adopted. I anticipate that the Board Office will be contacting you soon regarding scheduling a meeting with the representatives of the Faculty Senate, as outlined in the Bylaws of the Board.

As always, we appreciate and value your input.

cc: Marion A. Ruebel
Noel L. Leathers
Ted A. Mallo

APPENDIX D

DATE: July 23, 1997
TO: The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Dr. J.E. Drummond, Chair of the University Well-Being Committee
SUBJECT: Summary of July 11, 1997 Meeting of the UWBC

The committee met on July 11 with Mr. Jim Prunty, our new Vice President of Human Resources, and Mrs. Desnay Lohrum, the Manager of Benefits Administration. The meeting regarded the idea of replacing the comprehensive health plan currently run by Mutual Health Services with a PPO (Preferred Provider Organization) plan. The presentation by Mr. Prunty and Mrs. Lohrum brought forth several questions and the following main points were apparent:

1. Three vendors have expressed interest in providing an insurance package and these are large, well-known providers;
2. The University is expecting a cost savings in the range of \$400,000 to \$700,000;
3. The features of the new plan appear similar to the Mutual Health plan except that
 - a) There will be focus on prevention including coverage of adult physicals,
 - b) The annual deductibles will not be salary-driven but will be up to \$400 higher than the present levels for "out-of-network" providers,

- c) The annual out-of-pocket maximums will not be salary-driven but will be up to \$3,400 higher than present levels for "out-of-network" providers,
- 4. The PPO would not be a fixed cost to the University and the present situation in which the University pays a minimum monthly premium would continue;
- 5. Several questions remain to be resolved including what is called a "disruption of service" analysis in order to determine which employees are now using physicians or hospitals that are not in the proposed networks. Such questions will be dealt with prior to entering a PPO or selecting a vendor.

As a result of our discussion, the UWBC expressed interest in the PPO concept and requested that Human Resources proceed to get more information on the impact of such a change to University personnel. We requested that they be prepared to present the concept to the full Faculty Senate at the first meeting in the Fall of 1997. At that time they will have more concrete information on physicians and hospitals in the networks as well as more details on costs.

APPENDIX E

Report of the Vice Chair Graduate Council

Spring 1997

The Graduate Council met four times since the Fall 1996 Graduate faculty meeting. Regular business of Council was conducted on November 25, 1996, and on January 27, February 24, and March 24, 1997. There is one remaining Graduate council meeting for this academic year on April 28, 1997.

For the duration of her Spring 1997 faculty improvement leave, Dr. Therese Lueck, Fine and Applied Arts, was replaced on council by Dr. Kathleen Endres, Fine and Applied Arts. Graduate council greatly appreciated Dr. Endres' participation and welcomes Dr. Lueck's return in Fall 1997.

Members of Graduate Council whose terms end this academic year include Drs. Ted Conway (Engineering), Gary Hamed (Polymer Science and polymer Engineering), Gay Kitson (Arts and Sciences), and James Lynn (Fine and Applied Arts). The above Council members formed a nominating committee and their nominations are circulating. Official ballots will be distributed on April 22, 1997. Additionally, Council member Dr. Brian Leonard (Engineering) will be retiring, thus vacating his position with two years left of his three-year term. That two-year vacancy will be filled by a special election.

The Curriculum Committee, chaired by Dr. Susan Olson, Education, concluded their business for the academic year by approving 81 graduate-level curriculum proposals at the November 25, 1996, meeting of Graduate Council. A number of the proposals were preapproved by Dean Charles Dye as the Committee agreed to defer to the Graduate Dean on proposals regarding prerequisites, course deletions, title changes, bulletin descriptions with little degree of change, and number changes at the same level. Several proposals were approved "with comment." There were no other curriculum proposals brought forth to the Committee during the Spring 1997 semester.

The Membership Committee, chaired by Dr. Douglas Kahl, Business Administration, recommended approval of 14 applications for full-time regular graduate faculty status at the Graduate Council meeting of November 25, 1996. Four additional applications were returned to the faculty for revisions/clarifications. The Committee reviewed 88 applications for full-time regular graduate faculty membership during Spring 1997, and will recommend the approval of 80 of those applications at the April 28 Graduate Council meeting.

Chaired by Dr. Gay Kitson, Arts and Sciences, the Student Policy Committee considered two issues this semester: 1) academic reassessment for graduate students, and 2) funding for graduate assistants beyond the 2/4 year limits for masters/doctoral students. Data are being gathered as the Committee considers these issues further. Additionally, the Student Policy Committee recommended that academic units that honor the three-year baccalaureate degree submit their specific policies to Graduate Council.

Other Actions:

Graduate Council members agreed to serve as the pool of candidates to serve on hearing Committees for graduate student grievance proceedings. Per a friendly amendment to the motion, Council officers and committee chairs are exempt from service.

Graduate Council approved the tentative list of graduate degree candidates for Spring 1997 Commencement at the February 24, 1997 meeting.

Approved minutes of Graduate Council meetings are available on the Graduate School website at <http://www.uakron.edu/gradsch/gradcoun.html>.

Respectfully submitted by
Ted A. Conway, Vice-Chair, 1996-97

APPENDIX F

Report of Research Faculty Projects Committee

MINUTES OF APRIL 11, 1997

The Research (Faculty Projects) Committee met in Chestnut A of the Gardner Student Center on Friday, April 11, 1997 at 9:30 a.m. Members present were: Dr. Stephen Aby, Dr. Roger Bain, Mr. Andrew Borowiec, Dr. Clayton Fant, Miss J. Fitzgerald, Dr. L. W. Macior, Dr. D. Malhotra, Dr. Phillip Schmidt, Dr. Daniel Sheffer, Chair, and Dr. Mark Tausig. Members absent were: Dr. Celal Batur, Mr. Earl Ertman, Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. William McGucken (on leave), Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Victoria Schirm, Dr. Jerry Stinner, and Dr. Michael Williams.

The purpose of this final meeting of the Faculty Research Grant Committee was wrap up the year's activity. Dr. Sheffer noted that he had met with two individuals whose faculty research grants had not been funded, and he felt they responded to the committee's comments and criticism in a positive manner. Both would revise the proposals and resubmit next year.

This committee originally was budgeted at \$109,000, with Dr. C. S. Chen adding an additional \$50,000 from his indirect cost account. The committee spent \$17,005 in the fall, \$33,630 in the spring, and \$72,000 for the summer, for a total of \$122,635.

The first item on the agenda was a review of the current application and guideline materials. Mr. Borowiec noted that there is a discrepancy on the number of copies to be submitted to the committee. The guidelines will be corrected.

Dr. Fant would like to see the form simplified, particularly for the non-science and engineering proposals. He felt that outside agencies have forms vastly simpler than ours. He asked that a sub-committee be formed to look at a different format. He would like someone from the arts and quantitative social sciences to balance the field. He feels the reason we see so few proposals from certain fields is the form is not applicable, to the humanities, for example. Mr. Borowiec volunteered to work with this sub-committee.

Dr. Sheffer noted that these guidelines are to be written for faculty members across the whole campus. Dr. Fant stated that the experimental model doesn't work well for some areas.

Dr. Malhotra asked why they just couldn't mark not applicable if that was the case? Dr. Fant stated that there is the perception that it would go against them if marked that way. The perception is that they are discouraged from applying with the guidelines in this present form.

This sub-committee will consist of Dr. Schmidt, Mr. Borowiec, Dr. Fant, Dr. Malhotra, and Dr. Macior. Dr. Fant will call the initial meeting of the sub-committee.

The next item was the sub-committee report discussing consideration of the additional remuneration in the summer for faculty receiving a Summer Faculty Research Fellowship.

The subcommittee consisted of Mr. Borowiec and Drs. Malhotra and Schmidt. Dr. Schmidt stated that the sub-committee recommended that faculty receiving a Summer Research Fellowship be allowed to receive summer compensation for supervising graduate student research pertaining to either doctoral dissertation or master's thesis/paper which is a requirement for the degree. The faculty member involved should notify the committee chair before the start of the funding period. The chair is authorized to approve such exceptions.

Dr. Sheffer stated that we may need to consider other things, such as workshops and intersessions. Dr. Malhotra stated that we need to be clear on drawing a line with workshops and that exceptions need to be brought before the committee.

Dr. Fant felt that we shouldn't encourage faculty who are funded for the Summer Fellowship to do workshops and seminars. The point is to help students who have commitments to keep them from getting disrupted. They expect to have faculty available to work with them in the summer.

Dr. Sheffer stated that this should involve summer sessions only, not the intersession. The sub-committee proposed the following: Faculty receiving a Summer Research Fellowship

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Revenue Projections - 1997/98
Current Unrestricted Fund

(6% T&F; 3% Subsidy Guar. Scenario #5A			(4% T&F; 3% Subsidy Guar. Scenario #3		
NET AVAILABLE			NET AVAILABLE		
\$8,484,000			\$7,909,890		
	Permanent \$	One-Time \$		Permanent \$	One-Time \$
PERMANENT USES	\$7,754,000	\$730,000	PERMANENT USES	\$7,178,890	\$730,000
1 H/R(#1) - Training	\$150,000	\$730,000	1 H/R(#1) - Training	\$150,000	\$730,000
2 * Year 2000 Conversion (#3,#4,#27)	840,000		2 * Year 2000 Conversion (#3,#4,#27)	840,000	
3 Media Center (#5)	94,000		3 Media Center (#5)	94,000	
4 Salary Increase (3%) (#7)	3,000,000		4 Salary Increase (3%) (#7)	3,000,000	
5 OhioLink (#8)	30,000		5 OhioLink (#8)	30,000	
6 Faculty Salary Adj.:Market/Equity	1,050,000		6 Faculty Salary Adj.:Market/Equity	1,050,000	
7 Library (#13)	200,000		7 Library (#13)	200,000	
8 Academic Initiatives (#11,#12)	200,000		8 Academic Initiatives (#11,#12)	200,000	
9 Grad. Asst. (#9)	200,000		9 Grad. Asst. (#9)	200,000	
10 Advising (#10)	150,000		10 Advising (#10)	150,000	
11 Advertising (#18)	300,000		11 Advertising (#18)	300,000	
12 Athletics - Gender (#14)	750,000		12 Athletics - Gender (#14)	750,000	
13 Campus Planning (new)	120,000		13 Campus Planning - Phase-In (new)	120,000	
14 Distance Learning (new)	200,000		14 Distance Learning - Phase-In (new)	200,000	
15 Safety/Chemical Waste Disposal (#15)	250,000		15 Safety/Chemical Waste Disposal (#15)	95,890	
16 Restore Pres. Reserve to \$1m (#2)	420,000		16 Restore Pres. Reserve to \$1m (#2)	420,000	
Available less Uses (1 thru 16)	\$0	\$0	Available less Uses (1 thru 12)	\$0	\$0
Other:			Other:		
17 EEO/Minority Affairs (# 19)	\$275,000		15 Safety/Chemical Waste Disposal (#15)	154,310	
18 Central Funding of PFOC Chge-Backs	400,000		16 Restore Pres. Reserve to \$1m (#2)	420,000	
			17 EEO/Minority Affairs (# 19)	\$275,000	
			18 Central Funding of PFOC Chge-Backs	400,000	
Available less Uses (ALL)	(\$875,000)	\$0	Available less Uses (ALL)	(\$1,249,310)	\$0

* Total funding of \$2,790,000 includes \$840,000 in 1997-98; \$880,000 in 1998-99; \$740,000 in 1999-00; and a total of \$730,000 in computing equipment funded in 1997-98 from the OBOR capital appropriation.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Revenue Projections - 1997/98
Current Unrestricted Fund - Reconciliation of PBC to Executive Budgets

	1996-97		1997-98 Projections - Reconciliation			
	Original Budget	Revised Budget	PBC Estimates (3)	Executive Estimates (6A)	\$ Difference	Explanation
Revenues:						
Tuition and Fees						
Undergraduate	\$54,088,400	\$54,843,030	\$57,134,000	\$58,142,400	\$1,008,400	PBC - 3% rates; Exec.- 4% summer & fall, 6% spring
Graduate	15,869,300	15,600,000	15,981,100	16,048,300	67,200	PBC - 4% rates; Exec.- 4% summer & fall, 6% spring
Non-Resident Surcharge	5,875,000	6,285,000	6,536,000	6,584,200	48,200	Rate differences detailed above.
Course Fees	1,375,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	1,455,000	0	No change
Miscellaneous Fees	1,095,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	No change
Off-Campus Credit Course Revenues	0	0	0	200,000	200,000	Off-Campus revenues to be returned to colleges
Less: G/F Support to Athletics	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	(4,713,030)	0	No change
Total Tuition and Fees	\$73,589,670	\$74,470,000	\$77,393,070	\$78,716,870	\$1,323,800	
State Appropriations						
Base Instructional Subsidies	\$88,180,457	\$88,180,456	\$90,923,000	\$90,922,880	(\$120)	Executive reflects "final" subsidy approved by state
International Business Subsidy	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	No change
Various Challenges (est share)	0	0	0	483,200	483,200	Executive reflects estimates of challenges approved by state
Capital Component (net)	0	0	0	1,176,295	1,176,295	Executive reflects excess capital approved by state
Total State Support	\$89,180,457	\$89,180,456	\$91,923,000	\$93,584,375	\$1,661,375	
Other Sources:						
Earnings on Investments	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$3,700,000	\$4,000,000	\$300,000	Exec. reflects revised earnings estimate
Departmental Sales/Services:						
UASC	748,420	1,000,000	1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	No change
Other	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	5,452,381	0	No change
Indirect Cost Recovery	2,025,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	0	No change
Miscellaneous	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	0	No change
Total Other Sources	\$12,275,801	\$12,877,381	\$12,577,381	\$12,877,381	\$300,000	
Endowment Income	\$161,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$930,000	\$730,000	Increase reflects Executive budget's provision for the Scholarship for Excellence Program.
TOTAL REVENUES	\$175,208,928	\$176,727,837	\$182,093,451	\$186,108,626	\$4,015,175	
REVENUE CHANGE FROM 96-97 REVISED BUDGET	(\$1,520,909)	\$0	\$5,365,614	\$9,380,789	\$4,015,175	
ADMINISTRATIVE BUDGET REDUCTIONS			\$850,000	\$850,000	\$0	No change
ACADEMIC BUDGET SAVINGS/REALLOCATIONS			\$0	\$581,856	\$581,856	Reflects est. part time faculty savings from 96-97 quality enhancement dist. for full time positions (\$300,000) and reallocation of academic salary savings (\$281,856).
ADJUSTED AVAILABLE RESOURCES			\$6,215,614	\$10,812,645	\$4,597,031	
LESS: "DEFAULT" DECISIONS (See Attached)			\$0	(\$2,328,645)	(\$2,328,645)	Executive reflects "default" decisions not considered by PBC.
NET REVENUE AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION			\$6,215,614	\$8,484,000	\$2,268,386	

