

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

9-18-1997

Faculty Senate Chronicle September 18, 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.



Corrected

1997-98, No. 2

Sept. 18 & Oct. 2, 1997

27 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Academic Calendar	1
Faculty Senate Membership	2
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members	3
Faculty Senate Committees	3
Senate Members of other University Committees	7
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of September 18, 1997	9
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of October 2, 1997	14
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of October 2, 1997	24
A. Report of <i>Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee</i>	24
B. Members and Committees of <i>Graduate Council</i>	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

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

Academic Calendar

1997-98

FALL SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 25
* Labor Day (Day & Evening)	Mon., September 1
Veterans Day (Classes Held, Staff Holiday)	Fri., November 11
** Thanksgiving Break	Thurs.-Sat., November 27-29
Classes Resume	Mon., December 1
Final Instructional Day	Sat., December 6
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., December 8-13
Commencement	Sat., December 13
Spring Intersession	Fri.-Sat., January 2-10

SPRING SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., January 12
* Martin Luther King Day	Mon., January 19
* President's Day	Tues., February 17
Spring Break	Mon.-Sat., March 16-21
*** May Day	Fri., May 1
Final Instructional Day	Sat., May 2
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., May 4-9
Commencement	Sat., May 9
Commencement/Law School	Sun., May 17
Summer Intersession	Mon.-Fri., May 11-June 5

SUMMER SESSION I

First 5 and 8 Week Sessions Begin	Mon., June 15
* Independence Day	Thurs., July 3
First 5-Week Session Ends	Sat., July 18

SUMMER SESSION II

Second 5-Week Sessions Begin	Mon., July 20
8-Week Session Ends	Sat., August 8
Second 5-Week Session Ends	Sat., August 22
Commencement	Sat., August 22

FALL SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 31
-----------------------------	-----------------

* Classes canceled

FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP

(Update: 10/8/97)

College of Arts & Sciences (16) S. Baranowski, 00 James Buchanan, 99 Lindgren Chyi, 00 Elizabeth Erickson, 99 F. Griffin, 98 D. Malhotra, 98 J. Marquette, 99 W. McGucken, 98 Chand Midha, 98 T. Norfolk, 00 Gary Oller, 00 W. Pelz, 99 Diana Reep, 99 S. Stevenson, 00 J. Stinner, 00 Mark Tausig, 99	Community & Technical College (5) Rebecca Gibson, 99 David Hoover, 98 Michael Jalbert, 98 Wyatt Kilgallin, 98 James W. Taggart, 98	College of Education (4) Susan Clark, 99 Robert Dubick, 99 Edward Lasher, 98 Lynn Smolen, 99	
College of Engineering (4) Celal Batur, 99 Jack Braun, 98 Michael Cheung, 99 Jerry Drummond, 98	College of Fine and Applied Arts (9) A. Borowiec, 99 Christina DePaul, 98 Virginia Gunn, 99 B. Heinzerling, 99 Scott Johnston, 99 James Lynn, 00 Marc Ozanich, 00 S. Rasor-Greenhalgh, 98 Ralph Turek, 00	College of Business Administration (4) John Hebert, 98 Dennis Kimmell, 98 Jay Patankar, 99 David Redle, 99	University Libraries (3) Steve Aby, 99 J. Fitzgerald, 99 TBA, 00 <i>James Kuhn, 00</i> TBA, 00 <i>Mary Konkel, 00</i>
College of Nursing (4) Cheryl Buchanan, 99 Kris Gill, 99 Karen Reed, 99 K. Ross-Alaolmolki, 98	Polymer Science/Engineering (2) John Frederick, 98 A. Isayev, 99	Wayne College (2) Dan Deckler, 99 Forrest Smith, 99	Contract Professionals (2) Connie Murray, 99 Gregory Stewart, 00
Part-Time Faculty (2) B. Filer-Tubaugh, 00 Peggy Richards, 98	Students (3) Derwin Hammonds, 98 Marshall Pitchford, 98 TBA, 98	School of Law (2) William Rich, 00 Ann Woodley, 99	SEAC (2) Dolli Markovich, 99 Holly Mothes, 99 <i>Kevin Butler, 99</i>

Note: Term expires in year listed.

Members - 64

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
1997-98

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Devinder Malhotra, Chair
Dr. Barbara Heinzerling, Vice-Chair
Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary
Dr. Steve Aby
Dr. Timothy Norfolk
Mr. William Rich
Mrs. Peggy Richards

SENATE COMMITTEES

* designates Senator

Boldface designates Chair

Term expires in year listed.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE

C. Midha, 98*
P. Richards, 98*
J. Bee, 99
C. Gigliotti, 99
W. Kilgallen, 00*
D. Kimmell, 00*
E. Mancke, 00

G. Oller, 00*
S. Stevenson, 00*
G. Stewart, 00*
N. Stokes, 00

Ex officio member, Dr. Noel L.
Leathers, Senior VP and Provost

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE

E. Lasher, 98*
K. Ross-Alaolmolki, 98*
D. Deckler, 99*
D. Redle, 99*
D. Reep, 99*
S. Baranowski, 00*

C. Clemons, 00
R. Clinefelter, 00
M. Jalbert, 00*
S. Rasor-Greenhalgh, 00*
J. Welch, 00

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

D. Hammonds, 98*
 C. Buchanan, 99*
 J. Lynn, 99*
 A. Woodley, 99*
 J. Braun, 00*
 D. Brink, 00
 N. Clark, 00
 J. Cosgarea, 00
 R. Dubick, 00*
 B. Filer-Tubaugh, 00*
 J. Hebert, 00*

T. Norfolk, 00*
 V. Rostedt, 00
 L. Saliga, 00

Ex officio members, Mr. David
 Jamison, NCAA Faculty
 Representative

Mr. Michael Bobinski, Athletic
 Director, or designee

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE

D. Dobrindt, 98
 G. Peeples, 98
 W. Taggart, 98*
 C. DePaul, 99*
 K. Gill, 99*
 B. Heinzerling, 99*
 J. Patankar, 99*
 L. Smolen, 99*
 K. Hinckley, 00
 P. O'Connor, 00
 M. Ozanich, 00*
 N. Ranson, 00

Ex officio members, Delmus
 Williams, dean of University
 Libraries, or designee

Ex officio, non-voting member,
 Mrs. Debra Keller, Director,
 Network Services

Mr. Paul Richert, Law Librarian

REFERENCE COMMITTEE

D. Hoover, 98*	J. Harris, 00
W. Rich, 98*	W. Pelz, 00*
J. Larose, 99	S. Johnston, 00*
D. Chlebek, 00	G. Oller, 00*

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

* call

7039

7729

6673

8740

J. Drummond, 98*	L. Chyi, 00*
K. Dunning, 98	E. Erickson, 00*
J. Kline, 98	R. Turek, 00*
H. Sterns, 98	W. Yoder, 00
V. Gunn, 99*	
A. Isayev, 99*	
C. Murray, 99*	
F. Smith, 99*	Ex officio member, Mr. Roger Ryan, designee of VP for Admin. Support Services
D. Buchthal, 00	

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

B. Bucey, 98	D. Laconi, 00
L. Pachnowski, 98	P. Linberger, 00
M. Pitchford, 98*	TBA Library 00*
TBA, 1 Student, 98*	Mary Konkel 00*
T. Alexander, 99	Ex officio members, Dr. Thomas Vukovich, Asst. VP, Enrollment Services, or designee, and Mr. Doug McNutt, Director of Student Financial Aid
R. Gibson, 99*	
H. Mothes, 99*	
J. Buchanan, 00*	

Kevin Butler

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE

R. Caplan, 98	R. Butler, 99*
M. Cheung, 98*	D. Markovich, 99*
J. Frederick, 98*	J. Marquette, 00*
J. Padovan, 98	B. Vijayaraman, 00
W. Rich, 98*	
R. Sibberson, 98	Ex-officio member, Mr. Richard <i>Debra Keller</i>
O. Bly, 99	Seivert, Interim Assoc. VP <i>Asst. VP,</i>
F. Griffin, 99*	for Information Services, or <i>Information Services</i>
F. Kinsinger, 99	designee

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE

J. Fant, 98	K. Endres, 00
W. McGucken, 98*	J. Hawes, 00
V. Schirm, 98	P. Henriksen, 00
P. Schmidt, 98	G. Jones, 00
M. Williams, 98	D. Sheffer, 00
S. Aby, 99*	
C. Batur, 99*	
A. Borowiec, 99*	Ex officio member, Dr. C.S.
S. Clark, 99*	Chen, VP, Research &
J. Fitzgerald, 99*	University Development, or
E. Klosterman, 99	designee
K. Reed, 99*	
J. Stinner, 99*	
M. Tausig, 99*	

SENATE MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE

Dr. Barbara Clements, 98*
 Dr. Yueh Jaw-Lin, 98
 Ms. Carol A. Olson, 98
 Mrs. Nancy Stokes, 98
 Ms. Susan Clark, 99*
 Mr. Michael Jalbert, 99*
 Ms. Monica Smith, 99

Dr. Lucille Terry, 99
 Dr. Wayne Mattice, 00
 TBA, (Nursing), 00

Dr. Elizabeth Kinion, 00

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE

Mr. Thomas Andes, 98
 Dr. Richard Einsporn, 98
 Mr. J. William Taggart, 98*
 Dr. Paul Daum, 99
 Dr. Jerry Drummond, 99*
 Mr. W.S. Jordan, III, 99

Dr. Suzanne MacDonald, 99
 Mrs. Laura Conley, 00
 Mr. Joseph Larose, 00
 Mr. Alvin Lieberman, 00
 Dr. Erol Sancaktar, 00

Dr. Marlene Huff, 00

Kevin Butler

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR,
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS
1997-98

Prof. Shelley Baranowski,* Buchtel College of Arts
and Sciences

Prof. John Bee, Alternate Representative
Buchtel College of Fine & Applied Arts & Sciences

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE

Dr. Jesse Marquette *	Arts & Sciences
Mr. James W. Taggart *	C & T
Dr. Robert Dubick *	Education
Dr. H. Michael Cheung *	Engineering
Dr. James Lynn *	Fine & Applied Arts
Dr. Dennis Kimmell *	Business
Miss Judith Fitzgerald *	Library
Dr. Kris Gill *	Nursing
Dr. John Frederick *	Polymer Science/Engr.
Mr. Forrest Smith *	Wayne
Dr. Gregory Stewart *	Contract Professionals
Mrs. Peggy Richards *	Part-time Faculty
Mr. William Rich *	Law
Mr. Derwin Hammonds *	Students
Mrs. Holly Mothes *	SEAC

~~TBA~~ * Kevin Butler *
Mrs. Dollie Markovich *

MINUTES OF SPECIAL SENATE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 18, 1997

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, September 18, 1997, in Room 307 of Leigh Hall.

Forty-seven of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Filer-Tubaugh, Mothes, Pelz, and Rasor-Greenhalgh were absent with notice. Senators Borowiec, Braun, DePaul, Dubick, Hammonds, Hebert, Hoover, Ozanich, and Stinner were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED TWO MOTIONS FROM UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE REGARDING THE PROPOSED PPO HEALTH CARE PLAN**

The Chairman said that before beginning to discuss the Preferred Provider Organization health proposal, he had a few announcements. He had talked to President Marion Ruebel this morning about the proposal, and although the President could not be here, he wanted the Chairman to convey a couple of things to the Senate. First, this was not a done deal. The PPO proposal was not being presented to this body purely for informational purposes but to see what the Senate's reaction and recommendation would be. The central administration had not made any decision with regard to the adoption of the proposal. Second, he requested that given the nature of this room, senators stand when speaking so that the audio system would be able to pick up what they were saying. Finally, Dr. Mark Auburn had made available to the Senate a copy of the University's self-study report for the NCA, and this would be placed in the Senate office for anyone to read. It was also available on the Web.

The Chairman then called on Senator Jerry Drummond, Chair of the University Well-Being Committee for its report.

Senator Drummond reported that the Committee had just finished its deliberations on this proposal approximately 20 minutes ago. First, he wanted to thank the University community for its participation in the five meetings which had been held over the past two weeks regarding the proposed PPO plan. There had been close to 500 people at these meetings on the main campus of the University, Wayne, NEOUCOM, etc. Not surprisingly, there had been a lot of interest in this.

He wanted the body to know that the Committee was making its decisions and recommendations on the basis of being a committee which dealt with the well-being of this faculty and staff. The Committee was also aware that there were budgetary considerations here. However, the Committee had two recommendations which it had approved unanimously and wanted the body to consider separately. The first read as follows: "The University Well-Being Committee moves to reject the PPO Plan as presented and continue the existing benefits plan." The second read, "We also move that in the future, budgetary considerations involved in health care issues be taken up by the Planning and Budgeting Committee prior to submission to University Well-Being Committee."

The Chairman suggested that before the body began to discuss these recommendations, it consider whether or not it would like to go into the committee of the whole. Then the matter could be discussed fully and the Senate could come out of the committee of the whole and report at that time. Was there any sentiment to proceeding in this fashion?

Senator Elizabeth Erickson moved that the Senate go into the committee of the whole, and this was seconded. Since there was no discussion, the body gave its approval, and the Senate went into a committee of the whole. The Chairman turned over the meeting to Vice Chair Barbara Heinzerling.

(Although when the Senate is in committee of the whole minutes are not supposed to be kept, the issues discussed and their relevance to understanding the body's final recommendation were important and are summarized as follows):

The body recognized that Human Resources had taken into account some of the problems which had been raised at the meetings with faculty and staff. This had led them to change the original proposal by adding three tiers tied to salaries for the deductibles and out-of-pocket expenses as well as considering a possible dual approach which would include both a PPO plan and the current indemnity plan. The Senate also realized that changes in health care and increases in costs would ultimately require the University to choose alternatives to the present system. However, a number of objections and concerns were raised regarding this PPO proposal. The major issue was still the lack of timely information to understand the plan in order to make an informed decision. There were many questions about the physicians and facilities which would be in the plan and whether most people would have to change their doctors and hospitals to take advantage of the PPO savings. The quality of the health care was a concern as well. There was also confusion about the actual costs and savings. It was pointed out that the PBC was certainly the place for this aspect of the problem to be discussed.

After an hour of discussion, the body came out of the committee of the whole, and Senator Malhotra returned to the Chair. Vice Chair Heinzerling rose to report that the motions had been discussed in the committee of the whole.

The Chairman asked Senator Drummond to restate the Well-Being Committee's first motion so that the body could now vote on it. The motion was that "The University Well-Being Committee moves to reject the PPO plan as presented and to continue the existing medical plan."

The Senate then voted and unanimously approved the motion.

Senator Drummond reminded the body that the second motion was as follows: "We (the Well-Being Committee) also move that in the future, budgetary considerations involved in health care issues be taken up by the Planning and Budgeting Committee prior to submission to the University Well-Being Committee." The Chairman stated that this was now open for discussion.

Senator William Rich, in light of some discussion which had occurred while in committee of the whole regarding amending this, wondered whether it would not be better to ask the Chairman to convey his understanding of the general viewpoint of the Senate concerning why it had voted the way it had. The body was not rejecting in principle the idea of cost containment and would be willing to entertain a reasonably well-planned proposal with adequate consultation at the appropriate time.

However, it would be difficult to come up with the right language here to make that clear. Therefore, he was suggesting that the body not try to amend this.

Senator Forrest Smith thought that this motion was a first step in the appropriate direction. One important consideration for the future was communication with all constituencies, not just the Senate, so that everyone had the details well in advance. However, he was not suggesting an amendment to that effect.

Senator H. Michael Cheung was in favor of the motion. When he had discussed this earlier in committee of the whole, his intent had been to convey the point that if we were not forced to do this now, we certainly would be forced to again address the issue and possibly have faculty contributions or something similar. He preferred that the representatives of faculty and staff be ahead on this issue rather than be surprised again as we were this time. Next time there might be such a fiscal crisis that we would have little grounds on which to maneuver. He thought that the Planning and Budgeting Committee was a perfectly good place to start with this, with homework assignments, if one wanted to think of them that way, then being routed out to appropriate bodies like Human Resources or University Well-Being. However, we needed to stay apprised of this issue and where the health care costs of the University were going, or we were going to be very unpleasantly surprised some budget day when we would be faced with horrendous costs, no maneuvering room and probably even less time to craft a solution that at least was not too onerous.

Senator Marshall Pitchford wanted to know what the intent of these two motions would be. Were we trying to convey our thoughts to the Board of Trustees?

The Chairman responded that any recommendation of this body would go to the President. It would go on to the Board if he agreed with it. If he disagreed, then he would come back and give the body an explanation as to why.

Senator Kris Gill spoke in favor of the motion because the name of the Committee was Planning and Budgeting and not strictly Budget. The goal setting which had begun with the 21st Century Task Force included supporting faculty, so this belonged in that think tank.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson thought that Senator Pitchford's confusion had arisen from something that had been said by Executive Director James Prunty when he had made his presentation to the Senate. He had commented that whatever recommendation the Senate chose to make would be included in the material that went to the Board.

The Chairman replied that he had answered Senator Pitchford in the way he had because the President had assured him that a decision had not yet been made on this. Before it would be presented to the Board, any Senate recommendation would get very careful and deliberate consideration.

Senator James Buchanan asked whether he was wrong in believing that the intent of the Senate here was to say no to this proposal and to add that this should not be tried again. He had heard Senators say that the proposed plan would be inconvenient and difficult with rearrangements. He took these proposed changes in a very personal way. This was not business for him. It was a 4-year old who got up in the middle of the night and needed emergency care. He knew the kind of care that was

out there with HMO's. He did medical workshops and knew that we did not want to be there. When we would be looking down the gun barrel of an HMO, we would not like the bullet that would come out. Forget about one's own health; consider your children. He was speaking against this plan and in favor of the motion.

Vice President Paul McFarland asked for permission to speak, and the body granted his request.

He said that he had not wanted to speak until after the Senate had passed the first motion. However, he thought that some misstatements needed to be corrected and that some of the strong feelings that had been expressed had been fostered because people did not have the right information. He had been at four different universities in his 25-year career, and they had had four plans exactly like what was currently here at The University of Akron. Each of those institutions had also had a medical school and a teaching hospital. He was speaking from the experience of having been in charge of the financial affairs of those hospitals and medical schools and also, if not having been directly in charge of benefits programs under Human Resources, closely involved with the decisions made. We had an indemnity program with an "administrative services only" type plan which basically said that we paid all the charges of all of our employees wherever they went, and the group that handled the processing added a fee on top of this for their work. Health care inflation was going up every year. Even if it had come down from double digits to single digits, it could be 5%. The University was right now spending almost \$9 million per year on health care benefits, so 5% of that was almost \$500,000. Therefore, the impetus was that we were trying to figure out a way to stop that inflation by a method other than just paying claims.

The University was not looking at an HMO. When this had first been proposed as a managed care type of approach, he had personally been dead set against it because he had seen what the revolution in health care had done with managed care approaches, which to him really rationed care. He thought that this institution ought to have a program that provided the broadest and most complete benefits for its people. When he investigated what this managed care approach would be, he determined that it was a PPO approach. He did not want to criticize what had been a statement brought up while the Senate was in committee of the whole attributed to the chief operating officer of Summa about PPO's. However, hospitals and physicians did not like PPO's because they came to them and asked for a discount for what they were charging others full price. With this purchasing power clout, PPO's were able to get those discounts, but hospitals did not like this because they would much rather have us pay charges than have a discount. He granted that in the greater Cleveland area there had been only maybe a 28% penetration to PPO's. It had not been much greater than that in Chicago where one of the institutions (Loyola) with which he had been involved had been able to have a seamless transition from the indemnity plan to the PPO.

In regard to this second motion which would require the issue to be discussed first in the PBC, he wanted to remind people who might have forgotten (and this was a problem more of the process than anything else) that he had responded to a question which had been raised at an April 17 meeting of the Senate dealing with the budget recommendations of the PBC by pointing out that our budget for this year was based on anticipating savings from this new health care benefits approach. At that point, he had thought it was proper to put this into the budget because there was sufficient time to consider and debate it. The problem now was that we had done nothing about this over the whole summer and now in September they needed a little lead time to make a change. It had been in the proposed

budget, but there had been no discussion of its merits. He thought that everyone in the PBC knew that we did have an amount budgeted. What we were trying to do was to find savings in all of our costs that 1) kept us from raising tuition, and 2) obviously gave us more money to do everything - one of which was to find additional monies this year for additional faculty salary increases.

It was unfortunate that the opinion had become prevalent that this change in plan was going to force us to switch doctors. He was not certain that we had the data to draw that conclusion. He reiterated that what he had seen in Chicago was a seamless approach, but he was not sure what it would be for Akron. We had not gotten the information from the potential bidders as to what the story was in terms of the coverage of all of the 1,600 physicians we had used last year - i.e., how many were in every plan or in multiple plans. He did not want people to leave here with the impression that this was a bad approach to be considered. There was no attempt to limit the benefits in the PPO approach. One got the same benefits; hopefully it did not limit one's access significantly. Actually, one got more benefits and a savings of about 10-15%. A lot of additional discussion on this topic was needed. He hoped that people would approach this with an open mind and discuss it more fully. Sufficient time was needed to understand it, and the problem this time was that we had done it in too quick a manner.

Senator Steve Aby did not think it was necessarily the approach that was the problem here. It might be part of it, but a lot of people were upset with the specifics of this plan. The question was whether or not this was the best possible PPO that we could be floating in front of the faculty and staff. A lot of people had said that it did not appear to be the best possible PPO that it could be. Just because it was a PPO plan did not mean that they all were equally good. We had all seen how in just the past couple of days this plan had evolved and changed because of criticism which had apparently been a surprise to the people doing the planning. To him this indicated that this was not set in stone and could be better. If it were better, maybe people would take it more seriously and support it.

The Chairman reminded the body of the motion on the floor and asked that Senators limit themselves to comments on that particular motion.

Senator Greg Stewart called the question. Since there were no objections, the body voted and approved the second motion unanimously.

Senator Chand Midha moved for adjournment, which was seconded by Senator Lindgren Chyi. The Senate voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 4:15 p.m.

MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF OCTOBER 2, 1997

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:03 p.m. on Thursday, October 2, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-three of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators J.Buchanan, Gibson, Isayev, Pelz, Reep, Stevenson, and Woodley were absent with notice. Senators Batur, Borowiec, Braun, C.Buchanan, DePaul, Dubick, Gill, Kimmell, Lasher, Mothes, Pitchford, and Reed were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **REFERRED A QUESTION REGARDING DAILY CLASS STARTING TIMES TO THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chairman asked whether there were any additions or deletions to the agenda. Since there were none, the Senate approved the agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 4, 1997 - Secretary Gary Oller stated that he had two corrections. The first was to The University of Akron Academic Calendar for 97-98 on page one. It stated that the Spring Semester would start on Tuesday, January 12, but it should read "Monday, Jan. 12." The second correction related to the May 1 minutes which had been approved at the last meeting. In the May 1 meeting there had been discussion regarding a package of changes that had been presented from Student Affairs including a "Civility Statement." During the discussion, Mr. Frank Axell was quoted (p. 19) as saying that the document had been authored by Irvin Brandel of the Counseling, Testing and Career Center. Dr. Brandel had since contacted Secretary Oller to tell him that he had chaired the Committee to Study the Learning Climate and it was that Committee which had created the document. He thought that the following statement should be inserted at the bottom of page 19 of the May 1 minutes to correct the error of fact: "The Campus Civility Statement, which is a separate document from the proposed Student Code of Conduct, was authored by the Committee to Study the Learning Climate, a joint committee of 35 faculty, contract professionals, students and staff, which was chaired by Dr. Irvin W. Brandel, Director of the Counseling, Testing and Career Center." These were the only corrections which the Secretary had.

Since there were no other corrections, the body voted its approval of the amended minutes.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR - The Chairman began by wishing everyone a happy Rosh Hashanah for the year 5758. He then welcomed two new Senators - Senator Wayne Kilgallin from C&T, and Senator Susan Clark from the College of Education. The body acknowledged this with applause.

The Chairman next reported that at their September 24 meeting, The Board of Trustees, on the basis of President Ruebel's recommendations, had approved an extension of the current health benefits for two years. He wanted to take this opportunity to express the body's sincere appreciation of President Ruebel's and his administration's sensitivity in response to our concerns regarding the proposed revision of the health benefits. He was also gratified by the President's assurance that in the future any proposed changes in health benefits would be undertaken only after wide-ranging discussions among various segments of the University community and substantial feedback and input from development committees and this body.

There was one other item which he wanted to mention that had appeared in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, September 31. There had been a long article which had talked about the state of our football program. He had been very outraged and disgusted by it, not because of what they had been referring to in terms of our non-winning seasons, but by their attack on our venerable mascot, Zippy. He had always suspected that the Wall Street Journal had a gender bias, which had now been confirmed because they were attacking Zippy, the only female mascot among all the schools which play Division I football.

Finally, the Chairman wanted to announce that Professor Don R. Gerlach had very kindly agreed to serve as parliamentarian for the upcoming year. He was glad to have him aboard because he was sure that he would keep him in a straight and narrow line.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - There were none.

V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First, let me congratulate the new Senate officers and reassure you that I look forward to working with you this coming year. I would also like to take a few minutes to congratulate the Community & Technical College on three programs that were reaccredited by the Technology and Accreditation Committee of the Accrediting Board of Engineering and Technology. First was the associate in applied science, the bachelor of science and electronic engineering technology. The second, the associate in applied science, bachelor of science and mechanical engineering technology were reaccredited for three years, and finally the associate in applied science and surveying and construction engineering technology was reaccredited for six years. I congratulate the college on the status of these programs.

The North Central Association evaluation, as you know, will be coming up with the team scheduled to be on campus Oct. 24. Needless to say, this is an extremely important evaluation for us. Our institution, as you well know, went through two focused visits within this 10-yr. gap, and now the team is coming back for the regular 10-yr. visit for reaccreditation. Dr. Leathers and I and a number of campus folks had an opportunity to meet with the chair last week for the better part of an hour and found him to be very realistic in the things he will look at and things he wants the team to look at. Basically, the North Central accreditation is this - are you in fact doing what you say you're doing? For those of you who have not had an opportunity to read our self-study, I have chaired

committees myself for North Central and I have to say that this is as good a self-study as I've seen. I think it's a very realistic, straight-up approach as to what this institution is all about, what we intend to do over the next 10 years, and how we're going to handle things that have taken place in the past.

Enrollment-wise, the main campus head count at the end of the 14th day was 2.5% down from last year, student credit hr. production was down 1.5%. We had anticipated that we would be down 3%, and I guess the Zippy in me, Mr. Chairman, will not be satisfied until we're not down at all, so we have to keep working on our enrollment. Someone told me one time that we're down 2% but we budgeted for 4%, so everyone was happy. Not in my world. You're not happy over something like that. I want to make sure that we continue to work very hard as an institution to attract students to this campus and then meet the goals the students have and the objectives that we have as a faculty and as an institution.

We held a goal-setting retreat on Sept. 18 that included the Planning & Budgeting Committee, and I anticipate that we're going to carry forth with this program now. Our budgeting process will be back on track so that we can get this budget prepared and done when it should be during the academic year so that we can be realistic about what we expect as far as the Board is concerned and be realistic with the faculty also. The Chairman mentioned the Board action on the medical plan, and I want to bear some responsibility here because I was not satisfied with the way it was presented; I was not satisfied with the time frame that it was presented in. I'm not saying that we have the best situation in the world with the policy we have right now. However, I think for the good of the institution we owe it to everyone who works here and we owe it also to the people in charge of our budget to make sure we have the best plan available for everyone concerned. So we did renew the plan that we have right now; however, we are going to take a look over the next year as to how we can do a better job than this. It won't come at you the way it came at you this last time, I assure you.

All of you will receive a letter soon from me dealing with a Dept. of Labor audit that we have had on campus that's been going on for a number of months. Let me inform you of just a few things in this letter. For over a year the Department of Labor Office of Contract Compliance Programs has been conducting a comprehensive review to determine whether The University of Akron is in compliance with its affirmative action plan and the governing regulations. The review is now completed, and I want to share the results with you. I'm pleased to announce that for the most part the department concluded that the hiring and promotional policies and practices were not discriminatory and that the Department of Labor did report, however, that in a couple of support areas, not academic areas, there were some violations here. We're going to work on these violations and are going to go through a training process with every division that's involved and make sure our training is in place, that our promotional procedures are in place. This is something that I think over the last 15 years the institution probably has not been where we should be, excluding the fact that if a person is hired in at a certain rank at the University, I think it's our duty to be able to tell this person we hire what you have to do to get promoted to the next level. And if this calls for training and we don't provide that training, then shame on us; we should provide that training. All of you remember the Hayes-Hill Study we went through 15 years ago that was put in place and was very effective, and no one has touched it since it was put in place. So this is the institution's responsibility and we will see to it that these policies, procedures and practices are perfected. Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report and I will take questions."

Senator Peggy Richards wanted to know whether it would be possible for the University Well-Being Committee to be involved in the review of the health benefits package from the beginning and to report to the Senate through the committee's chair. The President said that it would.

Senator William McGucken reminded the President that at the last meeting he had asked him a question regarding the issue of summer compensation. The President had said that he would get back with a response. Did he now have any comment?

The President replied that he had no further information than he had had at the last meeting. The only thing which he had gathered was that all of the units were not uniform as far as the compensation was concerned. This was something that we, as an institution, had to look at to make sure that they were uniform. In short, they had found there were some variances from department to department and unit to unit as far as how many hours one could teach in the summer.

Senator McGucken thanked the President and wondered whether he had found out why the Provost's office had withdrawn the discretion that it had given the deans in these matters in earlier years. He reminded the body that the idea was to limit summer teaching of 10 hours total for the two semesters with 7 hours maximum in one session. However, the deans had been given the discretion to allow people the possibility of being compensated for 8 hours. This had existed for a couple of years, but this last summer it had been withdrawn. This was the basis for his question. Who had withdrawn the discretion and why?

The President said that he had not. He was not trying to be facetious, but it had probably been the same person who had put the discretionary policy in. Load should be a policy that was followed by all units, and evidently it had not been. He would work hard and he was sure that the Provost would work hard to see that it would come back to the middle on this. He thought that this probably came out of the decentralization idea; each unit could do different things at its discretion.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Interim Provost Noel Leathers gave the following remarks:

"I found out one thing - when you're in administration you'd better listen carefully to what the President says, because that means we're going to have to do more work, so everyone should listen very carefully to that. Bill, if I can just throw in one thing here - there are 2 or 3 committees starting, one on research and one on sponsored programs which deal with summer compensation, at least indirectly. What they're doing will impact on this issue, and one of the things we hope to have come out of these and I think we have a preliminary consensus, is to redefine what we mean by an academic year. If we achieve that major goal, then all things will come from that so we can define how much research time is actually available, etc., and what the compensation would be for that time during the summer months.

Another aspect of this is that you asked about load hrs. and how much people can teach. To the best of my ability by going back through the records, the load policy as was established some years ago was that the maximum any faculty member could teach in the summer was 9, and that the maximum any faculty member could teach in one session was 6. Somehow that crept to 10 and 7 or 10 and 8, or under extraordinary circumstances, 11. So is it going to be under review? Yes. Will it come back to what it was at one time? Could be. I have a hard time in my own mind saying that a faculty member can't teach 12 hrs. in 16 weeks, but you can teach 8 hrs. in 5. Qualitatively I worry

about that. I can't find any rationale on that, I can't find any record of what moved it from 9 and 6 to 10 and 7. I can't find anything that says 10 and 8. There is no record of any policy being determined by the old University Council or by the Senate or anywhere else. Somehow it just kind of creeps around, so there's been some slippage. I think we have to go back and finish discussing it. If we're going to be what you all want to be, we must be extremely conscious and aware of quality at all levels in all things. That means load, it means teaching, it means research, and it means that everything we do we should try to do our best. That's just a challenge to each one of us and we can all do that.

There's a question that came up about part-time faculty and so on. Last year there were some changes adopted in classification, etc., on part-time faculty, and the idea was that we would spend the 1997-98 academic year making those changes. So Lecturer 1,2,3,4,5 became Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3, and we would classify part-time faculty as auxiliary, continuing and renewable and that these all have different connotations to them. When I looked at that and when I saw what Bill Seton sent forward which was paper 'that thick' about making these adjustments, it seemed reasonable that it would take all year to get it done. Incidentally, they did a great job - I found only 3 or 4 things that I had to question out of 200, but this is a tedious process. Dean Creel and Dean Moore from the College of Arts & Sciences and Fine & Applied Arts, which have lots of part-timers, have stepped up the speed of doing this so that we will be finished in the fall semester of 1997.

So the plan is as follows: I met with the assistant and associate deans this morning and Graham Kelly's group to go to school and learn about what the problems are with part-time faculty insofar as paperwork, classifications, and so forth, and I thought they were pretty good teachers. The general consensus is and what we're going to try to do is have all the reclassifications, etc., done the week of or before Thanksgiving. Before Thanksgiving break comes we want to have all this in and review it, double-check it, approve it, and take all of these at once to the Dec. 10 meeting of the Board, which means we have to have it in reproduction some time in Nov., about two weeks ahead of the Board meeting. So we're going to be pushing that time envelope, but if we can do this then that becomes a basis for merit increases for part-time faculty after that step is taken. We can't do everything at one time; there is a pool of money set aside for part-time faculty increases, but there's no sense giving an increase if someone is Lecturer 2, someone else is Tier 1 or 3 - it's chaos. So the idea is to get it straight, do all this reorganization and do it now, because obviously what is going to happen in the software world because we're going on-line HR-wise about Dec. 31, we're going to go down for a week and make that switch insofar as the HR problem is concerned. We're also dealing with the Student Affairs group and the financial package. We're going to have to start on that and that will impact you almost immediately, but if we can get these things in order, then we can have a merit pool for part-time faculty and get it in place in Jan. and there'll be time to make that evaluation and recommendations on the new system. I think that's the plan and I hope that makes some sense to everybody involved.

The only other comment I want to make is that we are moving to get ready in this Year 2000 program conversion of the stuff in the Computer Center and all our programs. The President mentioned the old Hayes-Hill Study which has not been touched, and we're going to have to address that. But in going to this new system and its conversion which has a target date of fall of 1999, that means a tremendous effort. The original plans were 2003, and we can't wait that long. What it means is that we'll have to drag people out of various service areas i.e., the admissions office, the

registrar's office, financial office, because they will be users, and involve them in the planning and the building of this new system before it goes on line so that when it goes on line we've got people in these various support offices that know how to run it and know how to get the kind of information we need and to get it quickly to improve the general efficiency of the campus. So what does it mean to you as a faculty member? It means that maybe certain things might slow down just a little bit. Many people are going to try to back-fill, but there may be some temporary impact here. We're going to have to find space to put these 20-some people into some office areas which are decent. That may mean we'll need to squeeze existing space some. If it affects you we're sorry, it's temporary but we have to move. It's critical that we go ahead and do this, because I think it will help us become more efficient. We received \$730,000 this year from the state to help with the Year 2000 conversion. We put \$640,000 of University money into it; that's a million 3. We've got 640 planned for next year and for the year after that, and we may have to throw some more into it. But this is for equipment, people, software programs, and so on. I just wanted you to know that's coming up, and we think we'll get there. If there are any questions, I'll try to answer them."

In regard to the merit raises for the part-time faculty coming in January, Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh wondered whether there would be criteria developed then to base them on. Provost Leathers replied that it would be up to the individual colleges and departments to develop the criteria which would then be reviewed and implemented.

Senator Filer-Tubaugh asked whether these merit raises would be retroactive to the fall. The Provost answered that they might be, but he wasn't certain. As he understood it, there would be ranges in the new system, so some things still had to be worked out, but they would be.

President Ruebel wanted to comment that he believed in merit, but any time that one mentioned merit and teaching, evaluation also had to be mentioned. If full-timers were given raises on merit, it was because they were evaluated. Part-timers needed to go through the same process. There was no way that you could justify merit without evaluation.

Senator Filer-Tubaugh responded by noting that in her department, Developmental Programs, they were evaluated every semester with student evaluations as well as having visits to classes from the department head.

The Chairman now introduced Interim Associate Provost Mark Auburn, who made the following remarks about the upcoming NCA visit:

"Thank you Mr. Chairman, and thanks to the Executive Committee for this opportunity to speak about our upcoming comprehensive evaluation by the North Central Assoc. We now know the team. We haven't met them personally yet except for one member, but we know who they are. The team consists of a distinguished group of people from the 19-state region of the North Central Assoc. of Colleges and Schools. (From 18 of those states, the state of Ohio was excluded, as North Central considers it a prima facie conflict of interest for someone in the same state to be part of the evaluation team.) Our team includes a sitting president, 2 vice presidents, 2 deans, 2 professors, an assoc. vice president, an associate to the president, and I'm really interested to find out what that guy does, and a retired chancellor. The team reflects some diversity of American higher education. There are 5 white males, 1 hispanic male, 1 african-american male, 2 white females, and 1 african-american female on the team. I want to emphasize with you that we call them in North Central, consultant

evaluators. That means that their purpose is not simply to come here and pass some kind of recommendation on whether or not we are doing what we say we are doing, but also to be available to us as consultants - to listen to our concerns, to share suggestions.

A major part of the written report will be a section on strengths, concerns and suggestions that they will provide for us, and none of those will affect the formal form that's called the stipulation of affiliation status form, the statement of affiliation status. They will just be things that these bright people who've been academics most of them for 15, 20, 25 years who've been out on many North Central visits will see from the materials we have given them and they will glean from the conversations they have. Now you will have a chance to see a biography of each of these team members. An 'Akron Update' when it comes out the end of next week will have their names and positions. I hope by then as well to have a sheet that will be distributed widely on campus with a picture and a biography of their positions and special services they've been involved with. We're having a hard time getting those pictures out of them, but we're working on it.

The team arrives on Sunday night, Oct. 26, and they'll be staying at the Ramada Plaza Hotel downtown. They'll get together by 5:00 and President Ruebel will host a reception and a supper for them. They will meet each other for the first time on that occasion. That is to say they will not have gathered elsewhere though they may have shared some mail in common other than the box load of materials we sent them. They will be on campus Monday and Tuesday, and on Wednesday morning around 10:00 they will report their recommendations and they'll leave. We will get the final version of their report about the 8th of December. It is at that point that we make a formal response to the Commission of the North Central Assoc.

I'm pleased with this team; I think it's a good team. I've already gotten some feedback about the self-study report which is the center of all the documents we sent from a number of team members. They feel that that report is candid, but they're also concerned because we had to say up front a number of things we were concerned about.

I gave a briefing on the nature of accreditation and the findings of our self-study report that included a video to the Board of Trustees a week ago Wed. and again to the Council of Deans and then yesterday morning to the chairs of the Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences. It's about a 35-minute briefing in all, depending upon how many words I feel I have in me at the time I present it. It includes a video that we have sent to each member of the team, a 13 minute video on The University of Akron. We will be using that video with a different script for recruiting purposes. I'm now in the process of visiting the faculty at each of the colleges to talk about this upcoming visit and to remind them of how they can help. We also plan to invite 2 or 3 different groups of University stakeholders to see this presentation and video in the Gardner Student Center Theatre some time during the week of Oct. 20. For instance, we'd like to have all academic-side clerical professionals have an opportunity to see this because they're some of the first people that our North Central team will meet and they need to be in on the understanding of what this process is. Would you please watch 'Akron Update' for dates and times if those presentations are not oversubscribed.

The North Central team has already indicated that it wishes to have an open meeting with faculty, also other open meetings with staff and with students. The faculty open meeting is now scheduled for Mon., Oct. 27, at 2:00 p.m. in the Summit Lounge of the Gardner Student Center. This is a standard part of most North Central visits. I would urge you to come. What can you do to

help our reaccreditation request? Well, let me tell you a few things. You can read the self-study report. Every department office, every dean's office, every University support office has a hard copy of that self-study report. The Faculty Senate office has 2 hard copies. If you don't want to kill a tree, go the University Web page and read the self-study report on the University home page. It's there; it's available to you. If you cannot sift through 172 pages about The University of Akron, skim it anyway so you have a sense for its flavor, what it looks like - what will have been the major piece of information that these 10 strangers will have about us. The second thing you can do is attend one of these longer presentations about the accreditation process if you can. Particularly, I would appreciate your helping your subordinates by releasing them from work so that they can come to the session we're scheduling for them, and by backing them up if necessary. I would urge you as a third thing to attend the North Central open meeting on Oct. 27 at 2:00 p.m. in the Summit Lounge at Gardner Student Center. Encourage your fellow faculty to attend that. Encourage your staff and your students to attend the meetings that will follow - staff at 3:00, students at 4:00. You will probably have an opportunity to talk with a consultant evaluator when they're here. If you do so, focus on who we are, what we have accomplished, and what we aspire to become. That's what I told you one year ago when I last addressed you on this process. That's what I tell you again today. That's what we want the team to look at, not the past, but who we really are now. Look at the past and what we've accomplished but more important, what we aspire to become. I would urge you one more thing - be candid. Tell the truth as you see it. Focus forward, but tell the truth if you're asked difficult questions. The team is likely to be poised to want to know the gossip. What really happened? Tell them what you think but move them forward. Let's get beyond 1995-1996.

We were lucky, as Pres. Ruebel said, to have a pre-visit from our team chair, Dr. Richard Gowen, the President of the S. Dakota School of Mines & Technology. He was here last Thurs., the 25th. Dr. Gowen incidentally, is a very experienced chair of North Central evaluation teams, and it was just a couple of years ago that he chaired a team that reaccredited Case Western Reserve University. So he also has some knowledge of northeast Ohio; we could hardly have been so lucky. He met with the President, each of the Vice Presidents, the Assts. to the Pres., with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and with 5 Trustees. He gave comments that I think showed a good understanding of what has happened here in the past and what we feel we need to do in the future. In particular, he confirmed my sense that the major reason for his visit was to be able to tell this team on Sunday night when they gather together at 7:15 to get their assignments and to talk about campus, to be able to say to them when they say, 'What happened - why these 2 focused visits?' He's going to be able to look them in the eye and say, 'Folks that's not what we're here about - that's history. We're here to see if this institution is doing what it's doing. I have talked with the players, don't worry about that.' There's another reason we're lucky, and if all of you who recognize why we're lucky for this particular reason would raise your hands when I tell you these facts - he's an electrical engineer and his degree is from Iowa State University.

I'm optimistic about the results of this visit. I think we've prepared well for it. I think we're getting the word out and people are doing things like returning to remind themselves what the mission statement is of this University, what the strategic directions are, what we have done of late. But I need to say to you as I said to the Board of Trustees, 3 in 10 North Central comprehensive evaluations result in something less than an unblemished 10-year extension of accreditation, 3 in 10. That means 3 in 10 may have less than a full 10 years, 3 in 10 may require a focused visit on some topic, 3 in 10 may require a monitoring report. I must tell you that in 11 years as a consultant evaluator for North Central, I have never come to a campus where within the last 18 months there

have been two emergency focused visits. Nevertheless, I remain optimistic. I need your help. Tell the truth as you see it. Concentrate on who we are, what we have accomplished, and what we aspire to become. Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to take questions."

There were no questions for Dr. Auburn.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the new Executive Committee had met twice last month to organize itself, to set the agenda for today's Senate meeting, and to discuss matters of interest. It had also met on Sept. 25, as the body had just heard, with Dr. Richard Gowen, President of S. Dakota School of Mines and Technology and head of the NCA team. Dr. Gowen had been here for a preliminary visit to get a sense of the state of the campus in light of the events of a year or so ago. In that discussion, the Executive Committee members had expressed the opinion that relations between the Senate, faculty and upper-level administration was quite good, but they also expressed strong reservations about the Board of Trustees' actions in regard to the presidential search procedure and what it might mean for the future of shared governance at our institution.

The Secretary concluded his report by asking the Arts and Sciences senators to stay a few minutes after the meeting to meet with Dean Roger Creel.

FACULTY RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - (Appendix A).

GRADUATE COUNCIL - (Appendix B).

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - Senator Tim Norfolk reported that the Committee had met last Monday, and he had been swept into its leadership as Chair. The Committee was proceeding to have organizational meetings with Athletic Director Bobinski to fulfill the Senate resolution that had been passed in April.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman reminded the body that it still needed to elect an alternate representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents (FACCOBOR). The floor was now open for nominations.

Senator Chand Midha nominated Dr. John Green, and this was seconded by Senator Jesse Marquette. There was then a motion that the nominations be closed, and this was seconded. The body approved the motion; it then voted and approved John Green as the alternate.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Ralph Turek was curious to know whether any study or follow-up had been done to determine what the impact had been on going to the new schedule for the start of classes (7:45, 8:50, 9:55, etc.). He explained that the School of Music had had a number of problems with this both in the morning and the evening. In the morning there had been problems getting staff before 8:00 a.m. for things such as xeroxing. Where these problems had pretty much been resolved, the problems were more severe in the evenings. There were a number of graduate students who took evening classes and also played in the Akron Symphony Orchestra, for instance.

They used to be able to leave early and get to rehearsals late, but now that was not possible. There were also general problems during the day. His school director had told him that somehow they had lost essentially a full class period during the day.

The Chairman pointed out that the body had two alternatives here. It could take the concerns which had just been expressed and try to get more information for Senator Turek from the administration, or Senator Turek could make a motion that the body discuss this issue now.

Senator Turek made a motion that the body discuss this, which was seconded. Senator Marquette then moved a friendly amendment that the body request that the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee to look into the issue since they were the appropriate venue. They could then report back to the Senate. Senator Elizabeth Erickson seconded this, and Senator Turek said that this would be fine.

Since there was no discussion, the body voted its approval to send the matter to APCC.

Senator David Redle was not certain that this was the appropriate point in the meeting to discuss these items. If he was out of order, please stop him. The first item was the parking situation at the west end of campus. This was now horrendous because of the closing of the Polsky deck. There had been much confusion about who could park where. The appropriate body needed to be reminded that some clarification was necessary. Some faculty members were complaining that students were parking in faculty lots, and other faculty members were saying that the students were allowed to park there because of the Polsky closing. The second item had to do with new faculty members being unable to get some of their payroll issues resolved in time for the first payroll. They had not gotten the automatic deposit in. Also a regular faculty member was having trouble just getting a basic change to withholding. Something had been happening in the payroll office. Questions had been raised about whether it was an ongoing problem or was something temporary.

The Chairman stated that these items would be more appropriate to discuss under the good of the order. When we reached that point, Senator Redle could have the floor again.

There was no other new business.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - The Chairman recognized Senator Redle, who stated that he stood by what he had just said.

The Chairman said that the concerns which Senator Redle had expressed could be transmitted to the administration through the Executive Committee in order to get some information as to what was causing some of these inconveniences. Senator Redle replied that this was acceptable.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - Senator Midha moved for adjournment and this was seconded by Senator Richards. The body voted its approval and the meeting ended at 3:55 p.m.

APPENDIX A

Report of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee

- A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 97-1. The committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has conducted a comprehensive review and has submitted a report to the President. The President accepted the committee's recommendations.
- A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 97-2. The committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has conducted a comprehensive review and has submitted a report to the President. The President accepted the committee's recommendations.
- A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 97-3. The committee completed its consideration of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.
- A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 97-4. The committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has assisted in resolution of the complaint by conciliation.
- A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 97-5. The Appellant withdrew the grievance before consideration.
- A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 97-6. The committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has assisted in resolution of the complaint by conciliation.

Respectfully submitted by
Nancy L. Stokes, Vice Chair
Faculty Rights & Responsibilities

APPENDIX B**1997-98 GRADUATE COUNCIL MEMBERS**

Dr. Charles M. Dye, Dean of the Graduate School, *Chair*

Term expires August 31, 1998**Representing College of:**

Dr. Thomas G. Calderon (Accounting)
 Dr. Therese L. Lueck (Communication)
 Dr. Amy Milsted (Biology)
 Dr. Susan J. Olson (Secondary Education)
 Dr. Phillip H. Schmidt (Mathematical Sciences)

Business Administration
 Fine & Applied Arts
 Arts and Sciences: At-Large
 Education
 Arts and Sciences: Natural Sciences

Term expires August 31, 1999

Dr. Douglas R. Kahl (Finance)
 Dr. Susan N. Kushner (Educ Foundations & Ldrship)
 (vacant—election TBA)
 Dr. Robert F. Pope, Jr. (English)
 Dr. N. Margaret Wineman (Nursing)

Business Administration
 Education
 Engineering
 Arts and Sciences: Humanities
 Nursing

Term expires August 31, 2000

Dr. Robert J. Veillette (Electrical Engineering)
 Dr. Thein Kyu (Polymer Engineering)
 Dr. William T. Brandy (Speech-Lang Path & Audiology)
 Dr. McKee J. McClendon (Sociology)

Engineering
 Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering
 Fine and Applied Arts
 Arts and Sciences: Social Sciences

1997-98 Graduate Student Government Representative:

Donna Richards, President of Graduate Student Government

Dr. Lathardus Goggins, Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Invited Guest
 Mrs. Dolli Markovich, Coordinator of the Graduate School, Invited Guest

The University of Akron
Committees of Graduate Council

1997-98

Graduate Faculty Membership

Douglas R. Kahl, Chair (Council), Business Administration
Amy Milsted, Vice Chair (Council), Arts & Sciences
Virginia Doolittle, Education
Janne R. Dunham-Taylor, Nursing
Kathleen L. Endres, Fine & Applied Arts
Purushottam Das Gujrati, Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering
Bruce C. Taylor, Engineering

Curriculum

Susan J. Olson, Chair (Council), Education
Robert J. Veillette, Vice Chair (Council), Engineering
Thomasita M. Chandler, Fine & Applied Arts
John E. Frederick, Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering
Daniel French, Business Administration
Elizabeth S. Kinion, Nursing
Judith A. Palagallo, Arts & Sciences

Student Policy

Susan N. Kushner, Chair (Council), Education
William T. Brandy, Vice Chair (Council), Fine & Applied Arts
McKee J. McClendon (Council), Arts & Sciences
Victoria M. Schirm, Nursing
George W. Ebert, Education
David R. Durst, Business Administration
Arkady I. Leonov, Polymer Science & Polymer Engineering
David N. Robinson, Engineering
Trent Burner, student rep (Community Counseling)
Tara Morris, student rep (Community Counseling)
Felix Torres, student rep (Geography & Planning)

**The University of Akron
GRADUATE COUNCIL**

**MEETING SCHEDULE
Fall 1997/Spring 1998**

September 8, 1997	Monday	10:00 a.m.
September 22, 1997	Monday	10:00 a.m.
October 27, 1997	Monday	10:00 a.m.
November 24, 1997	Monday	10:00 a.m.
December 8, 1997 (tentative)	Monday	10:00 a.m.
January 26, 1998	Monday	10:00 a.m.
February 23, 1998	Monday	10:00 a.m.
March 23, 1998	Monday	10:00 a.m.
April 27, 1998	Monday	10:00 a.m.

All meetings are scheduled for room 465 of The Polsky Building. Additional dates may be added as necessary with prior notice to Council.

* * * * *

For your calendars:

GRADUATE FACULTY MEETINGS--

November 20, 1997	Thursday	3:00 p.m.
April 16, 1998	Thursday	3:00 p.m.

(location in Gardner Student Center to be announced at a later date)