

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

9-4-1997

Faculty Senate Chronicle September 4, 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.

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 Faculty Senate Meeting of September 4, 1997	9
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of September 4, 1997	23
A. Current Indemnity Plan	23
B. New Preferred Provider Provisions	24
C. Managed Care Questionnaire Response Summary	25
D. PPO Network Facility Provider Comparison	26
E. PPO Network Provider Matchup	27

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

* Martin Luther King Day	Mon., January 19
Day & Evening Classes Begin	Tues. Tues., January 12
* 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

** Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 6:45 a.m.

*** Classes canceled from noon to 5 p.m.

FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP

(Update: 9/4/97)

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 James W. Taggart, 98 1 TBA, 98	College of Education (4) Susan Clark, 99 Robert Dubick, 99 Edward Lasher, 98 Lynn Smolen, 99 1 TBA, 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 James Lynn, 00 Marc Ozanich, 00 S. Rasor-Greenhalgh, 98 Ralph Turek, 00 1 TBA, 99	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 James Kuhn, 00
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 1 TBA, 98	School of Law (2) William Rich, 00 Ann Woodley, 99	SEAC (2) Dolli Markovich, 99 Holly Mothes, 99

Note: Term expires in year listed.

Members - 64

scigraph

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. Hardy, 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*
W. Rich, 98*
J. Larose, 99
D. Chlebek, 00

J. Harris, 00
W. Pelz, 00*
TBA, F&A Arts, 00*

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

J. Drummond, 98*
K. Dunning, 98
J. Kline, 98
H. Sterns, 98
V. Gunn, 99*
A. Isayev, 99*
C. Murray, 99*
F. Smith, 99*
D. Buchthal, 00

L. Chyi, 00*
E. Erickson, 00*
R. Turek, 00*
W. Yoder, 00

Ex officio member, Mr. Roger
Ryan, designee of VP for Admin.
Support Services

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

B. Bucey, 98
L. Pachnowski, 98
M. Pitchford, 98*
TBA, 1 Student, 98*
T. Alexander, 99
R. Gibson, 99*
H. Mothes, 99*
J. Buchanan, 00*
J. Kuhn, 00*

D. Laconi, 00
P. Linberger, 00

Ex officio members, Dr. Thomas
Vukovich, Asst. VP, Enrollment
Services, or designee, and Mr.
Doug McNutt, Director of
Student Financial Aid

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE

R. Caplan, 98
 M. Cheung, 98*
 J. Frederick, 98*
 J. Padovan, 98
 W. Rich, 98*
 R. Sibberson, 98
 O. Bly, 99
 F. Griffin, 99*
 F. Kinsinger, 99

D. Markovich, 99*
 J. Marquette, 00*
 B. Vijayaraman, 00

Ex-officio member, Mr. Richard
 Seivert, Interim Assoc. VP
 for Information Services, or
 designee

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE

J. Fant, 98
 W. McGucken, 98*
 V. Schirm, 98
 P. Schmidt, 98
 M. Williams, 98
 S. Aby, 99*
 C. Batur, 99*
 A. Borowiec, 99*
 J. Fitzgerald, 99*
 E. Klosterman, 99
 K. Reed, 99*
 J. Stinner, 99*
 M. Tausig, 99*

*S. Clark, 99**

K. Endres, 00
 J. Hawes, 00
 P. Henriksen, 00
 G. Jones, 00
 D. Sheffer, 00

Ex officio member, Dr. C.S.
 Chen, VP, Research &
 University Development, or
 designee

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
~~Dr. James Hardy, 99*~~ *Ms. Susan Clark, 9**
Mr. Michael Jalbert, 99*
Ms. Monica Smith, 99

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

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

Prof. Shelley Baranowski,* Buchtel College of Arts
and 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

**MINUTES OF FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF
SEPTEMBER 4, 1997**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, September 4, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Borowiec, J. Buchanan, DePaul, Markovich, and Smolen were absent with notice. Senators Braun, Kimmell, Lasher, Mothes, and Ozanich were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **APPROVED A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE BOARD'S REVISED
PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH PROCEDURES**
- * **HELD ELECTIONS FOR A NUMBER OF SENATE OFFICES AND
THE PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE**
- * **APPROVED A MOTION TO HOLD A SPECIAL MEETING ON
SEPTEMBER 18 TO CONTINUE DISCUSSION ON THE PROPOSED
PPO HEALTH CARE PLAN**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chairman stated that there was one correction to the agenda, and that was to add consideration of the minutes of April 17 and 24 to item II. Since there were no additional changes to the agenda, the body voted its approval of the amended agenda.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF APRIL 17, 24, MAY 1 AND JULY 24 - There were no corrections to any of those minutes, and they were approved by the Senate.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN - The Chairman said that since this was the last opportunity he would have to address the body as its Chair, he wanted to thank the Senate for selecting him. It had been no small choice on the body's part. When he had been chosen three years ago, and again two years ago, no one had had any idea what was about to occur at the University. It was rather fortunate that we did not. If he himself had, he would have run screaming from the room and let someone else deal with what was to come. He did not want to rehash those events, but he did want to thank the body for having faith in him and for placing its trust in him, and he also wanted to thank the body for something he hoped would not come as a surprise. There had been times when he had drawn upon what he knew to be the resoluteness of every person in the room that we needed to do what was right for our University. He liked to think he would have had the strength to do what was

right had he been standing alone, but it had helped him to consider what this body would think was right. He was not saying he had guessed correctly every time, but speaking for the Senate made it much easier for him to act on its behalf and let the chips fall.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chairman made a number of introductions. First, he introduced Interim Provost Noel Leathers, a man who many members already knew since he had been around campus now and again for some time. The Chairman had not had the opportunity to know him very well when he had been Provost previously, but he had probably been the Provost who had signed the paperwork allowing him to come to the University as a faculty member. He hoped that Provost Leathers had not had occasion to regret that. Since he had started working with him as Interim Provost, he had been extraordinarily impressed.

The Chairman then introduced the newly elected or reelected Senators. They included the following: from Arts and Sciences - Sheryl Stevenson, Shelley Baranowski, Lynn Chyi, Tim Norfolk, Gary Oller and Jerry Stinner; from Fine and Applied Arts - James Lynn, Marc Ozanich and Ralph Turek; from University Libraries - James Kuhn; from the Part-Time Faculty - Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh; from the School of Law - Bill Rich; from Wayne - Forrest Smith (filling the remainder of Rick Maringer's term); from Contract Professionals - Greg Stewart; from the student body - Derwin Hammonds (President of ASG) and Marshall Pitchford (School of Law). He asked the new or returning Senators to stand and be recognized, and the body gave them a round of applause.

The Chairman then asked the body to stand for a moment of silence in honor of Howard Baldwin, former Registrar, Claibourne Griffin, former Dean of Arts and Sciences, and any other faculty or staff members who had recently passed away. The Senate then did so.

Finally, the Chairman wanted to remind the Senate that when the new committees had met and chosen chairs, to let Mrs. Marilyn Quillin know who those chairs were. Also, if you had not received a committee assignment, please contact Mrs. Quillin.

V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me reiterate what Dr. Leathers said yesterday at the Convocation to you, Mr. Chairman, that on behalf of the administration we truly appreciate what you have done, the contribution you have made, not only to this body but to the University. When Dr. Leathers came back this year and we had an opportunity to visit, and I know we reiterated this many, many times, but the most popular and common word we should use is "we," not a division but we, and I think you put forth a great deal of effort to make sure that this took place. So, Mr. Chairman, I want you to know that on behalf of the administration we appreciate what you have done for The University of Akron.

The first item on my agenda has to do with the residence halls renovations. When I come back in my second life, I'm coming back as a contractor. Sisler-McFawn and Orr renovations that were due to be completed on August 1, needless to say, were not completed by August 1. So we were

forced to move students into a dormitory that we were not going to use this year, that we were taking off-line. We are doing this at no cost to the students, and I think this is the only fair way to do this and I say this as Dad four times, that if someone told me they couldn't put my student into a dormitory that was not going to be used, not because it's unsafe but because it's not the best we could offer. So the plan is for the dormitories to be completed by mid-semester and at that time we'll go back to the regular pay schedule, but because the dormitories are part of revolving funds, they can go ahead and pick up this tab. I think it's grossly unfair to pass this on to students. For the attorneys present, we will be visiting with the contractors.

The following enrollment head count looks like this at the end of the fifth day of the had count: down 2.9%; credit hr. production down only 1.7% and as all of you know, credit hr. production is the most important as far as the state subsidy formula is concerned. I'm not satisfied with that when you say, I got hurt just a little bit. I will not be satisfied until we get to the place we can say that all of our figures are up. I am happy to report to you though what is happening at the freshman level. Our latest statistics in freshman applications indicate that we're up 1.1% as of today. Transfers are up 9%; the quality of our freshman class is going way up. We have an 8% increase in unconditional admits and we show a 63% increase in direct admits to the degree-granting colleges. So I think this is cause for elation as far as the quality of students we're attracting. The cohort of the upper-classmen, the drop-off, the attrition - this is something we could expect. If you recall, last year the freshman class was up; this year's freshman class is up, and if we can continue in that trend, we're going to be all right. The biggest factor here is that the quality is going up, so the quality assures us that if we maintain the positions and the quality we've been producing so far, we're going to maintain these students. We're going to keep them in school.

At our last Board meeting the Board accepted the recommendations from Dr. Leathers and myself that we make the total administration across the board leaner and provide more people in the classroom, and we are working in this direction. This is going to call for some reorganization as far as some units are concerned, and we're working in this particular direction because we feel as all of you do that the most important function that takes place here takes place in the classroom and not from the administrative perspective.

The merit raise right now that we have talked about is that each unit will have its own criteria for evaluation. By unit we define that as college, not down to the department level. But each unit will have its own criteria. I'm not saying that the criterion for being evaluated in the College of Education should be the same as the criterion for the people in the College of Arts & Sciences. I'm sure you can name vast differences also. So we will work toward the merit evaluation from each particular unit on campus. This will give each unit an opportunity to determine what as a unit that particular group wants to accomplish that year, and then at the end of the year that unit will have the opportunity to determine whether this in fact did take place. I feel very good about this progress. The faculty equity pool study that was made showed no significant group inequities in the statistics we had and that the individual salary deviations we have will be evaluated, and Provost Leathers is handling this on a case-by-case basis. But I think the important thing here is that no significant group inequities were found statistically.

In closing, let me say that most of you probably have read about the tragedy that took place at Colorado State University where they just in their library alone suffered a \$120 million loss in damages to their books and journals. The University of Akron, through Dr. Williams' leadership here,

has responded to this request and we're sending as many duplications as we possibly can to this particular institution. I also would like to thank all of you who took part in the Convocation reception, and if there's anyone here from the "Buchtelite" and you want to stop by, I'll gladly spell my last name for you. I'll respond to any questions."

Senator William McGucken asked whether the President could tell the body why the policy on compensation for summer teaching had been modified this past summer and who had done it.

The President could not answer the question, and neither could Provost Leathers. Dean Roger Creel asked for permission to speak, which was granted. He said that to his knowledge there had been no modifications in the summer compensation program in the College of Arts and Sciences.

Senator McGucken explained that he had learned quite a lot from Dean Creel about what the past policy had been. That long-standing policy stated that one could be compensated for a maximum of 9 hrs. during summer, and then one could be compensated only for a maximum of 6 within any one of the two sessions. Under Provost David Jamison that had been changed so that the maximum number was 10 for the summer, and then in one summer session the maximum number was 7. This had come as news to him, and he had consulted many people about it. No one had heard of this before; it had not been publicized in any way. Apparently, part of the rationale for going to 7 from 6 was that some people might be teaching a 3 hr. and a 4 hr. course. The issue here in connection with the recent modification was that along with it the deans had been given certain discretion. An illustration of this would be the situation whereby one were to teach not a 3 hr. and a 4 hr. course but two 4 hr. courses, then the deans had the discretion to see that the individual was paid for the full 8 hrs. His understanding was that this discretion had been withdrawn from the deans some time prior to this summer, and this was really the basis for his question.

The President reiterated that he could not answer this question. The last load policy of which he was aware as far as summer was concerned was 9 total with 6 in one and 3 in the other. He would check and see what he could find out about this, but he was not aware that it had been changed. If Senator McGucken's own dean did not know that it was changed, President Ruebel did not know who changed it.

Dean Creel said that before Provost Jamison, the policy had been 9 total with 6 maximum for any one session. When Jamison had become Provost, the total had been increased to 10. It had been left to the deans' discretion as to how that could be divided between the two summer sessions. Last year, however, the Provost's office had set the maximum as 10 with the maximum for one session as 7. What did change then was that deans no longer had the discretion to divide the 10; they could only go with 10 and 7.

The President noted that this was not something that would have gone to the Board for discussion.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST

Interim Provost Noel Leathers made the following remarks:

"Hello, it's nice to be here, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Faculty Senate. Rube

reminded me that the last time I was at one of these things I was Chairman - that was the old University Council. I see there still are committees, and I admire the enthusiasm with which you greeted the Chairman's announcements about signing up for committees. That hasn't changed much, I guess. There are just two or three things I'd like to remark on to you so you're aware of what's happening as we move ahead, as there have been some things on this campus we feel we ought to move ahead on. My job is to get things going instead of drifting, and unfortunately for whatever reason, there has been some of that occurring in the past. I think the basic task of the University was being fulfilled despite what was being said in the media and other places, and I congratulate you on that. I don't think that was very easy certainly for many of you. But in addition to trying to streamline things and to become effective and efficient and better in delivering services to the faculty and to the students, which is what we're about, we will be making some changes as we go.

There are some areas we feel we should spend some time with and move. One of these is research and research policies, and under Dr. C.S. Chen, research generated this past year reached an all-time high, so that's all good. And there is in the old bylaws a Research Council which was defunct last year. We will revitalize that immediately and set it into motion next week. As I understand it, the Senate Executive Committee has appointed two persons to it, and I want to tell you that Dr. Chen resigned from his position as the Director of Research and Technology Transfer and other sponsored programs. He did that voluntarily; in fact, he came in and told me he wanted to do this because this is his last year and he's taking ERIP next spring and wants to spend the time teaching. He incidentally testified before our Board of Trustees at the last meeting on August 6 and did an excellent job, outstanding. He was thrilled with the response of the Board - the questions and the interest that the Board had in stimulating and supporting research and we feel very good about that. So I told C.S. I'd hold his letter of resignation for a month to see how we could do this and asked him when he came in finally, are you going to accept it or not? I told him what we were planning and said if you will be on this council I'll accept a resignation; otherwise, you have to stay there and I can appoint you. So the Faculty Senate Executive Committee appointed him without my knowing, and that's fine. He's very happy about it and I think he did an outstanding job and am very proud of him for what he did and think he'll do a lot more this year. He feels he can speak out more forcefully as a faculty member than as a member of the administration, and I guess he's probably right. So we're counting on that. But the idea is to take a look at three basic areas and to move. The first of these is the Research Council, and they're going to look at everything under the sun. They're also going to have a Board member, Dr. Fink, who is a new faculty member at NEOUCOM, as an adjunct who has apparently worked with some of our faculty in biomedical engineering and is very interested in this. So he will serve as a liaison person from the Board and keep the Board advised of what's being considered as we go along. That committee will be chaired by the Assoc. provost, Mark Auburn, who will be in on all the accreditation we're going to have this year.

The second group will be sponsored programs, which has a different kind of pathway in the channels of paper around this campus, and I've asked Graham Kelly, the other Assoc. provost, to head that one and to do similar kinds of things. And Patty Graves, who is a second-year Board member, will be the liaison for that committee, and the third one, which will be an interesting one, I'm going to chair, and that's the one on campus health service. Dr. Apte, who is on the Board and chairman of the Educational Policies Committee, will be the liaison person for that. We hope that these three groups are going to be reporting back to everybody on February 1, and that's important so that whatever changes we want to make we'll have time to incorporate them in next year's budget. That's about a 120-day time period, and we mean business and want something to happen and want to get it

done. So I'm just advising you up front that that's the plan. The other plan is that the Board will approve all the contracts September 26, so you should get your new paychecks at the end of this month. We're happy about that and appreciate the Board's steps to accomplish this. The law's changed so everything has to go through twice in order to get this accomplished, and I think that's a good thing. The Board was frustrated with the delays in trying to get a budget put together and I understand the frustration, and we voiced ours. So next year the budget starts on December 2 - that's when we start working on the budget for next year. On February 6 all our information is back into the Provost's office. We'll ask each group - Senate, Planning & Budgeting Committee, the Council of Deans, central administration, and the Board of Trustees to come up with five bullets - what is it you want to get accomplished next year, what are our priorities. We get all of these in by the first of February, so that means from December until the first of February we get these ranked in priority by each constituent group and this comes together by the first of February. If we apply ourselves, we can come together with these by the end of February hopefully, and by the 15th of March I told the Board that they'll get the budget. They get 30 days to pass it, so on April 15 we'll have a budget, and by the end of the school year we fully intend to have contracts out for the next year and none of this long delay and so forth. We did it before and we can do it again, and I think the Board's willing to go along with us on this and there's no great mystery about this. We can do it and we just have to get at it to get it done.

I was asked a question about the part-time situation, and as I understand it, last year you went through a reclassification, a new system, and there's tiers 1, 2, 3 and 1 through 5, and there seemed to be some new discussion about when this all goes into effect. It's my understanding and it's safe to say that as of the beginning of the second semester this year for all intents and purposes, all those changes will be in place. I thought Arts & Sciences would take longer but Roger has directed his people to get on the stick and get this done. So I think all of these changes can be run through the paper trail and be in effect by January 10 or 15, when the second semester starts. I feel good about the place. There are a lot of good people here and we're going to do well - we're going to take care of students. That's the important thing. I'm teaching a class, I taught 2 hours this morning, and my speeches are always short. They start at 7:45 and I thought I'd have a break halfway through - I looked at my watch and it was 9:15. I was really interesting to myself. For fear you'll all go to sleep on me, that will be it and I'll answer anybody's questions very briefly."

There were no questions for the Provost. The Chairman noted that both the President and Provost had to leave in order to get our salaries put together.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Gary Oller reported that the Committee had met a number of times over the summer as had been noted at the special meeting of July 24. It had needed to discuss such issues as the proposed new preferred provider option for the health plan, and the Board revised presidential search procedure. It also had made assignments to the Senate committees for the coming year, certified various elections from the units for Senate representatives and set the agenda for today's Senate meeting. Finally, it had met with President Ruebel, Provost Leathers, Presidential Asst. Walton and Presidential Asst. Gigliotti to discuss matters of mutual interest.

The Committee did have one action item to present to the body, and this was a resolution coming out of the Senate's discussion at the July 24 meeting regarding its reaction to the Board's revised presidential search procedures. That discussion had been halted by the lack of a quorum, and this resolution gave the spirit of the two different opinions that were being discussed when the meeting

had ended. It read as follows: "Be it resolved that although the Board of Trustees has the power and right to modify the procedure by which The University of Akron selects its new president, the Faculty Senate expresses great disappointment with the decision to significantly reduce the traditional faculty role in this important process. Therefore, the Faculty Senate endorses the suggested changes to the presidential search process proposed in the Executive Committee's letter to the Board of July 15, 1997, and encourages the Board to work with the Senate's constituency committee to achieve those ends." The Executive Committee letter referred to in the resolution was the one in which the Committee recommended that a subcommittee work with the Board to evaluate the academic credentials of the candidates during the course of the process, and also to add an ability for all faculty and staff to meet with the finalists when they were brought to campus so that they might be able to send their opinions to the Board as well. It was those two changes that were referred to as suggested changes to the presidential search process in the resolution.

The Chairman noted that this action of the Committee, which did not require a second, was now before the body.

Senator William Rich supported the resolution but thought that in one respect it understated what had been done. It said that the decision was "to significantly reduce the traditional faculty role in this important process." He reminded the body that the only role for the faculty in the new process was for the five members of the Faculty Senate's constituency group to interview the two or three finalists for the position. Then one member of that group would have the opportunity to speak with the Board of Trustees in executive session to convey the sentiments of the committee. For that reason, he preferred that the wording be changed from "significantly reduce" to "reduce greatly," and he so moved. This was seconded by Senator Tim Norfolk.

Senator John Hebert apologized for not being an English major, but the change which the proposed wording would make was not significant to him. He did not see how "reduce greatly" was any different than "significantly reduce," and therefore he spoke against the motion.

Since there was no discussion, the body voted. A voice vote was indecisive, and a division of the house was taken. The motion failed (18 to 22, with 3 abstentions).

Senator McGucken proposed a slight amendment to the beginning of the second sentence which read, "Therefore the Faculty Senate endorses the suggested changes to the presidential search process proposed..." The word "suggested" should be removed since the sentence went on to say that the changes were proposed, and "suggested" weakened the statement somewhat.

The Chairman asked whether there were any objections from members of the Executive Committee to accepting that as a friendly amendment. There were no objections.

The Senate then voted on the amended resolution and approved it.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Jerry Drummond, the Chair, reported that the Committee had met in July to hear a proposal from Human Resources relating to the replacement of our comprehensive health plan by a preferred provider organization. The Committee had listened to several concepts about this PPO plan and had thought that it was an interesting proposal. The time table however was a problem, since Human Resources wanted to present this to the Board at the

September 24 meeting. The Committee recommended that Human Resources make a more concrete proposal to the Senate today in order to get this information out, and Vice President James Prunty and Mrs. Desnay Lohrum were present to do that under unfinished business.

The Committee had not as yet made any recommendation regarding the proposal. If Human Relations really wanted to take this to the Board by September 24, many things had to be done. Presentations would need to be made to the faculty so they could give the Committee feedback, and many questions still needed to be answered. Some questions that the Committee had already raised would be answered in the presentation before the Senate this afternoon. If we could get the appropriate feedback within the next two weeks, it might be possible for the Committee to make a recommendation by the 18th of September, which would then require a special meeting of this body. He was not sure that this would be the wish of the body, but he thought we should take a look at the proposal. It would save the University money. As far as one could see now, it did not look as though it would hurt to any great extent faculty or staff at this University. Perhaps after the presentation, the body could decide what it wanted to do about a special meeting on the 18th. He did want the Senate to know that the Committee, when this had come up very quickly in the summer, had taken a look at it, and it was not intending to rubber-stamp something that really stank. It wanted to get faculty feedback; it wanted to look at this in some detail before making any sort of recommendation to this body about it.

The Chairman said that after Mr. Prunty and Mrs. Lohrum made their presentation, the body could decide whether or not it wished to meet on September 18.

VI. ELECTIONS - The Chairman stated that the first elections would be for the officers of the Senate (Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary) and four at-large members of the Executive Committee. He called for nominations for the position of Chair.

Senator Chand Midha nominated Senator Devinder Malhotra. This was seconded by Senator Lindgren Chyi.

Since there were no further nominations, Senator Peggy Richards moved that the nominations be closed. The body gave its approval.

The Chairman then called for a unanimous ballot for the sole candidate, and this was moved by Senator Richards and seconded by Senator Elizabeth Erickson. The body then voted its approval and Senator Malhotra was elected the new Chair.

Former Chairman Cheung turned over the symbol of office, a gavel that had been given as a gift to the first Chair of the Faculty Senate, Don R. Gerlach, and new Chairman Malhotra assumed his office.

The Chairman thanked the body and said that there was a certain element of nervousness. He hoped that he was worthy of the responsibility. He wanted the members to know that he would try to be as good a spokesperson as he could possibly be for this body because he thought that the Senate was very important for the functioning of the University. He also wanted to take this opportunity on behalf of himself and the entire body to thank former Chairman Cheung for the excellent job that he

had done over the past three years. (The body agreed with its applause.) He felt that these were big shoes to fill, and he was glad that Senator Cheung would still be in the Senate and available not only to him but to every other member of the body for his advice and counsel. He might try to hide, but we would find him.

The Chairman stated that the next election was for Vice-Chair, and the nominations were open.

Senator Erickson nominated Senator Barbara Heinzerling, and this was seconded by Senator Steve Aby. Since there were no further nominations, Senator Midha moved that the nominations be closed and this was seconded by Senator Richards. When the Senate agreed, the Chairman asked that Senator Heinzerling be elected by acclamation. The body voted its approval and Senator Heinzerling was elected as Vice-Chair.

The Chairman then moved on to nominations for the position of Secretary. Senator McGucken nominated Senator Oller. Since there were no additional nominations, it was moved and seconded that the nominations be closed. The Senate approved and then voted by acclamation to elect Senator Oller to another term as Secretary.

The Chairman then called for nominations for the four at-large members of the Executive Committee. The following Senators were nominated: Peggy Richards, Elizabeth Erickson, Steve Aby, William Rich, Connie Murray, Tim Norfolk, and Shelley Baranowski. Senator Midha moved that the nominations be closed, and this was seconded. The body then voted its approval.

The Chairman then told the body that they had to decide whether to elect by a majority or a plurality. Senator Jesse Marquette moved that Senators vote for four candidates on their ballots and that the four highest vote-getters would be elected. This was seconded and approved by the body.

The Senate then proceeded to vote for the four additional members of the Executive Committee.

While the votes were being counted the Senate moved on to the next election, which was to choose its representative to FACCOBOR (Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents).

Senator Norfolk nominated Senator Baranowski. Since there were no further nominations, Senator Richards moved that the nominations be closed and this was seconded. The body then unanimously elected Senator Baranowski to the position.

The next position to be elected was for an alternate representative for FACCOBOR. It was suggested that this be postponed until the October 2 meeting to allow members to talk with their colleagues to see whether they would be willing to serve.

In answer to a question regarding the job description for this position, Senator Rich, who had served as FACCOBOR representative, said that the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents met monthly. Its principal role was to advise the Chancellor on matters of

concern to faculty members at state institutions of higher education in Ohio. The committee met with the Chancellor and her deputies, but it also would meet separately to discuss issues of concern to the members and occasionally passed resolutions in the nature of recommendations or urgings. The job consisted of going to the meetings in Columbus once a month, participating in those deliberations, and driving home.

The next election was for the representatives of the Planning and Budgeting Committee. The different constituencies of the Senate then caucused to choose their representatives. The results were as follows: Community and Technical College - Senator William Taggart; College of Education - Senator Robert Dubick; College of Engineering - Senator H. Michael Cheung; College of Fine and Applied Arts - Senator James Lynn; College of Business Administration - Senator Dennis Kimmell; University Libraries - Senator Judy Fitzgerald; College of Nursing - Senator Kris Gill; Polymer Science and Engineering - Senator John Frederick; Wayne College - Senator Forrest Smith; Contract Professionals - Senator Greg Stewart; Part-time Faculty - Senator Peggy Richards; Students - Senator Derwin Hammonds, School of Law - Senator William Rich; SEAC - TBA. (There were no Staff representatives at the meeting.)

Secretary Oller then read the results of the election for the four at-large Executive Committee positions. They were as follows: Senator Aby - 31; Senator Norfolk - 31; Senator Richards - 30; Senator Rich - 29; Senator Erickson - 22; Senator Murray - 22; Senator Baranowski - 21. (There were 48 ballots cast.) Senators Aby, Norfolk, Richards and Rich were elected.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman introduced Mr. James Prunty, Vice President for Human Resources, in order to discuss the proposed preferred provider organization option for the health plan. Mr. Prunty began by noting that while he was new to Akron (having been here for five months), he was not new to Ohio since he had spent five years as Assistant Vice-President for Personnel Relations at Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland. He looked forward to working with the Faculty Senate.

Mr. Prunty and Mrs. Desnay Lohrum, the Manager of Benefits Administration in Human Resources, then started their presentation. Mr. Prunty said that the genesis for this plan had occurred before his arrival and come from meetings that Human Resources had had with an external consultant from Peat Marwick who, on the basis of changes occurring in the health care field, had recommended that the University look into a possible alternative medical plan and see what the vendors could offer. The proposed order of presentation would be to first remind the members of the present plan and the choices which it offered. Then the present indemnity plan would be discussed before moving on to present the proposed alternate PPO provisions and their advantages. Mr. Prunty said that in the meeting with the University Well-Being Committee some excellent questions had been raised, especially about the network in the proposed plan. Some answers to those questions would be presented later, but he wanted to emphasize that while this proposed plan was something new and different, he was not talking about people having to sacrifice in terms of the choices that they made. There were currently four choices in terms of medical options, and in the new plan there would still be four choices. There also would be no sacrifice in quality. This program impacted him and his own family too, so there was no attempt to serve something up which was negative.

Mrs. Lohrum then presented the current medical plan choices which included the indemnity plan with 90, 80, or 70% coverage, the Kaiser HMO (Summa Health Care facilities in Akron), the Hometown HMO (IPA model), and finally a waiver of coverage. She then went on to discuss the details of the current indemnity plan which included the following: the 90%, 80%, or 70% total payment options; the annual deductibles which were salary-driven; the out-of-pocket maximums which were also salary-driven; very limited preventive care, pharmacy benefits; patient responsibility issues including claim forms, usual, customary and reasonable charges, and pre-admission review; and unlimited life-time maximums. (For details, see **Appendix A.**)

Mr. Prunty then stated that under the new plan there would still be four choices. The same two HMO choices and the waiver of coverage would remain as options. However, the PPO plan would replace the indemnity plan.

Mrs. Lohrum discussed the PPO plan. (For details, see **Appendix B.**) In this plan one would have the option of going to physicians who were either in-network or out-of-network. You would receive 90% reimbursement if the physician was in-network but only 70% if the doctor was not. There would be no commitment to always using someone in-network. Each time you needed to make an appointment with a physician or a facility, you would make that choice. There would be a total \$12 co-pay for doctor's office visits in-network. (This \$12 would not count toward the deductible.) If the doctor was not in the network, then your fee would go toward the deductible. The savings here would allow for expanded preventive care in areas like well-baby care, childhood immunizations, and, with some criteria in mind, routine physicals. Deductibles would no longer be salary-driven but standard amounts - \$250 for an individual; \$500 for a family (in network); \$500 for an individual; \$1,000 for a family (out-of-network). Out-of-pocket maximums would also now be standard amounts - \$700 for an individual; \$1,500 for a family (in-network); \$2,000 for an individual; \$4,000 for a family (out-of-network). Prescription drugs would be the same as they were now in the indemnity plan.

In this PPO plan, patient responsibilities would change a bit. When using in-network physicians, claim forms would no longer be required. There would also be no usual, customary and reasonable charges for any services rendered by an in-network physician. This was all handled ahead of time. Also, pre-admission and pre-approval responsibilities would go to the in-network physician. Finally, the unlimited lifetime maximum would stay the same as it was in the indemnity plan.

Senator Ralph Turek said that on the basis of this information there would be a pretty big incentive to go with in-network physicians. Would there be in-network physicians beyond the Akron area, in Cleveland for example?

Mr. Prunty answered that there were. He knew that people were concerned about whether their doctors would be in the network or not. Human Resources had been very cautious about this and had asked the three vendors who had bid on this alternate medical plan to show their G.O. access studies which would show who was in the network and who was not. There had been an attempt to match these to the physicians and facilities which University employees currently were using.

Senator Chyi wondered what would happen if a faculty member were out of town for a week attending a conference and got sick and had to see a doctor not in the network. Also, suppose one did not like the in-network doctor in town that he had chosen. How did that work?

Mrs. Lohrum answered that tentative arrangements had been made if you were in an out-of-the-service area. Then basically you would get network benefits. If you were in town and did not like your in-network doctor and changed to one out-of-network, you would get out-of-network benefits. One could change doctors within the network, but it was not necessary to commit to a doctor. There was going to be a book, and each time you needed medical care you could go through the book and choose an in-network physician and receive the in-network benefits. If you decided to go out-of-network, you would receive those benefits.

Senator Smith realized that many of his colleagues lived all over the map. There was a large contingent of 60 or so in the Wayne County area at Wayne College. He himself lived in southern Summit County about halfway in between. Were these areas part of the G.O. access study?

Mrs. Lohrum replied that all the contiguous county areas had been used (Cuyahoga, Summit, Portage, Ravenna). Unfortunately, when you got to Wayne and Orrville, there was not a large volume of doctors in this area.

Senator Cheryl Buchanan wondered whether Human Resources had a specific PPO in mind.

Mr. Prunty answered that there were three large providers which had made bids. However, since a choice had not yet been made, he was not at liberty to talk about them. They were very large, reputable companies however.

In answer to Senator David Redle's question regarding dependents who were attending schools out of the area, Mrs. Lohrum said that this was something the bidders had been asked about. There would be coverage in emergency situations. This would apply in situations where faculty members or their families were traveling as well.

In answer to Senator Murray's question about primary care physicians being responsible for specialist referrals, Mrs. Lohrum said that this choice each time would be up to the individual. It was not like a true managed care situation, where the primary doctor was in essence a gatekeeper through whom you would have to go to get to a specialist.

In answer to Senator Dan Deckler's question about coordination of benefits with separate plans of a spouse, Mrs. Lohrum said that this would not change. It was a University provision and would remain in this plan.

Senator Diana Reep asked how the deductible would be figured in relation to going to both in and out-of-network physicians. Mrs. Lohrum responded that if you started with an in-network physician, it was combined. If you met \$250 within network and then went out of network, that \$250 would go toward meeting your \$500 out-of-network deductible.

Senator Aby thought that what people really wanted to see was which doctors and facilities would be in the network plan. This was really where the rubber met the road for a lot of individuals.

Mr. Prunty answered that he would be showing some information which would answer this partially, although you would not see names of physicians. He went on to say that Human Resources and the consultant had examined the program and thought that it was a good one. There were slight

differences with what we had now, but his guiding principle (having been through this twice before with previous employers) in instituting a program like this for 2,400 people was to provide the best quality program for the greatest number of employees.

Mr. Prunty then summarized the advantages of the alternate medical plan. The first was shifting the focus in terms of treatment of illness to prevention of illness. The second was enhanced distribution of benefits to cover a broader base of employees. A third was cost savings for the University, but these cost savings would not cause a sacrifice as far as choices or the quality of the program were concerned. Fourthly, the cost savings would also give us the ability to enhance other benefits like the dental program and long-term disability. The fifth advantage was the enhancement of the review and quality assurance mechanisms regarding providers in the program. This would include insuring that all physicians were licensed and board certified. The sixth advantage was that it would bring us in line with many of our sister institutions such as Youngstown and Kent State, which were moving to these sorts of plans. The seventh was that managed care programs were becoming more prevalent in today's market, and providers were making those groups and institutions who wanted to stay with the traditional indemnity programs pay a lot more to continue to maintain them. The last advantage was that at the University we had a non-contributory health program. In today's economy, this was unusual. Most employers and institutions asked their employees to make some contribution for their health insurance program. By going to this sort of PPO, we could delay the need for employee contributions.

Mr. Prunty and Mrs. Lohrum then turned to three charts which answered some of the questions raised by the Well-Being Committee. The first (**Appendix C**) related to quality assurance issues. An important point that Mrs. Lohrum made was that the physicians in all three proposals were paid for the services that they rendered. There were fee schedules without any withholds. The doctors did not get a set amount per month and then have financial disincentives at the end of the month about seeing additional patients or ordering additional tests, etc. Another point was that physicians in all three plans were re-credentialed every two years.

The next chart (**Appendix D**) showed the results of providing to the three bidders the names of the providers and facilities used most often by University of Akron employees over the past 12 months in order to see how many of them were part of the bidders' networks. Two of the three had Summa Health Care (Akron City and St. Thomas) in their plans; two of three had Akron General. All three had Cleveland Clinic. Mrs. Lohrum next discussed a chart (**Appendix E**) which showed the correspondences to the three bidders' networks in relation to the most used doctors and facilities over the past 12 months by University employees in the indemnity plan.

The last chart precipitated numerous questions and reactions from members of the Senate. It was noted that while the fit with facilities was good with one provider, it was another provider which had the best correspondence with physicians. There was concern raised about facilities not listed, such as Aultman Hospital in Canton. The response was that these charts only showed the facilities and physicians most often used by Akron employees. This did not mean that facilities that were not shown here would not be in the network. It just meant that they were not used as often as the ones on the chart. Senators then were concerned about how they and their colleagues would be able to find out which doctors and facilities were in providers A, B, and C.

In answer to a question regarding the status of this proposal, Mr. Prunty said that Human Resources would like it to be presented to the Board at its September 24th meeting. Whatever health plan in effect for next year, whether it was a rollover of the existing one or the new PPO, there was little time to get everything organized and allow the faculty to make their choices so that the plan could start on January 1, 1998.

A discussion followed in which Senator Drummond suggested that the Senate meet on September 18 to continue to consider this issue. In the meantime, information on the facilities and physicians in the three bidders' networks would be made available to anyone who wanted to see it. There would also be sessions arranged for all faculty and staff both at Akron and Wayne to give them the basic information about the proposed plan in order to get their reactions so that the Senate could make an informed decision on the 18th.

Senator Midha asked Mr. Prunty whether the Senate's recommendation would mean anything in this issue. Mr. Prunty replied that they would like the Senate's recommendation, but if this were presented to the Board by the administration on the basis of his and the consultant's assessments, and the Senate had recommended against it, that fact would be conveyed to the Board.

In answer to a question about the proposed savings from this, Mr. Prunty said that he was reluctant to throw out numbers. Initially, he had suggested between \$400,000 and \$600,000, but that was before he had gone back to the providers and asked them to tighten up their numbers in regard to who would be in the network. The savings came from what they called discounted savings in terms of those people who came into the network, and the providers had to do some repricing. What they told him originally might change when he said to them that they might be the vendor of choice but that they had to go back and solidify the numbers and say exactly what the savings would be.

Senator Drummond said that if in the next two weeks the Senate could not get the information that it needed and get feedback from the faculty and staff, then the recommendation from the Well-Being Committee would be that this was not recommended. Then Mr. Prunty would have to go to the Board and say that the Faculty Senate did not like this plan. He understood that this was information that they needed to have.

Senator Midha reminded the body that if the savings were going to be \$500,000, it would roughly represent half of 1% of our salaries. The body might consider that in its recommendation.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn until September 18 when the body would meet to discuss this issue further at a time and place to be announced. This was moved by Senator Norfolk and seconded by Senator Midha. The Senate voted its approval and the meeting ended at 5:23 p.m.

APPENDIX A

CURRENT INDEMNITY PLAN

1. THREE (3) CO-INSURANCE OPTIONS:

- 90 %
- 80 %
- 70 %

2. ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLES (Salary Driven)

- \$100/500 - Single
- \$500/1,000 - Family

3. OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS (Salary Driven)

- \$400/2,000 - Single
- \$600/3,000 - Family

4. LIMITED PREVENTIVE CARE

- Annual Mammogram
- Sigmoidoscopy

5. PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

6. PATIENT RESPONSIBILITY

- Claim forms required
- UCR excess charges
- Patient responsible for pre-admission review

7. UNLIMITED LIFETIME MAXIMUM

APPENDIX B**NEW PREFERRED PROVIDER PROVISIONS (PPO)**

1. **MEDICAL COVERAGE**
 - 90 % -- In-network
 - 70 % -- Out-of-network
2. **EXPANDED FIRST-DOLLAR BENEFITS**
 - Physician visits - \$12 co-pay
 - Expanded preventive care
 - Well baby care
 - Childhood immunizations
 - Adult physicals
3. **ANNUAL DEDUCTIBLES (not salary driven)**
 - \$250 Single -- In-network
 - \$500 Family

 - \$500 Single -- Out-of-network
 - \$1,000 Family
4. **OUT-OF-POCKET MAXIMUMS (not salary driven)**
 - \$750 Single -- In-network
 - \$1,500 Family

 - \$2,000 Single -- Out-of-network
 - \$4,000 Family
5. **PRESCRIPTION DRUGS**
6. **PATIENT RESPONSIBILITIES**
 - No claim form for in-network services
 - No UCR excess charges
 - Provider responsible for pre-admission review
7. **UNLIMITED LIFETIME MAXIMUM**

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

Managed Care Questionnaire Response Summary

• Minimum Hospital Credentialing Qualifications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current license - Accredited or good standing with Medicare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Licensed in good standing - Accredited, including Medicare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Licensed - Accredited - Medicare certified
• Physician Credentialing Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medical license - DEA registration - Malpractice claims - Graduation from accredited school - Malpractice insurance coverage - Professional care sanctions/restrictions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medical license - DEA certification - Malpractice coverage - Malpractice judgments - Professional care sanctions - On-site review (all primary care physicians and certain specialties) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Medical license - DEA certification - Professional liability insurance - Felony conviction status - Professional disciplinary action within last 5 years
• Physician Recredentialing Frequency	Every 2 years	Every 2 years	Every 2 years
• Percent of Participating Physicians that are Board-Certified			
- Primary Care	78%	80%	70%
- Specialists	70%	80%	53%
• Physician Reimbursement Basis	Fee schedule; no withholds	Fee schedule; no withholds	Fee schedule; no withholds

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

PPO Network Facility Provider Comparison

Top Area Facility Providers

Summa Health System	No	✓	✓
Akron General	✓	✓	No
Childrens Hospital	✓	✓	✓
Cuyahoga Falls General	No	✓	No
Cleveland Clinic	✓	✓	✓
Robinson Memorial	✓	✓	✓
Barberton	✓	✓	No
University Hospitals	✓	No	✓

kpmg Peat Marwick LLP
August 22, 1997

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON

PPO Network Provider Matchup

	<u>Company A</u>	<u>Company B</u>	<u>Company C</u>
Facility			
- Number	45	57	32
- Percent	62.5%	79.2%	44.4%
- Charge Volume	\$2,024,000	\$3,474,000	\$1,985,000
- Percent	52.2%	89.5%	51.2%
Professional			
- Number	128	95	104
- Percent	77.6%	57.6%	63.0%
- Charge Volume	\$2,189,000	\$1,895,000	\$1,840,000
- Percent	76.6%	66.3%	64.4%
Combined			
- Number	173	152	136
- Percent	73.0%	64.1%	57.4%
- Charge Volume	\$4,213,000	\$5,369,000	\$3,825,000
- Percent	62.5%	79.7%	56.8%

APPENDIX E

ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION

We are once again updating the Chronicle mailing list. Please indicate whether you want to receive a copy of this monthly publication, **if you are not already on the mailing list**, and also whether you want your name dropped from the list.

Name: _____

Department/+4: _____

___ I am currently **not** on your mailing list; please add my name.

___ Please drop my name from your mailing list.

Please return this form to Marilyn Quillin, SHN 155 (+4910).

