

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

9-7-1995

## Faculty Senate Chronicle September 7, 1995

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](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).



10K ✓  
Corrected

1995-96, No. 1

30 Pages

September 7, 1995

## 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 Committees	7
Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of September 7, 1995	8
Appendices to the Minutes of the Meeting of Faculty Senate of September 7, 1995	22
A. Chairman's Remarks	22
B. Remarks of the President of the University	24
C. Report of the <i>Executive Committee</i>	27
D. Report of <i>Athletics Committee</i>	28
E. Report of <i>Student Affairs Committee</i>	29
F. Report of <i>Computing and Communications Technologies Committee</i>	30

---

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

1995-96

### FALL SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 28
* Labor Day (Day & Evening)	Mon., September 4
Veterans Day (Classes Held, Staff Holiday)	Fri., November 10
** Thanksgiving Break	Thurs.-Sat., November 23-25
Classes Resume	Mon., November 27
Final Instructional Day	Sat., December 9
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., December 11-16
Commencement	Sat., December 16
Spring Intersession	Mon.-Fri., January 2-13

### SPRING SEMESTER

* Martin Luther King Day	Mon., January 15
Day & Evening Classes Begin	Tues., January 16
* President's Day	Tues., February 20
Spring Break	Mon.-Sat., March 18-23
*** May Day	Fri., May 3
Final Instructional Day	Sat., May 4
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., May 6-11
Commencement	Sat., May 11
Commencement/Law School	Sun., May 19
Summer Intersession	Mon.-Fri., May 13-June 7

### SUMMER SESSION I

First 5 and 8 Week Sessions Begin	Mon., June 10
* Independence Day	Thurs., July 4
First 5-Week Session Ends	Fri., July 12

### SUMMER SESSION II

Second 5-Week Sessions Begin	Mon., July 15
8-Week Session Ends	Fri., August 2
Second 5-Week Session Ends	Fri., August 16
Commencement	Sat., August 17

### FALL SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 26
-----------------------------	-----------------

\* Classes canceled

\*\* Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 7 a.m.

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



**FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP**  
(Update: 9/7/95)

<p align="center"><b>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</b> (16)</p> <p>David Buchthal, 97      Chand Midha, 98                  Barbara Clements, 97      T. Norfolk, 97                  Daniel Ely, 97      Gary Oller, 97                  E. Erickson, 97      N. Ranson, 96                  R. Gigliotti, 96      P. Stuyvesant, 96                  John Green, 97      (TBA), 98                  D. Malhotra, 98      (TBA), 98                  J. Marquette, 96      (TBA), 98</p>		<p align="center"><b>Community &amp; Technical College</b> (6)</p> <p>Carol Gigliotti, 97                  David Hoover, 98                  Michael Jalbert, 98                  Paul John, 98                  Ray Sibberson, 96                  (TBA), 98</p>		<p align="center"><b>College of Education</b> (4)</p> <p>Edward Lasher, 98                  Barbara Moss, 96                  Carole Newman, 97                  Dianne Wright, 96</p>	
<p align="center"><b>College of Engineering</b> (4)</p> <p>Michael Cheung, 96                  Jerry Drummond, 98                  Joseph Padovan, 98                  Daniel Sheffer, 97</p>	<p align="center"><b>College of Fine and Applied Arts</b> (7)</p> <p>Kathleen Davis, 97                  Christina DePaul, 98                  Virginia Gunn, 96                  Jean Hines, 98                  Georgia Peeples, 96                  Kenneth Siloac, 97                  David Witt, 97</p>	<p align="center"><b>College of Business Administration</b> (4)</p> <p>John Hebert, 98                  Dennis Kimmell, 98                  George Prough, 97                  David Redle, 96</p>	<p align="center"><b>University Libraries</b> (2)</p> <p>David Brink, 96                  Ruth Clinefelter, 97</p>		
<p align="center"><b>College of Nursing</b> (3)</p> <p>D. Dobrindt, 96                  K. Ross-Alaolmolki, 98                  Adele Webb, 96</p>	<p align="center"><b>Polymer Science/Engineering</b> (1)</p> <p>John Frederick, 98</p>	<p align="center"><b>Wayne College</b> (1)</p> <p>Robert McElwee, 96</p>	<p align="center"><b>Contract Professionals</b> (2)</p> <p>Barbara Bucey, 97                  Diane Vukovich, 96</p>		
<p align="center"><b>Part-Time Faculty</b> (2)</p> <p>Paul Fowler, 97                  Peggy Richards, 98</p>	<p align="center"><b>Students</b> (3)</p> <p>Carmen Keener, 96                  Celina Echols, 96                  (TBA), 96</p>	<p align="center"><b>School of Law</b> (1)</p> <p>William Rich, 97</p>	<p align="center"><b>Members = 56</b></p>		

Note: Term expires in year listed.

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON**  
1995-96

**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Dr. H. Michael Cheung, Chair  
Mr. David Brink, Vice Chair  
Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary  
Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter  
Dr. Elizabeth Erickson  
Dr. Timothy Norfolk  
Mrs. Peggy Richards

**SENATE COMMITTEES**

\* designates Senator  
Term expires in year listed.

**ACADEMIC POLICIES, CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE**

Student (TBA), 96\*  
Dr. Robert McElwee, 96\*  
Dr. Phillip Stuyvesant, 96\*  
Mr. Dan Buie, 97  
Mr. Jerry J. Burr, 97  
Dr. Barbara Clements, 97\*  
Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter, 97\*  
Dr. Jose DeAbreu-Garcia, 97  
Mr. Elton Glaser, 97  
Mr. William Lewis, 97  
Dr. Carole Newman, 97\*  
Dr. Timothy S. Norfolk, 97\*  
Dr. Gary Oller, 97\*  
Dr. Rita S. Saslaw, 97  
Dr. Kenneth Siloac, 97\*

Mrs. Nancy Stokes, 97  
Dr. John J. Zarski, 97  
Mr. Michael Jalbert, 98\*  
Dr. Dennis Kimmell, 98\*  
Dr. Edward Lasher, 98\*  
Dr. Chand Midha, 98\*  
Mrs. Peggy Richards, 98\*  
Dr. Kathleen Ross-Alaolmolki, 98\*

Ex officio member, Mr. David Jamison,  
Senior VP and Provost

Ex officio member, Miss Marie Kane,  
Dir., Institutional Research



**ATHLETICS**

Mr. David Brink, 96\*  
 Dr. Donald Stull, 96  
 Dr. Adele Webb, 96\*  
 Dr. Kenneth Aupperle, 97  
 Dr. Steven Chuang, 97  
 Dr. James Emore, 97  
 Dr. Richard Gigliotti, 97\*

Dr. Paul John, 98\*  
 A & S (TBA), 98\*

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

Mr. Michael Bobinski, Athletic Director,  
 or designee

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE**

Dr. Virginia Fleming, 96  
 Dr. Wallace Sterling, 96  
 Dr. Frank Canda, 97  
 Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, 97\*  
 Mrs. Phyllis O'Connor, 97  
 Dr. Nicholas Ranson, 97\*  
 Dr. Dorothy Dobrindt, 98\*  
 Dr. Georgia Peeples, 98\*  
 Mr. Rick Wiggins, 98  
 C & T (TBA), 98\*  
 A & S (TBA), 98\*

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

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

Mr. Paul Richert, Law Librarian

**REFERENCE COMMITTEE**

Mr. LaVerne Yousey, 96  
 Ms. Barbara Bucey, 97\*  
 Mrs. Cheryl Buchanan, 97  
 Dr. John Green, 97\*

Dr. David Hoover, 98\*  
 Mr. Daniel Mack, 98  
 Mr. William Rich, 98\*



**CAMPUS FACILITIES COMMITTEE**

Dr. Virginia Gunn, 96\*  
 Mrs. Debra Keller, 96  
 Dr. David Buchthal, 97\*  
 Dr. Dale Coons, 97  
 Mrs. Kathleen M. Davis, 97\*  
 Mr. Paul Fowler, 97\*  
 Dr. Gwendolyn Jones, 97  
 Dr. Dianne Wright, 97\*

Dr. Jerry Drummond, 98\*  
 Dr. Kenneth Dunning, 98  
 Dr. John Hebert, 98\*  
 Mr. John Kline, 98  
 Dr. Harvey Sterns, 98

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

**STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

Grad. Student (TBA), 96\*  
 Dr. Diane Vukovich, 96\*  
 Ms. Marcia Weidnecht, 96  
 Dr. Daniel L. Ely, 97\*  
 Dr. Carol Gigliotti, 97\*  
 Mr. Tucker Jolly, 97

Ms. Carmen Keener, 97\*  
 Mr. Don Laconi, 97  
 Dr. George Prough, 97\*  
 Mrs. Barb Bucey, 98\*  
 Ms. Lynne Pachnowski, 98

Ex officio members, Dr. Caryl K. Smith,  
 VP for Student Affairs, or designee, and  
 Mr. Doug McNutt, Director of  
 Student Financial Aid

**COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE**

Ms. Onadell Bly, 96  
 Dr. Frank Griffin, 96  
 Mrs. Rebecca McCollum, 96  
 Dr. J. Wayne Baker, 97  
 Dr. Jesse Marquette, 97\*  
 Dr. David Witt, 97\*  
 Dr. H.M. Cheung, 98\*

Dr. John Frederick, 98\*  
 Dr. Joseph Padovan, 98\*  
 Dr. Andrew Rancer, 98  
 Mr. Ray Sibberson, 98\*

Ex officio member, Dr. Frank Thomas,  
 Assoc. VP of Information Services,  
 or designee



RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE	
<p>Miss Virginia Berringer, 96                      Mr. Andrew Borowiec, 96                      Dr. Dolores Bower, 96                      Dr. Jon M. Hawes, 96                      Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman, 96                      Dr. Barb Moss, 96*                      Dr. Nancy Somerick, 96                      Dr. Claire Tessier, 96                      Ms. Tana Alexander, 97                      Dr. Roger Bain, 97                      Mr. Earl Ertman, 97                      Dr. Lazarus Macior, 97                      Dr. William McGucken, 97*                      Dr. Isadore Newman, 97                      Dr. Dan Sheffer, 97*</p>	<p>Dr. J. Clayton Fant, 98                      Dr. Brian Leonard, 98                      Dr. Victoria Schirm, 98                      Dr. Phillip Schmidt, 98                      Mr. Michael Williams, 98</p> <p>Ex officio, non-voting member,                      Dr. Charmaine Streharsky</p> <p>Ex officio member, Dr. Nicholas Sylvester,                      VP, Research &amp; University Development,                      or designee</p>

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE	
<p>Dr. Victoria Schirm, 96                      Mr. Ray Sibberson, 96*                      Mr. Edward Zadrozny, 96                      Dr. Ted Conway, 97                      Dr. Thein Kyu, 97                      Dr. F. Bruce Simmons, 97</p>	<p>Mrs. Nancy Stokes, 98                      Ms. Carol A. Olson, 98                      Barbara Clements, 98*                      Edward Thall, 98                      (TBA), 98</p>

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE	
<p>Mr. William Becker, 96                      Ms. Barbara Beller, 96                      Dr. Tomisita Chandler, 96                      Dr. Jerry Drummond, 96*                      Mrs. Sue Gerberich, 96                      Dr. Diana Chlebek, 97                      Dr. Gary Hamed, 97                      Dr. James Strong, 97</p>	<p>Richard Einsporn, 98                      J. William Taggart, 98                      Thomas Andes, 98                      (TBA), 98                      (TBA), 98*</p>



SENATE MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR,  
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS  
1995-97

Professor William D. Rich,\* School of Law  
Dr. Shelley Baranowski, Alternate Representative

BUDGET AND PLANNING COORDINATION COMMITTEE

Dr. Chand Midha, 97*	A & S
Dr. Dennis L. Kimmell, 97*	Accounting
Mr. Paul R. John, 97*	C & T
Ms. Barbara A. Bucey, 97*	Academic Advising
Dr. H. Michael Cheung, 97*	Engineering
Dr. Kenneth Siloac, 96*	Commun. Disorders
Mr. David Brink, 96*	Libraries
Dr. Adele Webb, 97*	Nursing
Mr. Robert McElwee, 96*	Wayne
Mr. William Rich, 96*	Law
Mr. Paul Fowler, 96*	Part-time

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Mrs. Peggy Richards, 96*	Part-time Faculty
Dr. Jesse Marquette, 97*	A & S
Dr. Daniel Sheffer, 96*	Engineering
Dr. Carol Gigliotti, 97*	Office Administration
(TBA), 97*	

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 7, 1995**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Cheung at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 7, 1995 in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-six of the fifty-six members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Carol Gigliotti, Richard Gigliotti, Robert McElwee and George Prough were absent with notice.

**SENATE ACTIONS**

- **ELECTED NEW OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
- **ELECTED NEW MEMBERS OF BPCC (7) AND LRPC (2)**
- **DEFERRED RUN-OFF ELECTION FOR FINAL LRPC POSITION UNTIL OCTOBER**
- **ELECTED TWO REPRESENTATIVES TO SHARED GOVERNANCE COUNCIL**
- **AGREED TO PERMIT THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO CHOOSE TWO REPRESENTATIVES FOR EACH SHARED GOVERNANCE SUBCOMMITTEE AND FOR GRADUATE COUNCIL**
- **ELECTED A REPRESENTATIVE AND ALTERNATE TO FACCOBOR**
- **DEFERRED CONSIDERATION OF APPEALS PROCESS FOR UNTENURED FACULTY UNTIL OCTOBER**
- **REFERRED A QUESTION REGARDING PART-TIME FACULTY STRS BENEFITS TO UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Senator Buchthal moved to approve the agenda, and this was seconded by Senator Clinefelter. The motion carried.

**II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 4, 1995** - The minutes were approved without corrections.



**III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - (Appendix A)**

**IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - Senator Brink said that before he hung up his quill pen and floppy disk and left the office of secretary, he wanted to recognize what he considered to be his most significant achievement during his tenure; namely, being one of the people who selected Marilyn Quillin. She made the job easy. So much so that if he had received a salary, it would have been criminal. He thanked her very much.

Professor Walton announced that this year's United Way goal for the campus campaign was \$100,000. There was a very convenient payroll deduction plan available. He asked that when people received their contribution cards that they give generously.

Before moving on to committee reports, Chairman Cheung apologized for the oversight during his remarks and introduced Dr. Jeffrey Wallace, the Associate Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs.

**V. REPORTS**

**A. Remarks of the President of the University - (Appendix B)**

Senator Oller asked a question about the search committee for the Vice-President for Business and Finance. Since this was obviously a position in which we all were interested and he had noticed that there was only one faculty member on the search committee, he wondered whether the President might consider adding one more to the committee; namely, the Chairman of the Faculty Senate.

President Elliott said that she would.

Senator Clinefelter had a question about the food service in the dining room of the Gardner Student Center. While the dining room was open, yet another sandwich place was about to open to service it. This made a total of three, counting those in the Chuckery, and it did not help people with food allergies or restricted diets or anyone who wanted a hot meal. She was somewhat mystified as to why this University couldn't operate a cafeteria any longer - something which it had done since 1941. She wanted to know whether auxiliary services had worked with the Campus Facilities Planning Committee last year in planning for this major change in the food service.

President Elliott assumed that they had. We were having problems attracting what we wanted for a food service because the way that one made money on food service was to run it seven days a week or sell liquor, and we did not do either of those. If she remembered correctly, and she reserved the right to check the facts, they were going to get two or three options and take those to the committee. One problem was dealing with conglomerates which, if you wanted Pizza Hut, would also make you take Barbecue World, Hot Dogs are Us, and anything else which they owned. Another problem was with exclusivity contracts which, for example, would require the University to remove from vending machines all over campus any soft drink which was a competitor with the one sold in their restaurants. Sometimes companies like Marriott would run the kind of operation which



we wanted at a loss, if we were feeding as many as 10,000 in the residence halls, but the University could not provide that either. She concluded that options were still being examined and that this was a concern to everybody.

Senator John asked whether anyone had visited Kent State recently and seen what they did with their food court. He wondered whether they, as a state-run institution, had encountered similar problems.

The President was certain that they had, but she noted they had two advantages. First, they were defined as residential and did have at least 10,000 in their residence halls. Our problem was that not enough people lived here every day. Also, they did sell hard liquor in their building and that was where they made a lot of money.

Senator Keener said that as a student who lived off campus, she still dined at Robertson Dining Hall. She would like to see more faculty eat there because the food was terrific.

Senator Norfolk, changing the subject, commented that he was startled last week to find out that apparently the operating budgets for the colleges bore absolutely no relation to student credit hour production. Buchtel College's budget had not changed in more than six years. There still was no incentive plan in place, and even if you did manage to make ends meet, your budget could still be cut to help other colleges which did not.

President Elliott agreed that this was an extremely important issue and that everyone needed to work to get an incentive plan in place. There was a charge to BPCC to get this done. She concluded by noting that it now looked as though we were going to do a little bit better on enrollment than we had originally thought.

**B. Remarks of the Provost** - Chairman Cheung stated that in the interest of the Senate getting through its agenda the Provost had declined to make remarks, but he would have some at the next meeting.

**C. Report of the Representative to FACCOBOR** - No report

**D. Executive Committee** - (Appendix C)

**E. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee** - No report

**F. University Well-Being Committee** - No report

**G. Graduate Council** - No report

**H. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee** - Assistant Provost Kelly reminded the Senate that at its May meeting it had approved intended changes in the curriculum process, and APCC had been charged with revising the Faculty Senate Bylaws to reflect those changes. At its first meeting next week, APCC would address that issue and would have something for the Senate's October meeting. Some APCC members, as also charged, had worked over the summer on



developing forms for use with the new curriculum procedures. These had been distributed to deans and department heads in both disk form and hard copy in August.

Senator Siloac stated that the new procedures were supposed to streamline the curriculum process. Yet there were already complaints in his college regarding having to redo proposals which were already in the pipeline to conform with the new format. Was there not some way that these proposals could go through with the old format? It seemed to him that reinventing the wheel did not streamline it.

It was Assistant Provost Kelly's impression that the people on the Curriculum Subcommittee who worked on the new procedures and forms had indicated their desire that all proposals this year be submitted on the new forms. They thought there would be a great deal of confusion if proposals were submitted on both old and new sets of forms. It did not really matter to the Provost's office which sets of forms were used. It was whether or not the Curriculum Committee would be receptive to receiving any on the old forms this year.

Senator Wright said that she had seen the disk copies of the forms which were IBM compatible. Would any consideration be given to the forms being on MAC?

Assistant Provost Kelly said this was in fact being worked on. He also offered to raise Senator Siloac's question with APCC, and Senator Siloac asked him to do so.

**I. Athletics Committee - (Appendix D)**

**J. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - No report**

**K. University Libraries Committee - No report**

**L. Reference Committee - No report**

**M. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - No report**

**N. Student Affairs Committee - (Appendix E)**

**O. Computing and Communications Technologies Committee - (Appendix F)**

**P. Shared Governance Council and Subcommittees - No report**

**Q. Long Range Planning Committee** - Senator Marquette reported that the Committee had met a number of times during the summer, and for the first time probably in the memory of the institution, the college plans had actually been read by somebody who was going to do something with them. The deans would shortly be receiving the Committee's responses to the plans that were submitted. There was a form and some letters would be sent back requesting specific information. Most of the plans were fairly well structured; they dealt with the mission and goals of the institution, but there had been little or no prioritization of goals within the colleges. For the Committee to generate a University-wide plan, it needed that prioritization from the deans. A second problem with many of the plans was that goals were stated, but no measures were suggested or planned to demonstrate



whether or not those goals were ultimately accomplished. Another area where clarification was needed was resource reallocation. In some cases what the Committee had were plans that asked only for new resources. Given the realities of the budgeting process at the institution, there had not been sufficient concern that within units resources might have to be moved from one area to another. The Committee wanted to know where that might occur. He thought that answers to all these questions could be answered within a few weeks because the necessary responses should be fairly easy to generate. With this information the Committee could move on to creating the new plan.

Another thing which the Committee had done was to look at the two reports on the electronic university from the CCTC and John Bee's ad hoc committee on multi-media/distance learning. Since there had been a tremendous amount of overlap, LRPC asked the heads of the two groups to eliminate the duplication. Senator Marquette concluded his report by noting that the Committee members had put in a tremendous amount of effort once they had received the college plans and that something reasonable for this body and BPCC would be forthcoming.

Senator Buchthal asked whether there would be a master plan before the budgets were issued to the colleges for next year.

Senator Marquette replied that there would be something by the end of the semester which BPCC could then take into account in making its allocations for the following academic year.

For the sake of clarification Senator Buchthal asked whether this meant that once the new plan was presented at the end of this semester, we would be making allocations in such areas as teaching assistantships. Were colleges and departments being asked to hold off on planning for next year and assigning assistantships beyond a certain level until the final decision was made on where money would go?

Senator Marquette answered that what we had done for the past twenty years was operate on new money. The LRPC was attempting to provide the opportunity for reallocation of resources between colleges, but this could not be done without a plan, which the Committee did not expect to conclude before the end of the semester. The college plans which the Committee had received simply did not permit the creation of a University plan because there were no priorities. As he understood it, the college deans had not been asked to provide such information, so what they had gotten looked a lot like what had been received in the past.

Senator Erickson asked whether the LRPC had originally asked for those priorities or was it that the deans had not provided them, and Senator Marquette replied that the Committee had not asked for the information, and he was not sure exactly who told them to start planning. He believed that the process was commenced not under the current provost but under Mark Auburn.

Senator Erickson stated that the problem as she saw it was that LRPC had taken quite some time putting the plan together and had not looked to see what in fact had been asked for. Was there any way that LRPC could come up with the priorities since BPCC could not make a reallocation of the budget unless this was done?



Senator Marquette answered that the 21st Century Task Force had created a planning process that had all those elements. It had been the Committee's understanding that that was what had been transmitted to the deans. Unfortunately, until it received the reports, the LRPC did not know that this planning process had just sort of disappeared into the woodwork. The people who had served on the 21st Century Task Force had turned in requests for priorities, coordination with budget, a time frame - the whole megillah was there. He had no idea why this process had not taken place, but the Committee was trying its best to make it work now.

President Elliott said that the most compelling thing she had heard in this regard was that people did not really think we were going to tie budget things together. They had just reverted to the old ways.

Senator Padovan wondered how seriously these plans which LRPC was evaluating were being taken at the collegiate level. He hated to throw in this other wrinkle, but it was a reality if you were going to be throwing out money without incentives or real plans for the colleges.

Senator Marquette responded that this was why the plans had been sent back to the colleges with a specific list of concerns. Some of the things that should have been done just did not get done. He did not know why, but the Committee was doing the best it could and was attempting to accomplish exactly what the governance structure demanded it to do. It had met just about every week this summer, and it now intended to reissue the plan guidelines that were supposed to have come out of the 21st Century Task Force and been employed so that it would be there for the colleges.

Senator Erickson asked what Senator Marquette thought about the Senate Chair's suggestion that BPCC and LRPC might be helped by additional people being put on the committees.

Senator Marquette replied that if the body found a way to create additional positions it would probably be helpful to make LRPC slightly larger. Another problem which the Committee had had to address repeatedly was the acquisition of revenue generation data. According to Assistant Provost Kelly, this would be solved shortly. The institutional research process had been in a shambles for several years. Theoretically this was being addressed, but in the meantime the Committee had put in a request for revenue generation data four months ago. Senator Marquette had met with the Assistant and Associate Provosts last week and been promised that this material would be forthcoming shortly. They were working with people in institutional research to make this happen. The Committee needed this essentially as a measure to check priorities.

Senator Norfolk asked for definition of revenue generation, and Senator Marquette responded that the Committee was looking at the money that came into the University from tuition, gifts and grants, indirect costs, etc. - everything it could think of. The requested data streams would be two separate ones, one generated before and one without allocation of money that came in our fiscal plan so that we would get a chance to look at this as there was going to be a change in the capital budgeting system in the state. Both streams were needed to allow the Committee to check this, and the information should be forthcoming soon.

President Elliott noted that perhaps one reason why the 21st Century Task Force planning process was not followed in some of the colleges might relate to the number of deans changed in



that period when the plans were being generated. It may have gotten lost in the translation in a number of areas.

**R. Budget and Planning Coordination Committee** - Senator Midha reported that the Committee had not met this summer. However, at the May meeting of the Senate he had reported on the BPCC recommended summer '95 incentive plan which required colleges suffering a loss to absorb 50% of the loss. Consequently, the plan was not put into operation because it was not approved by the Council of Deans. Therefore, there was no plan for the summer and the losses suffered by any college because of a drop in enrollment or any other reason were absorbed by the central administration.

Senator Erickson had a question that related to the issue of getting the BPCC to be in the process of reallocating the budget. What did Senator Midha see as the problems facing the BPCC in this whole procedure?

Senator Midha replied that the Committee had not been given the task last year to reallocate the funding from one source to another. Its task had been to look at new money and also to work on a year-long incentive program of which the summer incentive program was to be a part. Dr. Helmick had chaired the incentive subcommittee whose membership included Chairman Cheung, Dean Klingele, and Senator Fowler. In April that subcommittee had reported that this was a complicated process and more time was necessary. They decided to use the same experimental plan for the summer which he had reported on at the May meeting. In regard to the issue of adding members to the BPCC, he was not aware of how many members were on LRPC but there were fifteen or sixteen on BPCC, and in his opinion there were already too many on this Committee. As Vice-Chair of the Committee, it was his observation that there was very little money available to it, mainly the new dollars, and until March it had not been certain whether that would be \$3 or \$4 million. It was very difficult to work with these sorts of conditions. BPCC had discussed part-time faculty and staff salaries and the salary equity issue.

In Senator Midha's opinion BPCC had to work jointly with LRPC and set priorities at the beginning of the year. For example, the Committee had been working for two years on the salary equity issue. It collected data and worked with it, but when the amount of new money available was presented, it was so limited that there was not enough to use in dealing with equity problems. So he hoped that BPCC could work with LRPC in setting priorities and moving from there.

The Chairman interjected that the members of the incentive subcommittee had discovered that it took most of the year to collect data to even begin to design an incentive plan and then summer was upon them.

Senator Siloac had an additional observation on the incentive planning process. A problem which he had noted last year on BPCC was that whereas colleges had to justify requests for money, there was a margin at the University. The University did not justify what it was taking, and it took an incredible hunk off the top. He thought that we needed some data generated in terms of where that money went and how much was really needed as opposed to, "it's ours."

The Chairman noted that one thing he would love to see LRPC and BPCC do which addressed this indirectly would be to be in the loop for the creation of permanent positions which was the



largest sink for money on this campus.

President Elliott said there were federal and state data that should be helpful if the Committee did not already have it, and she thought that it would be heartening.

Senator John said it had been mentioned that central administration handled the summer school losses. Who was central administration?

Senator Midha and then Chairman Cheung replied that all the revenue generators - the colleges - made up the losses.

Senator Marquette commented that in terms of our priorities in budgeting and new money and that sort of thing, one thing we needed to keep in mind was that any reallocation of the budget in the University in the larger sense involved moving positions and things of that nature around. Don't expect massive shifts next year. If we chose to do this reallocative process and we needed to if the institution was going to survive, it was not going to happen overnight. We were talking about some colleges gaining positions and some colleges losing them, some and hopefully a lot of administrative positions disappearing in favor of faculty positions and other things of this nature. This would not happen overnight because of the fact that all the money was tied up in current positions.

Senator Buchthal asked whether since BPCC had been limited to allocating new dollars, had the new dollars which they had allocated been equal to the actual amount of new dollars which came to campus or had more money come to campus than was originally proposed or considered last year? If more money had come to campus, would they have a chance to recommend how that money should be allocated?

As Chairman Cheung understood it, if there were slightly more, it was to go into a salary pool, and if there were a lot more, it would go back to the Committee. At the moment, the information which Senator Buchthal was requesting was not yet available.

President Elliott said that we would know when the subsidy yielded in December; we had rarely gotten it without discount. We did not even know at this point what a subsidy dollar was. We would know when all the enrollment was in and it was applied to the numbers in the dollars in the subsidy pool. If enrollments were up all over the state, the match was lower; if it was down, they were higher so that it was not an absolute. This made it more complicated in the state of Ohio and it was certified by the 14th day. She urged Senators to get everybody in their classes enrolled. If they were not enrolled by the 14th day, we got no subsidy for them.

Senator Erickson wondered whether we did not have two budgets here - one, the operating and the other, the salary.

Senator Marquette answered that the operating budget of the institution included the salaries, line items, xerox and things like that. There was also a salary allocation that came in from the state for the fiscal plan.

Senator Midha had one final observation about the BPCC. It had Senators from 11 colleges and some appointed members who were given the task to allocate new money. It had come up with a



recommendation which the President was kind enough to take to the Board of Trustees, but the Committee had been told that the Council of Deans was not entirely supportive of the plan. This could happen at times because the Senators on BPCC were not the ones who were going to run the operating budgets of the respective colleges. He wondered whether some sort of subcommittee consisting of people from the Council of Deans and the BPCC could on occasion get together to iron out their differences.

President Elliott stated that this was her job. Recommendations from both the Council of Deans and the BPCC came to her.

S. General Education Advisory Council - No report

VI. ELECTIONS - Chairman Cheung announced that there were lots of elections and the first ones were for the officers and members of the Executive Committee - the Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary and four at-large Executive Committee members. Before beginning with the nominations for Chair, he entertained a motion from the floor to the effect that in the event there was a ballot and no one received a majority, that the two top vote-getters be run off rather than rerunning the entire ballot. This was moved, seconded, and approved by the Senate.

Nominations were then opened for Chair. Senator Marquette nominated Chairman Cheung. This was seconded by Senator Richards.

Senator Clinefelter moved that the nominations be closed, and this was seconded by Senator Midha. The Senate then approved the motion.

Senator Green moved that this election be conducted by acclamation, which was seconded by Senator Oller. The Senate voted its approval, and Chairman Cheung was re-elected. He thanked the body and noted that he had already mentioned in earlier remarks what he thought it needed to do so he would not belabor the point.

The next election was for the position of Vice-Chair. Senator Clinefelter nominated Senator Brink, and this was seconded by Senator Oller.

As there were no other nominations, the Chairman closed the nominations. There was another motion for election by acclamation which was approved, and Senator Brink was elected.

Nominations were then opened for the position of Secretary. Senator Brink nominated Senator Oller, which was seconded. There were no other nominations, and Senator Buchthal moved that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast. This was approved, and Senator Oller was elected.

For the four at-large memberships to the Executive Committee, the following candidates were nominated: Senator Clinefelter (by Senator Erickson); Senator Richards (by Senator Fowler); Senator Norfolk and Senator Erickson; Senator Prough (by Senator Brink). Ballots were then cast and counted.



While waiting for the results, the Chairman moved on to the next election which was for the BPCC. He stated that Senator Brink (Library), Senator Siloac (Fine & Applied Arts), and Senator Rich (Law) were continuing members. This meant that the Senate had to elect six members for two-year terms and one for a one-year term to fill out the last year of Senator Aupperle who had resigned from the Senate. Given the constraints about there being only one representative from each college, the units from which members could be elected were Buchtel College, C&T College, Education, Engineering, College of Business Administration, Nursing, Polymer Science and Engineering, Wayne, Contract Professionals and the students. The Chairman thought it would be appropriate to adjourn for five minutes to allow the members to caucus and choose nominees from their respective units.

Senator Midha suggested that the candidates for LRPC membership be chosen during the caucus as well in order to save time. The Chairman agreed and stated that continuing on LRPC were Senator Richards (Part-time Faculty) and Senator Sheffer (Engineering). There was a need to elect three from the following units: Buchtel College, C&T, Education, Fine & Applied Arts, CBA, Libraries, Nursing, Polymer Science/Engineering, Wayne, contract professionals and students. He reminded the Senate of the constraint that one could not serve on both BPCC and LRPC.

The Senators then broke into their respective units to caucus and choose nominees for the two committees.

After five minutes the body reconvened. Chairman Cheung read the results of the election for the four at-large seats on the Executive Committee. Those receiving a majority and therefore elected were Senators Clinefelter (35 votes), Erickson (37 votes), Norfolk (40 votes), and Richards (38 votes). Senator Prough received 16 votes.

The Senate then turned to the election for BPCC. After a discussion of how to elect six to two-year terms and a seventh to a one-year term, Senator Hebert moved that it be done by rank order of votes. This was seconded by Senator Norfolk and approved by the body. Nominations were then opened for membership to BPCC as well as for the LRPC election which would follow.

The following were nominated for BPCC: Senator Midha (Buchtel College) by Senator Buchthal; Senator John (C&T) by Senator Jalbert; Chairman Cheung (Engineering); Senator Kimmell (CBA) by Senator Hebert; Senator McElwee (Wayne); Senator Bucey (Contract Professionals) by Senator Vukovich; Senator Keener (Students) by herself.

After a discussion of who had served on the committee last year, the body voted for the seven positions on BPCC.

While waiting for the results and unable to go on to the LRPC election because some of the candidates who lost for BPCC might be nominated for LRPC, the body turned to an election for two representatives to the Shared Governance Council. In answer to a question from Senator Webb regarding restrictions on who could serve, Senator Bucey pointed out that in the governance by-laws it stated that, "Officers of the Faculty Senate are barred from election as officers of Shared Governance." Therefore, apart from that restriction, all Senators could serve.



Senator Erickson nominated Senator Ranson who respectfully declined. Senator Rich (by Senator Sibberson) and Senator Fowler were then nominated. Hearing no further nominations, Chairman Cheung deemed that the nominations were closed and entertained a vote of acclamation. This was moved and approved, and Senators Rich and Fowler were elected to the Shared Governance Council.

The Chairman then stated that the Senate also had to appoint two Senate representatives to each of the Shared Governance Council Committees. These were Student Affairs, Contract Professionals, Staff Affairs, Diversity, and Part-Time Faculty. Last year the body had chosen to permit the Executive Committee to make those appointments. Was that the will of the body this year as well?

It was then moved that the Executive Committee make the appointments to the Shared Governance Council Committees, and the Senate gave its approval.

Chairman Cheung next said that the Senate had to elect two Senators to represent it on Graduate Council. With the body's consent, the Executive Committee would review the list of Senators to see who met the constraint of category two graduate faculty status and appoint two from that sublist with of course their concurrence. This was moved by Senator John and seconded by Senator Marquette. The body then voted its consent.

The Chairman then noted that the last election to accomplish before turning to LRPC was the representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents and the nominees did not have to be Senators.

Senator Malhotra nominated Senator Green who respectfully declined.

In answer to Senator Erickson's question regarding who the present representative was, Chairman Cheung stated that originally it had been Senator Jo Ann Harris, but when she had taken an administrative position and left the body, it had fallen to the alternate Dr. Shelley Baranowski. He had talked with Dr. Baranowski who was willing to continue as alternate but did not want to serve as the primary representative.

Senator Bucey moved that this election be delayed until the next meeting to allow for an opportunity to find faculty members who might be interested in serving in the position. This was seconded.

Senator Oller wanted to know whether there was going to be a meeting of FACCOBOR this month and, if so, whether Dr. Baranowski would represent the institution until the body elected a new representative. The Chairman said that he would check with her, but since she had indicated her willingness to continue as alternate, he expected there would be no problem.

Senator Siloac hoped that in the month's delay the body would consider Senator Rich for the position. When Senator Rich indicated his willingness to serve, Senator Bucey and her second, with the permission of the body, withdrew her motion. Senator Rich was then nominated and by unanimous consent elected to the position of faculty representative to FACCOBOR.

Senator Norfolk wondered whether we needed to send another lawyer to Columbus.



Chairman Cheung then said that the body might as well go ahead and elect the alternate. Dr. Shelley Baranowski was nominated and elected by a vote of acclamation.

The results of the election for BPC were then announced. They were as follows: Senator Midha (40); Senator John (37); Senator Cheung (40); Senator Kimmell (34); Senator Webb (35); Senator McElwee (30); Senator Bucey (37); and Senator Keener (27). Since 29 votes were required to elect, Senators Midha, John, Cheung, Kimmell, Webb, and Bucey were elected to two-year terms, and following the decision to go in rank order, Senator McElwee was elected to the one-year term.

The Senate then turned to the LRPC election. Already nominated earlier were Senator Marquette (Buchtel College) by Senator Buchthal, Senator Carol Gigliotti (C&T) by Senator Jalbert, Senator Moss (Education) by Senator Newman, Senator Ross-Alaolmolki (Nursing) by Senator Webb, and Senator Vukovich (Contract Professionals) by Senator Bucey. Now added to the list were Senator Davis (Fine and Applied Arts), Senator Redle (CBA) by Senator Hebert, Senator Clinefelter (Library) by Senator Brink, and Senator Keener (Students) by herself. Senators Marquette, Gigliotti, and Clinefelter were currently serving on the committee. The Chairman asked the body to vote for three representatives.

**VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - While waiting for the result of the ballot, the Chairman suggested that the body move on to the next agenda item which was unfinished business. Item A pertained to the changes in the appeals process as it was presented in the Faculty Manual. Assistant Provost Kelly had brought copies for those who did not have the document. It was easy to recognize since the first phrase, "Terminating Employment" would catch your eye.

Senator Oller stated that given the fact this was extremely important material which the body would be discussing and given the lateness of the hour, he wanted to make the same motion that he made at the end of the May meeting when this document had been presented as an item of new business and there was not ample time to deal with it. The motion was to postpone discussion until the October meeting, but with the proviso that the Executive Committee give it a position of primary importance on the agenda. Perhaps it could be moved up on the agenda as a special item of old business before committee reports. It needed to be handled because we were approaching the time when departments would be making decisions on retention and people might be wanting to make use of the appeals process. It had to be clearly set forth so that everyone knew what the procedure was.

The Chairman interpreted this to be a motion to defer the document to October and place it at the top of the agenda preceding committee reports. There was a second, and then the body voted its approval.

**VIII. NEW BUSINESS** - Senator Richards wanted to introduce a motion regarding STRS release for part-time faculty. She had been asked to do this by Dr. Sheryl Stevenson, Chair of the English Department. What was desired was to ask the University Well-Being Committee to determine or get some sort of determination for when part-time faculty members were eligible to receive or withdraw their STRS benefits from Columbus. The background for this was that last summer a teacher who had taught at The University of Akron for 23 years and was a very respected member



of the English Department ended up in an extremely awkward situation where her husband had hospitalization coverage through his employer, but their son was going through very expensive surgery, exceeding \$10,000. The doctors performing the surgery wanted their 20% up front because his hospitalization only covered 80% of the cost. The only method this professor had of obtaining that 20% was to request that her STRS be released. She filed the proper papers and application; she was not under contract to The University of Akron because it had expired with her last paycheck in May. Our payroll office denied her application but told her that if she signed a letter of resignation she could withdraw her money. She did so angrily and regretfully. She was humiliated that the place which, at the moment did not employ her, was asking her to sign a letter of resignation from her employment.

What was needed was a firm answer to the question of when part-time faculty could withdraw their STRS. Columbus said that it was a University decision. Cleveland State professors withdrew their STRS when they got their last paychecks in May. Some of them filed applications because they needed the money to live on during the summer. Kent State University part-time faculty did the same thing. It was not a practice which Senator Richards recommended in any way, shape, or form. However, if one thought about the fact that part-time faculty got contracts from September to December and then perhaps again from January to May, there was no guarantee that they would ever get them again. But the payroll office said they were still employed. On the other hand, if they tried to get unemployment compensation, the payroll office said they were never employees. Perhaps a possible solution was for the University Well-Being Committee to come back with a good benefits package for part-time faculty which was perhaps one of the things they were working on now.

Senator Richards concluded by moving that the University Well-Being Committee find a definitive answer as to when part-time faculty were permitted by this University to withdraw their STRS benefits. This was seconded by Senator Fowler. The Senate then voted its approval.

Chairman Cheung announced the results of the election for LRPC. Only two had received a majority (29 votes), Senator Marquette (30) and Senator Gigliotti (31 votes). The rest of the voting was as follows: Senator Moss (4); Senator Davis (5); Senator Redle (7 votes); Senator Clinefelter (18); Senator Ross-Alaolmolki (4); Senator Vukovich (8); and Senator Keener (12). A run-off was required between the two highest vote getters, Senators Clinefelter and Keener. A vote was taken and the ballots were counted.

**IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER** - Since there were no other items of new business, Chairman Cheung moved to the good of the order. Senator Fowler wanted to know when the Reference Committee expected the revised Faculty Manual to be coming out. Chairman Cheung responded that it was no longer in the hands of the Reference Committee nor the Executive Committee nor the Faculty Senate any longer. The revised Faculty Manual was passed on to Vice President Helmick who passed it on to the Board of Trustees and that was where it sat.

President Elliott said that she hoped it would be available soon. She and Chairman Cheung would be meeting with the Board in committee soon to straighten out some confusion on a few points.



Senator Buchthal commented that it appeared that the University had run a search this summer for two high administrative offices and he did not think that either one of those searches was accompanied by a letter to the faculty who were not teaching in the summer to make them aware of the searches being conducted. He thought that for high administrative offices there should be as much publicity as possible to get the best candidates, and the faculty had a right to be a part of it. Otherwise, they might get the impression that their counsel was not wanted in these searches. He hoped that in the future if searches were run in the summer, they would be better publicized so that faculty could be aware of them.

President Elliott wanted to know to which searches Senator Buchthal was referring. He replied that he did not believe that faculty received notes in the mail regarding the Graduate School Dean search and also the current search for a Vice-President for Business and Finance. President Elliott said that she would look into this matter.

Chairman Cheung announced that the result of the run-off for LRPC was a tie between Senators Keener and Clinefelter. Since he had already voted, it was not possible for him as Chair to vote to break the tie.

Senator Green moved to put off this election until the next meeting when the whole body would be present. This was seconded. The Chairman noted that the election in October would be between these two candidates. He did not think it would be proper to open the nominations again. The body then approved Senator Green's motion to postpone the election until next time.

**X. ADJOURNMENT** - Senator John moved to adjourn, and this was seconded. The body then voted its approval. Senator Brink asked that when the Senate committees met and elected new Chairs, that those new Chairs contact Mrs. Quillin so that she would know who they were. The old Chairs had been notified and asked to call the first meetings of their committees.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by  
Gary H. Oller, Secretary



## APPENDIX

### **Chairman's Remarks**

Welcome back from hopefully reinvigorating summers! I am sorry to report that my Parliamentarian, Prof. Gerlach, will not be with us this meeting due to an untimely death in his family; I have expressed our condolences to him.

While last year we accomplished much, I wish to take a moment and reflect on the things that I think we need to work on this year. Depending on the outcome of the election for Chair later in this meeting, you may regard these as either a statement of my goals as Chair or as my advice to the body as outgoing Chair.

There are a number of tasks which we've either left unfinished or not even started that I'd like to remark upon. This list is by no means exhaustive, but represent the nine issues I consider most important:

1. A better, perhaps more formal, mechanism for faculty evaluation of the President, Provost and perhaps the Vice Presidents. I think that an established mechanism would provide a valuable conduit to them for Faculty sentiment and concerns. It would also provide better information to those charged with evaluating them.
2. Improving Faculty - Board of Trustees interaction. Many things the Board does occur with virtually no Faculty input. The recent changes in Board Regulations, two of which concern me greatly, are a good example of that. I hope we can establish a discussion with the Board on what ways we can facilitate more faculty input to Board decisions, particularly on issues that did not originate in the Senate, but affect the Faculty. Chairwoman Stitzlein's comments at the last Board meeting, which were published in Akron Update you may have received today, are encouraging in that regard.
3. More formal oversight of the creation of permanent positions. This may be counter to the spirit of decentralization, but is a very sensitive issue with long term, University wide consequences. Even perceived growth in the Administration and bureaucracy has proven damaging to Faculty morale. As a 'stopgap' measure, I ask the President to provide the Senate with a report of recent non-Faculty hires indicating which are truly replacements for retirees and which are, in fact new. Madame President, I know that you are sensitive to this issue; more hard information would go a long ways towards lowering Faculty anxiety on this point. Longer term, perhaps LRPC and BPCC should be 'in the loop' for creating new permanent positions whether they be faculty, administration, contract professional, or staff.
4. Integration of the summer into the academic year budget (as much as is possible given the differences between the academic year and the summer). The summer budgeting process has been a particularly difficult issue and perhaps BPCC needs help in the form of an ad hoc committee of the Senate or perhaps a committee jointly appointed by the Senate and the President.
5. Continue to foster the connection of planning to budgeting. I think this is proceeding in the right direction, but much more slowly than we need it to move.



6. Revisit the salary equity question. We have not been able to make the kind of progress on this matter that our Faculty deserve. Worse, our not forthrightly addressing this creates an environment where 'anecdotal' analysis is rampant. Let's get data, share it and fix whatever needs fixed as best we can. We may need to create an ad hoc Senate committee to address this.

7. Revisit the details of LRPC, BPCC, the Shared Governance Council, etc. Nothing earthshaking, I think the basic structure is sound, but some operational difficulties could be easily addressed by adjusting the membership of these groups. I would like to see BPCC expanded slightly to give all major constituencies a 'seat'. I would like to see LRPC expanded substantially to do the same. I know that letting them get too large could make them unwieldy, but having broader input is of value.

8. Continue to seek Faculty representation on the Board of Trustees. I am sorry to report that the Governor rejected the request from this body, most of the other Faculty Senates and the Ohio Faculty Council. The next step is to seek the support of the Legislature. The Ohio Faculty Council will be taking this matter up at its meeting next week at Kent.

9. And last, we need to foster better communications amongst ourselves. To facilitate this two LISTSERV groups have been created which will be administered by the Executive Committee. One for the faculty at large called FAC-ACAD (for "faculty academy") and one specifically for the Senate called SENATE-L. I apologize for the names, they had to have 8 characters one of which was a hyphen. You will be receiving a mailing soon with instructions for subscribing and for submitting material. I cannot take full credit for this. The Executive Committee was most supportive and the experience of one our new deans, Dean Irving Miller of Engineering, with a similar arrangement at The University of Illinois. Also, the efforts of Mr. Gary Sponseller in our Computer Center are gratefully acknowledged. Of course this brings up the issue of getting, as soon as possible, all faculty & students on the network. Something I hope can be made a priority in creating a University for the next century.

Respectfully submitted by  
H. Michael Cheung, Chair



## APPENDIX B

### Remarks of the President of the University

I am pleased to be here with you today as we enter a new semester for the University and begin a third year for this body.

To our newly elected Senators, I commend each of you for your willingness to assume an important role in the life and direction of our campus. I very much look forward to working with you.

I would also like to express appreciation to Chairperson Cheung and the Executive Committee for their leadership this past year. To the new officers who will be elected later in the meeting, please know that you will have my support and cooperation as we continue building an even more effective shared governance system.

When you stood for election, you might have thought the hard work of this body had been completed, but I believe there remains a number of quite consequential matters that will require substantial efforts.

It is my hope that during the year we can make the necessary adjustments to be certain the Shared Governance Council functions with proper representation; finish the five-to 10-year plan being undertaken by LRPC; continue the decentralization of the budget with more integration of summer and the application of an agreed-upon incentive model for revenue; work with the Provost's efforts to create a database to support a salary equity model; and work very hard to further streamline some of our curricular and approval processes.

I believe the Senate can set a powerful example of progress and positive change for the entire campus if it begins to eliminate the redundant efforts in our processes and move recommendations with greater dispatch through the systems.

But these are hopes for the coming year and I must update you on the time since our last meeting.

The campus has continued to make very good progress. In June we received the best budget in many years from the state of Ohio. In that budget we received an additional \$1.75 million of dedicated funding for an International School of Business and for technology hardware. Our capital recommendations which will be funded at about \$16.9 million will be considered by the faculty committee shortly. From those (assuming faculty endorsement) we should be able to complete the renovations of Leigh and Carroll Halls and the Science and Tech Library addition. The completion of the Polsky Building has already been funded and that process is underway.

When the books were closed on June 30, The University of Akron Foundation had reached a total of more than \$75 million. External support for research and sponsored programs broke another record, and we also set a new high mark in the number of private gifts and grants (17,670).



Over the summer, we completed the framework of a comprehensive assessment effort as the first stage of our reaccreditation process. The Long-Range Planning Committee finished its initial review of the college plans as well as plans for technology including the CCTC recommendations endorsed by this body. New leadership joined us in the colleges of Business Administration and Engineering and in Minority Affairs and a good number of new faculty were hired for retiring colleagues.

Since new assignments are an area in which there seems to remain some lack of clarity (and the commitment made to the need for faculty is one I fully endorse) I will get together data about recent hirings and try to have it in time to attach to my September letter.

The fall opened with more students in our freshmen class who were admitted unconditionally. We opened a new wing in Gallucci Hall dedicated to our honors students. I hope you will go by to see this remarkable difference we have achieved in our support for these superior students. Selective honors students have been invited to join a supportive network of faculty and staff who, beginning this term, will help them prepare to be competitive for the prestigious post-baccalaureate scholarships when their degrees here are finished.

A new campus-wide speakers series--The University of Akron Forum--has been added to enrich the cultural awareness of both town and gown.

I have met with the Board to review the progress we have made toward the goals we set three years ago, and we have set new goals for the next three years. As the chairperson of the Inter-University Council, I have met with the legislative and executive leadership of our state to seek advice about how higher education might improve our sometimes tarnished image with these lawmakers and funders to the end that there would be a willingness to provide better support.

I must tell you that some of their assessments of higher education were very disheartening, since I know all the excellent things that we do. However, I did receive encouragement to come to them more often to "tell our side of the story." The first of these sessions has been scheduled for next week and our hope is to continue them throughout the year.

I also met with a number of Fulbright and European leaders and feel we have a good opportunity to expand our international exchange of faculty and many opportunities to develop summer offerings here for international students. Since these would provide for more travel and more pay, I am encouraging the Council of Deans and others to give them early and serious consideration.

Finally, as I said, I have met with our own Board of Trustees to review the three-year goals which we set when I arrived. I was pleased to be able to report that each was well underway or had been completed. I was also very pleased with the Board's complimentary appraisal of our work and with the goals we have set for the next three years.

Since both the Board and I believe that feedback based on professionally, systematically collected data are important as we work our way through rapidly changing external realities such as federal financial aid, new, reduced and sometimes vanishing subsidy models, technology and the like, the Board has decided to seek professional external consultants to do our future evaluations.

We will consider whether these might also be engaged for each of the vice presidents as well. In such data gathering I am sure members of this body would be quite central.



The new goals the Board and I have set are financial stability; enrollment stability; enhancement of institutional quality, visibility, and image; reaching our capital and endowment goals; and continuing institutional directions outlined by the University's Twenty-First Century Task Force and the state's managing for the future task force.

To underscore the critical nature of enrollment stability on which, of course, our financial stability is largely based, we are being asked by the Board and by the State to attract and to serve students in ways in which we now are not doing so or need to do more.

With 75.7 percent of our students currently employed and an additional 10.2 percent of students who have worked during the time they have been here, the scheduling of classes will be critical to continued enrollment stability and growth.

We also will be asking the administrative units to be certain that adequate support services are available to students in the evenings at off-site locations and on weekends. Additionally, each college will continue to be asked to learn why any non-returning student has stopped out.

Both the Board and I recognize that these goals will not be done easily even after all the ERIP windows have been completed and those positions are filled and when additional resources allow us to add positions as well as salary.

Since a good bit of folklore is still around concerning those ERIP positions, I am adding a matrix to our September letter so the correct data are available to everyone who would like to have them.

Recruitment and retention efforts will continue at accelerated paces and the potential for electronic delivery needs to continue to be explored.

The marketing and financial analysts report that our campus is now fiscally sound enough to bond for student capital projects which would be paid for by a student surcharge and user fees as all such facilities are funded in Ohio.

Focus groups and surveys with students produced a willingness to pay the extra dollars for some facilities. The one the students indicated the most interest in was improvement of the residence halls. We will need to consider carefully how any of these might assist in student recruitment.

After the semester is underway, I will begin to spend some additional days in fund-raising until our full goal for a 125th Anniversary Campaign is attained. Our prospect list is long and to the extent that I can tolerate all the red-eye flights required, I will meet with each one.

It will be from these funds, plus those from enrollment, which should make our most important goal--that of quality enhancement--possible. The endowment dollars in research are essential and where I will primarily focus, for they will fortify our commitment to the essential role of research even when federal and state funds are not provided. As you are aware, we were able to add nearly a million-dollar research endowment fund this last spring.

This year, we also will be working with Chancellor Hairston and others in developing a new subsidy formula for public higher education. Given that this is The University of Akron's year to



September 7, 1995

Page 27

chair the IUC committees, we believe we will have a real opportunity to provide leadership in this effort.

As I indicated in my convocation address, higher education faces a sobering set of external threats. But I believe unlike some campuses, we have already established a governance framework and a culture of open information, review, and consultative processes, and assumed the professional respect and responsibility to our values and to each other that will enable us to face the challenges ahead. I am glad to be working at your side.

Respectfully submitted by  
Peggy Gordon Elliott, President

### APPENDIX C

#### **Report of the Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee met on July 11 and August 7, 1995. The Committee verified election results; made Senate committee appointments; worked on a system for "tracking" Senate actions; handled other administrative tasks; and set the agenda for today's meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
David R. Brink



**APPENDIX D**

**Report of Athletics Committee**

The past year has been particularly active and momentous for the Athletics Committee (AC) given its varied responsibilities and unexpected events at the University. The AC was involved with the recruitment of two new head coaches, football and basketball. Other actions involved resolving an appeal by a student-athlete when he was dismissed from his team after testing positive for drug usage a third time. The AC also helped rewrite the University's Drug Policy for Student-Athletes.

The AC has also been involved with a number of important issues including: clarifying the role the AC is to play, the establishment of better reporting and communication procedures, investigating the issue of women's equity in intercollegiate sport funding at the University, making recommendations in regard to proposals requesting additional funding pertaining to gender equity and improved service at the Ocasek Natatorium.

Through numerous meetings the AC was able to interact with numerous University Administrators who had a direct or indirect link to athletics and recreation. Some of those who gave generously of their time when meeting with the AC include: Rich Franchak, Doris Marino, Caryl Smith, Virgil Starks, and Mary Katherine Warner. Dr. Marino was particularly cooperative with the AC.

It is the Chair's opinion that the past year was perhaps the AC's most productive. Numerous individuals took on significant work loads. While much is still to be done, the Committee was truly active. Much of our success can be attributed to a very involved Athletic Director, Mike Bobinski. His cooperation, leadership and humanity were evident at all meetings.

While communication problems did exist at times between the AC and the Central Administration, as well as between the AC and the Faculty Senate, these appear more as a result of the embryonic development of the University's shared governance processes and the large number of irregular activities which confronted the AC in a short period of time. Both President Elliott and Provost Jamison have been quite supportive of the AC's integrity and importance.

Respectfully submitted by  
Kenneth Aupperle, Chair

(\* A complete Athletics Committee report with appendices is available  
in the Faculty Senate office.)



## APPENDIX F

### Report of Student Affairs Committee

Present: B.Bucey, C.Echols, C.Gigliotti, T.Jolly, C.Keener, D.Laconi, D.McNutt, L.Pachnowski, G.Prough, C.K.Smith, D.Vukovich, M.Weidknecht

Absent: D.Ely

D.Vukovich convened the meeting. The first item of business was the selection of a committee chair from among the Faculty Senators. D.Vukovich will serve as Chair of the Student Affairs Committee for the 1995-96 academic year.

The members then reviewed the Committee's duties and responsibilities and discussed areas of concern. Several members had questions regarding the current status of the proposed Student Affairs Building. Members were concerned that this facility had taken a "back seat" to the Campus Recreation and Wellness Center proposal. C.K.Smith assured committee members that this was not the case. Plans for the Student Affairs Building are indeed moving forward. In fact, the Board of Trustees will be asked at the September 27 meeting to approve the recommended associate architect for the Student Affairs Building. The Committee requested that C.K.Smith present 1) an up-date on the status of the Student Affairs Building and 2) a summary of the results of the marketing survey that Brailsford Associates conducted regarding renovation of the residence halls and the development of a Campus Recreation and Wellness Center. C.K.Smith will provide this information at our October meeting.

D.McNutt gave the following report on the Federal Student Aid Budget Process.

**Pell Grant:** Proposals would increase the Federal Pell Grant Program maximum award by \$100 to \$2,440 per year for the highest need students. This increase would be paid for, however, by changing the minimum award from \$400 to \$600 and eliminating eligibility for students who received those minimum awards. This change would affect approximately 250,000 students.

**Campus-Based Aid:** Federal Supplemental Grants and Federal Work Study funding should remain at the previous year's level. Federal Perkins Loan capital contributions are at the prior year's level in the Senate version and eliminated in the House version of the bill.

**Student Loans:** The Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee is attempting to cut more than \$10 billion over seven years from the former Guaranteed Student Loan programs. On Friday, September 22, 1995, the Committee 1) entirely eliminated the six-month after graduation repayment grace period for new borrowers; 2) reduced the Direct Lending Program to 20 percent of the total loan volume (which would force about one-third of the current direct-lending schools out of the program); 3) increased the interest rate cap on Parent Loans (PLUS loans) from 10 percent to 11 percent; 4) imposed additional fees on lenders, loan guarantors, and secondary markets; and 5) required every school that participates in federal loan programs to pay a fee of 0.85 percent of its total loan volume (the former proposal was 2 percent). This "tax" would amount to approximately \$380,000 for The University of Akron at current loan levels.



It is essential to call your Senators again. Tell them the institutional tax was unacceptable at 2 percent and is still unacceptable at 0.85 percent.

Senator Mike DeWine (Member of the Senate Labor Committee)

202-224-2315

Senator John Glenn 202-224-3353

**The next regular meeting of the Student Affairs Committee is scheduled for Friday, October 20 at 3:00 p.m. at Paul Martin University Center, Room 210.**

Respectfully submitted by Diane Vukovich, Chair

## APPENDIX G

### **Report of Computing and Communications Technologies Committee**

The CCTC met on May 5, 1995, to discuss a proposed policy for access to adult material available through the University's computing facilities. The administration is concerned with public relations concerning access by minors. There are about 120 students enrolled and taking courses who are under the age of 18. It is very likely that by Fall, 1995, we will have additional minors between the ages of 14 and 16 years old taking one or two courses on campus.

Accordingly, the following policy was passed by CCTC:

1. All guests under the age of 18 on The University of Akron network will be required to have a parental signature.
2. All currently enrolled students under the age of 17 on The University of Akron network will be required to have a parental signature.

The CCTC did not meet over the summer session, but will have its first meeting of Fall Semester on September 19 to elect a presiding officer.

Respectfully submitted by  
Ray Sibberson, Chair