Chapter Seven
CRITERION FIVE: INTEGRITY

“The institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships.”

—Handbook of Accreditation, second edition; a publication of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Institutions of Higher Education

The self-study process revealed ethical policies and practices that pervade the design and delivery of services by the University. Questioning our integrity in fact increased it. Specifically revealed was that University employees take great pride in their work and earnestly work to provide:

- Clear and useful guides to University rules and regulations that describe relationships with students, faculty and staff
- Policies and practices that seek to resolve internal disputes
- Affirmative and pro-active policies and practices promoting equity of treatment, nondiscrimination, educational access and continuous re-creation of a diverse educational community
- Academic records developed and maintained so as to reflect each individual student’s accomplishments and to enhance the integrity of the educational process
- Publications in various media which create accurate and fair appraisals of the University, its operations, its programs and its aspirations
- Evidence of the University’s active cooperation with other institutions of higher education, including those with which it competes for students and other resources; evidence of active support, financial and otherwise, of resources shared with other institutions
- Policies and procedures that strive to create more honest institutional relationships and responsibilities for intercollegiate athletics, student associations and business enterprises
- Pro-active policies and procedures for developing and monitoring contractual arrangements with government, industry and other organizations
In Chapter 4 of this report, we detailed the role and activities of the Board of Trustees in the governance of The University of Akron. Here is the discussion and evaluation of how the policies and procedures of the Board of Trustees become the rules and regulations by which the University is governed.

The Board of Trustees schedules eight regular meetings a year and meets other times by special call. Meetings of the Board of Trustees and its committees are subject to Ohio’s open meetings laws; only upon a public vote and only for lawfully permitted purposes (e.g., personnel actions, to receive advice about pending litigation, or to discuss certain real estate purchases) can the Board or one of its committees meet in Executive (closed) Session; Board actions may only be taken in open session. Meetings are announced to the press and other interested parties at least 48 hours in advance, and some internal constituencies (e.g., Faculty Senate, the Staff Employees Advisory Committee, and the Contract Professional Advisory Committee) have elected observers who attend all meetings. Typically, meetings of Board Committees are scheduled on the same day and in the same location as the meeting of the full board so that trustees and the public may conveniently attend all meetings. However, some committees, such as the committee on rules, meets a few days earlier to discuss items proposed for the Board agenda.

Actions of the Board of Trustees are reported in several ways. First, the “Board packet” is distributed at the meeting itself. For most regular meetings, this one- or two-hundred-page document incorporates extensive exhibits as well as proposed resolutions and previous minutes. While not yet a full or final record of the agenda or of the actions of the Board, this document is circulated before the meeting to the President’s senior staff and after the meeting to interested parties who did not attend. The Board packet forms the basis, with corrections, additions, and alterations, of the record that is filed in Bierce Library after each meeting. That library copy is the second public report of the meeting. Third, the President sends a summarized report of the Board packet in the form of a letter to the campus within a few days of any meeting; this letter averages eight to ten pages, single spaced, and always includes a specific listing of personnel actions. Changes to official policies are published verbatim in the President’s letter (available in hard copy and on the web at http://www2.uakron.edu/bot/botrecent_actions.htm) if they are short or referenced by rule number if they are extensive, and some major rule changes of general interest are published separately. Recent examples of longer rules separately published include the Mercer-recommended job classification system for
staff employees, the Sick Leave Policy, and the Policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment. Fourth, new or amended rules and regulations are published electronically usually within ten days after filing with the Ohio Legislative Service Commission (LSC): [http://www2.uakron.edu/ogc/Rules/Rulesupdates.htm](http://www2.uakron.edu/ogc/Rules/Rulesupdates.htm).

Actions of the Board of Trustees become effective ten days after filing with State of Ohio LSC. Proposed changes to the Ohio Administrative Code, as it is applied to The University of Akron, are now accepted by the Legislative Services Commission only in electronic format.

The University of Akron was one of the first to offer all of its rules to all of its employees. In 1997, five years before the State of Ohio began its electronic rules filing, The University of Akron offered all of its rules to all employees to have and review without limitation. As was envisioned, the sheer volume of rules and updates being promulgated virtually precluded the University from seeking to provide a hard copy of all of its rules to its employees. Rather than selectively determine which rules could be viewed by an employee, the University embraced the idea that it could and should share all rules with all employees to allow for scholarly review, inquiry and reflection.

Insofar as portions of the rules and regulations of the Board of Trustees constitute a “faculty handbook” or a “staff handbook” or even the “By-Laws of the Faculty Senate,” electronic publication assures that all interested parties can consult the same document at the same time. New employees to the University, for instance, are directed to the electronic format of the rules and regulations that govern their contractual relationship; and while hard copies can be printed by the employee or by departments upon request, few new employees have asked for a paper version. Since the advent of the electronic versions of these rules, all individuals may rely on the most recent official stated procedures in lieu of potentially outdated paper copies that were simply not available to everyone. This is especially important in initial appointment, retention and promotion situations. Since only the electronic format has the University’s imprimatur and hence the force of law, grievances based on outdated paper versions, before possibly ruled as “de facto” contracts, are disappearing.

It should be noted that University employees governed by collective bargaining agreements have paper copies of their contracts. In the period after the signing of this contract and the negotiation of a new one, changes to Board of Trustees rules and regulations may take contractual effect by means of prior reference or may become the basis of negotiations in new
contracts. For employees not covered by collective bargaining agreements, all changes to Board of Trustees rules and regulations become effective upon the dates contained within each.

While not initially embraced by all, the conversion of the rules and regulations of the Board of Trustees to electronic format has worked successfully with our colleagues and users adapting well to the electronic environment in an incredibly short period of time. While losing a paper rulebook is not easy, the assurance of accuracy far outweighs the benefit of familiarity. Tools and links such as electronic indexing, search tools, cross referencing, recent alterations, and overview links embedded in complex rules have been and are being created, but the education of the user and continued enhancement focused on “user friendliness” continue to be a challenge. Further, an Associate Provost for Policies, Procedures and Reviews is charged to assist the Senior Vice President and Provost in all matters relating to academic policies, procedures and reviews and to coordinate and oversee all matters related to such policies, procedures and reviews. (3359-02-01)

The University of Akron operates an Office of Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) reporting to the Executive Director of Human Resources and through that office to the President, via an Executive Assistant to the President. University rule 3359-38-01 addresses the specifics of equal employment opportunity. The Director of EEO Compliance formally approves the initiation of every employment search, including its plan and any advertisements and their placement; gathers directly, analyzes, and shares with search committees information on the minority (or veteran, disability or age) status of candidates; sets unit-based affirmative action goals; reviews the results of searches before commencing telephone or on-campus interviews; and certifies the fairness of the search before offers may be made. The office conducts special and regular educational sessions, including mandatory training in sexual harassment and other forms of discriminatory behavior. Under a conciliation agreement with the U.S. Department of Labor, every University employee must receive such training.

Currently (FY03), this group comprises 822 full-time faculty, 845 part-time faculty, 1,069 graduate assistants, 1,212 full- and part-time staff, and 399 contract professional staff, and since 2000, more than 1,200 have received the mandatory training. The Director of EEO Compliance participates in creating the University’s annual Affirmative Action Plan for the Department of Labor and oversees the University’s responses to surveys and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity of Treatment</th>
<th>Equal Employment Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
reports about matters such as veterans, minorities and disability status.

To assure integrity in its relationships with persons protected by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the University tasks several administrators. The Director of EEO Compliance is the ADA Coordinator for employment; the Director of Physical Facilities is the ADA Coordinator for the physical environment; and the Director of the Office of Accessibility is the ADA Coordinator for students and the unofficial coordinator for the cultural environment. The Office of Accessibility employs six full-time persons with an operating budget exceeding $100,000. With a major focus on assuring opportunities to learn for persons with special needs, the office acts on behalf of instructors and students to determine the need for and the provision of appropriate accommodations; coordinates the work of interpreters, note-takers, and readers to assist students; arranges for adaptive learning technologies; and advocates for pro-active approaches to complying with ADA.

The Director of EEO Compliance and the Director of the Office of Accessibility are joined as the chief custodians in continuously recreating a diverse educational environment by the Associate Provost and Special Assistant to the President for Diversity and Multicultural Development. (university rule 3359-02-01) The portfolio of this officer has changed during the past seven years while he has served three presidents and four provosts. Currently, his division of one faculty member, five contract professionals and three clerical professional staff focuses primarily on success for students of color, who represent 14 percent of the fall 2001 undergraduate enrollment and 7 percent of the graduate enrollment. The Office of Multicultural Development operates through a Division of Access and Retention and through the Pan-African Culture and Research Center. The Extended Orientation Program, PASSAGE (Preparing Akron Students for Success and Great Expectations), Transitions, the Four-Phase Advising System, Peer Mentors, and the Leadership Development Program provide direct student services.
Grievance and appeal procedures for University constituents proceed by relationship status in different manners until they reach the Office of the President or, very rarely, the Board of Trustees. Courts and administrative bodies have testified to the completeness and integrity of the University’s grievance procedures by their insistence that any civil complaint be retained if the complainant has not exhausted appeals within the institution. While the University has been shown on occasion not to have proved just cause for an action, since the last comprehensive evaluation it has not been shown to fail to provide due process. Most faculty and staff grievances concern conditions and terms of employment. Student grievances most usually reflect disagreements about academic progress and assessment. University rules concerning grievance processes and procedures can be found at http://www2.uakron.edu/ogc/Rules/RulesByNumber.htm.

Two processes exist to address faculty grievances. For departmental and college concerns involving retention, tenure and promotion, university rule 3359-20-03.7 carefully outlines an appeal process (section N). Beyond the college, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, a university wide committee of the Faculty Senate (3359-20-03.7 and 3359-10-02, has a dual charge:

- The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee shall concern itself with grievance, matters relating to faulty assessment or evaluation, appointment, retention, tenure, and promotion.
- The Committee, in accordance with its general charge as stated in the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate, may consider any grievance relating to faculty well-being, rights, and responsibilities. (3359-20-03.6)

Staff grievance procedures all begin with the immediate supervisor and then proceed to higher-level supervisors. Contract professionals (called "general faculty" until the late 1980s) follow the same procedure as staff with the additional level of appointed committee review. Grievances by employees covered by collective bargaining agreements are resolved as stated in the collective bargaining agreement. (3359-26-02)

As a general perspective, most student appeals are heard by the administrator whose decision is questioned and may be appealed through ascending supervisory levels, with a final appeal to the Senior Vice President and Provost. The University publishes the procedures to appeal student residency classifications, grades, exam scheduling conflicts, tuition and fees, complaints under the
Code of Student Conduct, harassment complaints, and complaints regarding federal and State mandates.

Disciplinary actions, as opposed to grievances, are heard by committee. For example, students charged with violating the University Code of Student Conduct may have the matter heard before a panel of faculty and students. Final appeal is to the President. (university rules concerning the Code of Student Conduct 3359-41-01 through -07 and 3359-42-01)

Graduate students grieve about academic or employment matters according to procedures published in the Graduate Bulletin. When appeals through departmental and college channels do not reach adequate resolutions, they may request a review before a hearing committee appointed by the Graduate Council. (university rule 3359-24-02)

Grievances about sexual harassment and hostile work environment are referred with sensitivity to the Office of Equal Employment Opportunity. That office conducts an investigation upon request, usually involving the supervisor at one level above the point of complaint, and issues a final recommendation that constitutes the University's formal response. (university rule 3369-11-13)

As a member of The University of Akron community, the Department of Athletics, adheres to all University policies and procedures.

The University of Akron as a member of The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) is governed by this association. Legislation governing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics programs of member institutions apply to basic athletics issues such as admissions, financial aid, eligibility and recruiting. Member institutions are obligated to apply and enforce this legislation, and the enforcement procedures of the Association are applied to an institution when it fails to fulfill this obligation.

As a member of The Mid-American Conference (MAC), the University is governed by this association with members adhering to common standards of intercollegiate competition and who are voluntarily associated in the operation of the conference. All members of the Mid-American Conference are Division 1-A as defined by the membership standards of the NCAA. The MAC, a member of the NCAA, is bound by its standards and rules unless MAC rules are more demanding or strict.

---

**Part III: Athletics**

**Student Disciplinary Action**

**Graduate Student Grievances**

**Harassment or Hostile Work Environment**
Reported by NCAA in September 2002, the graduation rate for the 270 University of Akron student athletes who exhausted eligibility and had graduated by August 2001 is an astounding 83 percent. To help assure integrity, the Director has established a local directive: no coach may independently contact a faculty member about a student-athlete’s progress; only an academic adviser under the supervision of the Director may initiate such a contact.

Progress toward gender equity goals is steady. The department has made progress in this area with the addition of two women’s teams since 1998. However, there are still many areas that need to be addressed. Current athletic programs need to be enhanced in areas such as facilities, scholarship opportunities and operating budgets to continue toward compliance of Title IX. The department needs to continue toward the goal of proportionality by providing additional opportunities for women in varsity sports.

Integrity in the University’s dealings with student athletes, with faculty, and with its external constituents has been validated most recently through its comprehensive self-study and compliance with the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) in 1997 and its interim report in 2001. The University Registrar certifies athletic eligibility using the NCAA Divisional Manual guidelines relying upon the NCAA Certification of Athletic Eligibility Liaison Officer, whom the Registrar appoints, for advice.


The compliance unit within the Athletics department is responsible for coaches and staff recruiting tests, Scholastic Academic Progress reports, reporting of violations, and NCAA investigations. The fewer NCAA violations that occur relates directly to the success of this department. Education, understanding and interpretation of the NCAA rules are the ongoing goals of this department and produce opportunities to build on past successes.
To help assure integrity in its financial affairs and steadfastness in its public trust, the University employs an Internal Auditor to oversee its financial procedures. This officer coordinates with external auditors, both those for specific projects or for governmental agencies and bureaus and those working independently to create annual summative audits. No annual audit letter has raised any question about the duties, functions or accomplishments of the Internal Auditor. The officer also provides support services upon call, for instance, when a department chair wants help understanding operating budgets under his or her control. The officer reports to the Board of Trustees through the Office of General Counsel.

As discussed in chapter 4, the university internal auditor is responsible for conducting financial, operational, compliance and investigative audits. The university internal auditor leads the evaluation and execution of audits associated with the university’s compliance requirements, including, for example, compliance with university policies and rules and compliance with laws and applicable state and federal regulatory standards and mandates.

A university registrar establishes the contract for and records the results of every formal teaching-learning transaction. Few individuals bear more responsibility for the academic integrity of an institution and for the fair and equitable provision of its central service, the dispersal of knowledge and skills. Most important to the student is the individual record of accomplishment represented by the transcript. Accuracy and control of the information contained therein establishes the reputations both of the individual and of the institution. A proud adherent to the standards of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers Academic Record and Transcript Guide, The University of Akron has never, in collective memory, posted a grade illegally. Printed, certified copies of transcripts are made available under certain circumstances. Transcripts on demand are issued for a small fee; for no additional fee, transcripts are ready in three to five days. But in no instance is a transcript issued except upon written request by the student. Academic history stored electronically is segregated, and access is based upon one’s University role and one’s having a legitimate educational need to know. Passwords and written use authorization procedures protect all information, even advising information.

Of more immediate importance to current students are their course registrations, the records establishing contracts for courses of study. Here the University Registrar oversees several
hundred thousand transactions monthly and provides information on those transactions to hundreds of parties who share an interest in or a responsibility for them. Schedules of classes are established far in advance and updated frequently; printed versions are widely distributed, and electronic versions amenable to constant change form the legal base of the University’s course offerings at any given moment. Procedures for changes after deadline dates are codified, published and reviewed for compliance and consistency regularly. With so many people participating and with so many points for dissatisfaction, concerns arise about the timing of actions. Nevertheless, our complaint log (discussed below) is thin, and the Self-Study Committee is assured through the testimony of many that the University practices integrity in its scheduling of and registration for classes and its conduct of the rules governing progress.

The General Bulletin presents the academic offerings of a University to the public. Several steps to reshape the academic offerings have occurred since the last comprehensive evaluation. The curriculum approval process now begins with all electronic transmission and proceeds in that manner throughout a more rapid, streamlined approval process that encourages broad participation. The Academic Policies and Procedures Committee and the Curriculum Review Committee, permanent committees of the Faculty Senate, now have the attention of an associate provost, who has also been given responsibility for editing the University’s undergraduate course bulletin. (The Graduate Bulletin and the Law School Viewbook, which contains descriptions of its professional courses, are edited in the Graduate School and the Law School, respectively.) Faculty have many incentives to add to the curriculum and few to purge it. Among such steps is a sunset provision to remove from the curriculum any course not offered or taught within certain time frames. Adding positive incentives to remove courses voluntarily from the curricular offerings or refusing additions unaccompanied by deletions are other measures under consideration. The University has undertaken a comprehensive approach to creating its course bulletins, continually striving to provide for more thorough document continuity that will help assure future integrity.

Communication – both internal and external - is one of six University strategic themes. Shortly after assuming office in January 1999, President Proenza became convinced of two things: that there was far more documentable excellence at The University of Akron than anyone knew; and that previous attempts to gather this excellence and promote it systematically had not succeeded. One of his early steps has been to pay very close attention to how we form and project our image, and to that
end he includes at his senior staff meetings the Associate Vice President of Public Affairs and Development, to whom the Director of Institutional Marketing reports.

Formerly known as University Communications, the Office of Institutional Marketing has responsibility for media relations, advertising, merchandising, public relations, internal communications such as the E-Mail Digest (weekly campus electronic compendium) and Akron Update (periodic faculty/staff newsletter with feature articles, calendars, and publication/presentation/grants receipt/honors listings, now published electronically but formerly a single, heavy-stock newspaper-sized broadsheet), and all other major internal and external publications. Operating on a budget of about $2.5 million, the Office seeks as far as possible to achieve one voice and to create and monitor a cohesive corporate identity for the University. With another $2.5 million estimated being spent in various colleges and departments, coordination of marketing requires much attention. A marketing and communications group meets monthly, bringing together officers employed by areas such as the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Fine and Applied Arts, the College of Business, E. J. Thomas Performing Arts Hall, Student Affairs, Athletics, and Alumni Affairs (which publishes the quarterly, Akron Magazine). Other efforts assure that almost all advertising buys and media contacts go through Institutional Marketing, and a single corporate logo and identity graphic design appear on almost every University publication issued since early 2002. Institutional Marketing has at any one time about 125 open projects. A most expensive and effective effort, much of it created through subcontract with third parties, has been a video, billboard and print advertising campaign in northeast Ohio now in its third year.

Integrity in publications and marketing encompasses, first, telling the truth about an institution and its people. But, second, for an institution as radically decentralized as this large, comprehensive university, integrity implies its root meaning “whole.” To practice integrity in marketing you tell the truth, the whole truth. University documents, such as its periodically updated “Points of Excellence,” have resulted only by casting the net widely, drawing it in, and verifying its claims. University video spots amalgamate the achievements of everyone. The Self-Study Committee believes that The University of Akron is achieving integrity in its publications and marketing by promulgating fair, accurate and whole images of the institution on key themes to ensure common messages.
In 1997 the Board of Trustees adopted a goal to increase the University’s research effort, particularly in overall federal funding, in order to surpass $15.5 million annually by 2006. Now on course to exceed this goal in 2003, the University has invested considerably to encourage its research capabilities. Most visible was the appointment in 2001 of a Vice President for Research and Dean of the Graduate School, whose organization is described in chapter 4. This vice president oversees the integrity of the use of human subjects in research through an Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research (IRB), the operation of which is mandated and certified by the federal government. This office provides administrative support for the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) to provide for the ethical and humane treatment of animals in research. In cooperation with the Vice President for Capital Planning and Facilities Management, the vice president coordinates other activities to assure safety in research, including control of hazardous and radioactive materials. An Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs (ORSSP) initiates, establishes, and, in concert with the Office of the Controller, oversees and audits most grants and contracts. ORSSP balances the University’s own regulations against the grantors’ policies and procedures, attempting to assure probity in the collection and expenditure of approximately $25 million this year.

Integrity in research begins with individual faculty researchers. Since the last comprehensive evaluation, the University has developed and promulgated a new policy on Conflict of Interest and Conflict of Commitment (2000). The history of its development and interim versions can be found at http://www2.uakron.edu/ogc/Rules/conflictofinterest.htm. Originally created by a committee, the policy has not been widely accepted by the faculty and thus, it has been the subject of continuing discussion about its application. The policy describes (with too little specificity for some faculty and too much intrusion for others) the ethical bases for acceptable research behavior that can accommodate their own self-interest. As a management tool, it helps department chairs and individual faculty understand mutual obligations, and it seeks to create mechanisms for regular and timely reporting of potential areas of conflict of interest. Still needing further refinement is the committee-generated annual reporting form.

More recently (2002), the Conduct and Ethics Policy: Employee Financial Interests in Companies Licensed under University Intellectual Property (university rule 3359-11-18) was developed. The Board of Trustees has determined that the best interests of The University of Akron will be served if employees who create...
new technology are afforded the opportunity to hold personal financial interests in companies that are engaged in commercializing their inventions. Employee participation with outside companies in technology development activities will facilitate the University’s goal of making its research available for use in the private marketplace by giving researchers an incentive to develop inventions with commercial applications. The opportunity to participate in commercialization activities is also essential to the University’s efforts to attract and retain highly qualified researchers. The procedures and guidelines set forth in this policy are intended to enable the University to realize the benefits of such entrepreneurial activities while protecting the integrity of its research and educational mission and to comply with university policies and with applicable federal and state laws.

Assuring appropriate incentives for the development and marketing of intellectual property was the major driving force behind the creation of the Office of Technology Transfer (OTT) and of The University of Akron Research Foundation (UARF) in 2001. Until 2000, the State of Ohio prohibited individual researchers from having a property interest in the intellectual creations that they developed with University support or during University employment. Following a change in state law, control of the economic incentive of the research process now resides with the University through the introduction of a new policy that permits faculty to be part of a company based on their University creations. The three-sided relationship among faculty researchers, research funding agencies, and the University as an agent of the State of Ohio has always been tested by disagreements about property rights: faculty want to publish, grantors want to retain ownership and confidentiality if not secrecy, and the University wants flexibility to exploit ideas to the fullest and to recoup its and the state’s investment in facilities and in people, for both economic and educational reasons. Further complicating the relationship are State mandated limits to liability and indemnification. OTT and UARF seek to assure faculty incentives, maintain the integrity of research in the educational process, and resolve the limitations imposed by confusion over property rights. Good progress and open communication in these areas enable students and faculty researchers to use their results in establishing a public record of accomplishment; funding agencies to realize profits from the endeavors that they commissioned. Hence the University can recoup its subsidy of the research process for future generations of students and can share with individual investigators profits to be made from the applications of discoveries.
The interest of many individual researchers subsides after discovery but before application. However, both the University and the public can benefit from the application of research, even if individual investigators are not interested. So, as a public trust, the University must create mechanisms to effect and to profit from the transfer of the technology that it creates or makes possible through faculty discovery. Toward this end, the Vice President for Research oversees a large variety of relationships: with business and governmental incubators, with agents of city, county, state and federal governments; with regional planning bodies; with "intermediates," state- or business-created entities whose sole function is technology transfer; and with individual funding agencies. Individual researchers, departments or programs had such relationships in the past; now the University seeks through OTT and UARF to provide institution-wide services to support these relationships, to tell the story, and to assure that mutual interests support the common good. The Self-Study Committee found considerable evidence of effective communication of the University's resources and ability to provide opportunities for others to exploit these resources and, therefore, of integrity in its stewardship of the public's physical and human resources for the common good.

The University spends more than $90 million annually for supplies and services. All of these expenditures are governed by contracts, and while considerable decentralization is achieved for routine purchases of supplies, in fact only the Director of Purchasing actually buys anything on behalf of The University of Akron. That office of 13 enters into all contracts. State law and University policies and procedures require public bidding on all contracts over $10,000 (construction contracts over $20,000), but the Director of Purchasing can require bids on any amount. Contracts over $5,000 but under $75,000 are reported to the Board of Trustees for information; contracts over $75,000 require specific action by the Board. Achieving the smaller scale departmental purchases that maintain the work environment has become easier since the last comprehensive visit through the development of a department-based credit-card purchasing program and of an electronic purchase order system. Master contracts have been negotiated to achieve economies of scale, but exceptions to master contracts can be obtained without threatening the integrity of the bid procedure, which assures all suppliers equal access to the University's massive buying power.

Contracts for services, a large part of the University’s purchasing, cause the University to become more aware of another entity’s employment practices. To assure that the University not only practices but also enforces integrity, we employ a Contracts Compliance Officer.
Compliance Officer who, like the Internal Auditor and the Director of Purchasing, reports directly to the Vice President for Business and Finance. The Contracts Compliance Officer reviews all University contracts to assure that there is no illegal discrimination in employment and to gather information from everyone with whom the University does business to assure that their employment practices are fair. This officer attends pre-bid meetings and monitors compliance; for instance, employers under University contract must report monthly about the use of females and minorities in their workforces, and they must reveal details of their collective bargaining agreements, payment of worker’s compensation insurance and claims, and maintenance of prevailing wage rates. While the officer’s responsibility is to the letter of the law, he or she has opportunities to urge the employment of minority contractors and to encourage affirmative action. Since most all efforts in these regards are voluntary, it is rare that the Contracts Compliance Officer issues a 30-day notice of intent to suspend work for a violation; but such is the power of that office. Therefore, the officer helps assure our integrity and our responsibility to help build a better society. More could be done with the addition of staff to the office of one legal professional and one clerical professional.

Many federal regulations aim to assure ethical behaviors. Ethical behavior assures integrity. Thus, compliance with federal regulations should signal integrity. The University of Akron has never been judged out of compliance with federal regulations. For instance, because of strong counseling, its student loan default rate has been below ten percent, better than the average for like institutions. Safeguards to assure compliance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) of 1974 (the Buckley Amendment) must be working, since no complaint has been recorded by the Family Policy Compliance Office of the U.S. Department of Education. On two or three occasions, federal regulators have called for re-examination of specific procedures. For instance, criticism by agents of the U.S. Department of Labor led to the extensive, continuing internal educational effort about sexual harassment and other forms of discrimination described in the previous section. But the University’s integrity has never been in doubt, and no federal funds have been withheld to assure compliance.

Myriad programs involve the University in sharing its resources with other institutions. For instance, UA sponsors a Master of Social Work degree in cooperation with Cleveland State University; a Ph.D. in Nursing, a Ph.D. in Sociology, and a Doctor of Audiology program with Kent State University; a Ph.D. in Public...
Affairs and Urban Studies with Cleveland State University; and a Master of Public Health program with a consortium of Cleveland State, Kent State, and Youngstown State Universities and the Northeast Ohio Universities College of Medicine. Similarly, the University is co-license-holder with Kent State and Youngstown State Universities of television channels 45 and 49 in the organization Northeast Educational Television of Ohio. With a variety of community colleges and public school districts, the University offers course work and programs at their sites. As a member of the statewide libraries information database called OhioLINK, the University grants access to its holdings. Through joint written agreements, the University provides a home to many organizations such as the Rubber Division of the American Chemical Society and the Ohio Ballet.

While at times our financial officers imagine creating a master business plan that would anticipate all contingencies of entering into mutual agreements to share resources, in practice each new relationship brings with it the necessity of creating ad hoc business arrangements. If people are jointly employed, health care and travel policies, for instance, must be reconciled; if tuition and fees are to be collected, different rates must be reconciled. Generally accepted governing procedures (Higher Education Information requirements; state auditing procedures; National Association of College and University Business Officers practices) provide guidance, but each relationship raises some differences. The ambition of several area universities to improve all information technology practices and the business systems they drive through sharing resources at the IT backbone has created a series of agreements much like the imagined master business plan.

Continuance of many of these relationships over long terms and the lack of external measures of dissatisfaction such as suits or arbitration suggest that UA achieves integrity in these relationships nearly all of the time.

Proving the integrity of a $300-million organization of more than 30,000 community members is, of course, an ongoing effort requiring constant vigilance. Experience suggests that not every individual in the University will act responsibly all the time and that steadfastness to truth will not always lead to moral soundness. It is said that the Nordstrom Corporation’s employee handbook consisted in its entirety of the eight words, “Use your own best judgment at all times,” as if human behavior required no checks, as if competing interests needed no balances. For its part, The University of Akron has created and implements the

Conclusion
necessary checks and balances and welcomes the opportunity to distill from this comprehensive review and evaluation the essence of good faith and good results.

STRENGTHS, CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PLANS

STRENGTHS

- The University of Akron provides electronic access to all of its rules and regulations freely to all.
- The University has never been fined or had federal funds withheld for non-compliance.
- The University is achieving remarkable consistency with its corporate image.
- University-wide committees continually address and refine policies and procedures.

CHALLENGES

- Making electronic-only access to its rules and regulations required redoubled efforts to help users switch from paper-only sources.
- Continue to strive for equity of treatment.
- Continue to strive for gender equity in the athletic programs.
- Refine the conflict of interest forms.
- Spousal hiring issues.

FUTURE PLANS

- Development of a reporting mechanism for collaborative grants that credits all colleges involved.
- Continued education and communication addressing the access and availability of the university rules and regulations.
- Charging of existing university committees or the establishment of task forces to address issues of equity, conflict of interest, spousal hires, and others that may be determined.