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SENATE ACTIONS

1. Adopted a resolution from the Academic Policies Committee to change bypass credit eligibility (Appendix A).

2. Adopted a resolution from the Academic Policies Committee on awarding of Latin honors for undergraduates (Appendix A).

3. Adopted a resolution from the Academic Policies Committee to add the full academic discipline to graduation certificates (Appendix A).

4. Adopted a resolution from the Academic Policies Committee on the use of DTSD for alternative credit for undergraduate students at the University of Akron (Appendix A).

5. Adopted a resolution from the Academic Policies Committee on workload policy (Appendix A).

6. Adopted a resolution from the Part Time Faculty Committee to
change wording in university rule 3359-20-6.1, Section (H)3
(Appendix B).

7. Adopted a resolution on administration in teaching roles brought by Senator Shott and written by Senator Schulze (Appendix C).
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The meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, October 3, 2019, in room 180 of the Blake McDowell Law School. Senate Chair Linda Saliga called the meeting to order at 3:01 pm.

Of the current roster of 56 senators, 37 attended the meeting. Senators Akhigbe, Elbuluk, Fielding, Hariots, Mahajan, Sahl, Scotto, Seher, Szalay, Walker and Xi were absent with notice. Senators Bible, Chronister, Cole, Matejkovic, Srinivasan, Tuesday, Wang and Zheng were absent without notice.

I. Adoption of Agenda

On Senator Roy’s motion, the agenda was adopted as amended without dissent.

II. Adoption of Minutes of the September Senate meeting.

On Senator Hazlett’s motion, the minutes of the September Senate meeting were adopted without dissent.

III. Remarks of the Chair

I would like to welcome President Gary Miller and let him know that I’m looking forward to working with him.

We have a lot of business to attend to today. The Academic Policies Committee is bringing forward four action items, all of which I believe will be
very beneficial to our students. The Part-Time Faculty Committee is bringing forward a proposal that would put evaluation of the salaries for our part-time faculty into the hands of an active UA committee. As I mentioned last month, the starting salaries for our part-time faculty need to be evaluated.

Under old business, we will consider a resolution regarding teaching by administrators. It is clear that the result of the new workload policies will be that all tenure track faculty will be teaching more courses each semester. If the University’s financial situation is such that increasing everyone’s teaching load is necessary, then all the administrators who have the credentials to be in a classroom need to pitch in also and should be teaching at least one course each year.

Our last topic for the day will be the board rule regarding the faculty workload policy. Last month, John Green promised us that he would petition the Board during their October meeting to change the language in the board rule regarding the faculty workload policy so that it referred to regular (that is, tenured and tenure-track) faculty instead of full-time faculty. I asked John on two different occasions, one in a private meeting and another with the EC, to delay this petition to the board. I pointed out that the exclusion of the non-tenure track faculty in the workload guidelines was having a very negative effect on the morale of this group of faculty – many of them interpreted this to mean that the administration didn’t view their work as being important. I would like for us as a university to draft a policy that will address the need for, and expectations of, the various types of faculty (tenure track, non-tenure track and in some units even
contract professionals) that we utilize. I thought John agreed with me on the delay. Then Tuesday afternoon I received an email from Rex Ramsier, the one I forwarded to the Senate list yesterday morning. Apparently a change in the board rule will be going to the Board’s Rules Committee tomorrow morning, and as is required by the collective bargaining agreement, we are being consulted on this change today. Our comments are due back to Rex tonight. I’m not sure where I stand on this issue. On one hand, there is a new subsection that seems to address concerns about the teaching load for tenured/tenure track faculty members in departments that are small and/or have a large percentage of non-tenure track faculty members. On the other hand, if we value the work done by non-tenure track faculty members and believe that their work is vital to their units’ mission, then this should somehow be acknowledged. I’m sure we will have a lively discussion about this later.

Before I conclude my remarks, I will share with you the contents of a conversation I had with Dean Linda Subich on Friday, September 6th. Recall that during the September 5th meeting, John Green shared with us the revised guidelines regarding faculty workload policies. These guidelines have each academic unit’s average teaching load at the top of the range set forth in the board rule. We were informed that this was Dean Linda Subich’s idea. She was informed by several people who attended that meeting that John Green credited her with this idea. Linda shared with me that she did in fact make this suggestion, but in response to the administration continually bringing forth target teaching
loads that were well above the top of the range set in the board rule. We should all remember that the context of comments is very important.

This concludes my remarks.

IV. Special Announcements

None

V. Report of the Executive Committee

The Executive Committee has met three times since the last regular meeting.

On September 19th, the EC met to certify elections, make committee appointments, and prepare for the meeting with Interim President Green.

On September 19th, the EC met with the interim president to discuss enrollment, workload and studies of The University of Akron regarding branding, property, technology and staff and CP classifications. We also discussed workload.

On Sept. 26, the EC met to prepare the agenda for the faculty senate meeting. We also made committee appointments. We discussed workload and unanimously approved the following resolution.

Whereas, the relatively small number of tenured and tenure-track faculty members in academic units with relatively high proportions of non-tenure track faculty members must fulfill much of the unit’s service needs;

Resolved, That, in the event the administration should proceed with the proposal to limit the applicability of the University’s Faculty Workload Policy to tenured and tenure-track faculty members, a provision should be added that
prescribes a reduction of average teaching loads for tenure-track faculty in units that have a relatively high proportion of non-tenure track faculty members.

This concludes my report.

Chair Saliga asked for the vote to be withheld on the motion.

VI. Remarks of the President

President Miller thanked the Chair for the opportunity to visit the body to give a report. He thanked members of the Board of Trustees: Cindy Crotty, Taylor Bennington, and Andrew Adolph for attending the meeting. He asked the body to join him in thanking Interim President Green for his service to the University. He thanked the Faculty Senate for their service to the University and stressed the importance of the work as a significant part of shared governance. He called 15 or so faculty to find a solution to the University’s challenges, but all told him they would get back to him. He asked for information on what would make each campus unit successful and invited people to call him or Wayne Hill (as Chief ofStaff) with suggestions or questions.

Based on many conversations, he concluded that the current OAA structure is unworkable and asked the Board to reinstate the office of the Provost and conduct an immediate search. Once the search is completed, the roles of CAO and CDO will be discontinued. He committed to hiring a search consultant that would bring in a range of candidates to the committee and eventually to public meetings. He recognized the leadership challenges for the period of months during the search, but stated that further change would be disruptive. He expressed a need for better communication with regard to the roles and assured that conflicts between roles
would be worked out. He expected dean searches to be delayed. He stressed the importance of deans but was concerned that the quality of candidates would not be as good without a provost.

He summarized the Board of Trustees’ goals for The University of Akron as follows: quick development and deployment of an institutional strategy that aligns with the budget, a total enrollment strategy that plays to our strengths and increases revenue, and using data and predictive analysis to focus our research, academics and community engagement.

President Miller expressed confidence that the Board’s goals can be realized. Dr. Green began the strategic action planning process and the Tiger Team on retention provide a comprehensive list of best retention practices.

President Miller has begun examining the financial models to determine if the financial management strategy and investments are working. He noted our challenges are not much different from other institutions and argued that we need to figure out our advantages.

President Miller described part of his work as creating a compelling narrative that resonates internally and externally. He described some of the themes that have already emerged. He stated that we are seen as a unique, urban, research university that has been making and keeping promises to students and to the community for 150 years. He affirmed the value of the arts and the inherent value and applicability of knowledge. He argued our prosperity depends upon our embrace of our mission as an urban, research, community-engaged university.
President Miller described himself as an optimistic person and expressed belief that we can transcend our obstacles. He mentioned that in talking with faculty many expressed enormous pride and some frustration.

President Miller diagnosed our problems and challenges as stemming from leadership, rather than academic, or organizational.

He invited the audience to undertake a thought experiment to suspend everything known about the University and approach it from fresh eyes. He asked the audience to bring their best selves to work and to face each other as we meet tough decisions and challenges. He found inspiration in the extraordinarily gifted faculty, in the mission as an urban university, and in the trust students have granted. He found inspiration in research conducted in unique departments, in innovative and passionate staff members and contract professions, and in alumni from all over the world that say the best decision they ever made was The University of Akron. He expressed his pride to be a ZIP and to be a part of the community, and expressed his belief in the faculty and the university community at large. He ended by stressing the importance of the University and our mission.

Senator Shott thanked the president and asked if the provost will be hired before the next fiscal year.

President Miller stated that he hoped that a provost would be in place by the end of spring, adding that the search firm would be the same one that hired him.

Senator Hazlett asked about the part-time faculty resolution and asked about raising minimum salaries.
President Miller requested that when any resolution is passed he will provide a response. He agreed that part-time salaries were a nationwide problem but could not speak to this specific resolution.

VII. Remarks of the Chief Academic Officer

CAO Midha gave three updates. He stated that the program review committee completed the cycle one review for 10 programs. He noted the review will be presented to the CRC and then presented to the senate. Then, the programs will have two weeks to meet with the review units and the deans will make a recommendation.

The second update was regarding ODHE requirements for accelerated bachelors/master’s degree programs. The programs can have up to 9 credit hours of swing credits. Master’s programs need to have at least 30 unique credit hours with only nine overlapping hours. He also noted that a student is allowed to take nine graduate credit hours at undergraduate tuition prices, provided they meet the requirements for an exceptional student, which is currently under discussion.

CAO Midha referenced a policy endorsed by the body that graduate students could tutor for a graduate tuition waiver and at least one department has used this as a recruitment tool.

Senator Evans asked about midterm grades and how they will be used in light of the Tiger Team report.

CAO Midha answered he hoped the reports would go to the appropriate dean’s office and then given to the advisors to help the students succeed.
XIII. Committee Reports

A. Academic Policies Committee—Chair Klein

Senator Klein asked for the adoption of the items. She briefly summarized the bypass credit revision to focus on UA students (Appendix A).

The motion carries.

Senator Klein introduce the motion to discontinue the use of the commencement GPA (Appendix A).

The motion carries

Senator Klein introduced the motion to add the full academic discipline to the diploma (Appendix A).

The motion passes without dissent.

Senator Klein introduced the motion to allow units to adopt the DTSD exam criteria (Appendix A).

Senator Shott clarified the motion was not an endorsement of the DTSD exam criteria, rather the motion was designed to give units and departments the option to consider the exam.

Senator Klein confirmed that the motion was giving units and departments the option to consider the credit but not an endorsement or suggestion that they do so.
Senator Shott asked who would have the authority to accept this exam and if the units own considered judgement be enough to accept or reject.

Senator Klein said that the authority resides with the department.

The motion carries.

Senator Klein read the statement on workload (Appendix A).

Senator Ramlo moved for the adoption of the statement.

The motion passes without dissent.

B. Part Time Faculty Committee-resolution-Chair Antunez

Senator Hazlett presents the resolution on part-time faculty (Appendix B) and gave context for the resolution.

The motion passes without dissent.

Asked a question to CAO Midha about downsizing and why part-time faculty would need to go through a new hiring process.

CAO Midha said he would look into it.

C. Faculty Research Committee—Chair Diefendorf

Chair Saliga stated the report listed funding for last summer (Appendix D).

IX. Report of the University Council Representatives - Senator Evans

Senator Evans presented the information on the new Brightspace page regarding scholarships.
X. Report of the Graduate Council—Senator Graor

Senator Graor referenced the written report (Appendix E).

XI. AAUP Report—Senator Schulze

Senator Schulze reported that the union had three meetings with CDO Ramsier on workload and presented concerns for how changing the University Rule would make it difficult for units. Senator Schulze stated that the language represents a good faith consultation.

XII. Unfinished Business

Senator Shott thanked Senator Schulze for her input and he read the resolution regarding administrative teaching (Appendix C). He stated that this resolution is not a response to workload, rather, a good faith effort that would benefit students, morale, and the University.

The motion passes.

XII. New Business

Chair Saliga asked for comments on the changes to the Board Rule regarding faculty workload.

Senator Nofziger supported the language about small units and heavily NTT. She remains concerned about wording that mentions specific units and research units.

Senator Schulze stated the language was already there and suggested examples be deleted.

Senator Ramlo expressed confusion about all the deletions regarding NTT faculty, part-time faculty and contract professionals.
Senator Schulze noted it does not make sense to have part-time faculty in this rule.

Senator Hazlett agreed the information on part-time faculty is somewhere else.

Chair Saliga was leaning to accepting the language but supported adding more information regarding NTT faculty.

Senator Makki asked how separating NTT faculty from Tenure-Track faculty in the Board Rule helped meet the needs of our students.

Chair Saliga summarized the comments she would share included deleting specific units and adding a paragraph regarding NTT and contract professionals.

Senator Schulze thought there were separate rules for part-time faculty and NTT faculty.

Chair Saliga continued her summary.

Senator Nofziger expressed a concern this was rushed and not enough time given. She described it as a nod to shared governance without real and careful discussion. Request that this be delayed until the next board meeting.

Senator Woyat noted the undergraduate student government has not been contacted and urged the senate to contact the USG.

Senator Schulze shared the college lecturer rule that was rescinded and needed to be replaced. She shared Senator Ramlo’s comments that there should be rules governing all positions including visiting.

Chair Saliga read the resolution and clarified the options for action.
Senator Hazlett asked to add the words and/or part-time faculty at the end of the resolution.

Senator Ramlo supported the amendment and said that her dean stated all courses had to be justified and the goal was to get rid of part-time faculty. She gave the example of the survey and mapping degree, which relies significantly on part-time faculty, without which there will be shortage on granting degrees.

Senator Smith noted the resolution seems irrelevant.

Senator Nofziger moves that we table the resolution, and Senator Schulze seconds.

The motion passes without dissent.

Senator Saliga summarized her comments and committed to send them out to the list.

Senator Makki supported asking for a delay since all of the different types of faculty positions are not described in the rule.

Senator Schulze noted there are many places where the language needs changed.

Senator Smith supported the idea of workload but shares concern about the rushed implementation.

XIII. Good of the Order

Senator Roy announced the faculty first Friday is tomorrow at the Lockview.

XIV. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:40.

—Heather Howley, Secretary.
Questions and comments about the minutes can be emailed to hhowley@uakron.edu or called in to x8914.
In its September meetings, APC re-elected Janet Klein as Chair and Joe Minocchi as Vice-Chair. APC submits the following items for adoption by Senate:

1. **Rationale for change to rule 3359-60-03.1 on eligibility for claiming bypassed credit:** In its current iteration, this rule does not specify what categories of student are eligible to claim bypassed credit. Due to this ambiguity, bypassed credit may currently be awarded to guest students, high-school students enrolled in dual-enrollment programs (CCP), and other non-degree-seeking students at UA. Members of APC agreed that the bypassed credit policy exists to provide UA degree-seeking undergraduates an affordable, simple mechanism to earn credit and move efficiently toward graduation. The revisions to rule 3359-60-03 are to establish that this mechanism should be afforded to degree-seeking undergraduates at the University of Akron, a definition which includes those students seeking an associate degree in the Early College High School program. In addition, the attached revisions establish that bypassed credit may not be used for grade replacement.

2. **Rationale for changes to rules 3359-20-05.1, 3359-60-03.3, and 3359-60-03.4:** Per current language in the aforementioned rules, Latin honors at graduation for undergraduates are designated based on a recalculated grade point average incorporating all course attempts. This grade point average differs from the official transcripted GPA, is used internally for this purpose only, and is not available to students in the student information system. Additionally, the university utilized this recalculated grade point average to differentiate between students with equivalent grade point averages in determining numerical class rank, a practice abandoned twenty-five years ago. Current university rules allow for grade replacement and academic reassessment so that students may recover from poor academic performance and improve their academic standing. In the spirit of these goals, members of the committee voted unanimously to discontinue the use of this recalculated GPA for determining Latin honors at graduation. The attached revisions abolish the use of this GPA.

3. **APC discussed the merits of including the full academic discipline (major), in addition to the degree awarded, on University of Akron diplomas, i.e., Bachelor of Arts in English rather than simply Bachelor of Arts.** Currently, diplomas from some academic units do contain both degree and academic discipline text while others do not. This inconsistency has engendered confusion among students and their families. Inclusion of this text will incur no additional costs to students or to the institution, will result in no delay in printing, and can be implemented by the Fall 2019 graduation ceremony. Members of the committee unanimously support the addition of academic discipline (major) to the text of University of Akron diplomas. The content of University of Akron diplomas is not governed by university rule; therefore, APC brings this policy forward for senate consideration.
4. APC discussed the use of DSST (Dantes Subject Standardized Test) examinations for alternative credit at the undergraduate level. These examinations evaluate prior learning, similar to Advanced Placement (AP) and College Level Examination Preparation (CLEP) exams, to award undergraduate credits. Initially offered primarily to active duty military personnel, the program is now available to any undergraduate student, is offered at numerous testing centers including at UA, and credit is accepted at 1,900 institutions nationally. Unlike AP and CLEP, there is no uniform rubric governing how credit is to be awarded by Ohio institutions. The American Council on Education provides non-binding course equivalency recommendations. APC discussed the merits of this program and its use by other Ohio institutions and recommends that departments and schools evaluate these examinations for course equivalency at the University of Akron.

5. Academic Policies Committee Statement on 2019 Workload Policy

The Academic Policies Committee (APC) is a committee of Faculty Senate that—among other things—is tasked with reviewing and recommending policy changes that have an impact on individual academic programs as well as the overall academic mission of the University of Akron. Policy shifts that can improve or damage the academic integrity of the University and its programs are vetted by members of APC to ensure that the best possible practices are put forth, with the goal of maintaining and advancing the University’s academic reputation and attracting and retaining students, both of which are interrelated agendas.

In the spirit of shared governance, we respectfully request that the UA Leadership team delay the implementation of any workload policy in order to continue to work with units to develop workload policies that reflect the academic mission of each unit. The workload guidelines distributed by the administration on 8.26.19 categorize units with “similar missions.” These reductive categorizations are not in line with the board rule descriptions on workload. The guidelines do not provide an explanation for how units were deemed similar to other units, nor a transparent pathway for changing categories.

The APC hopes that the UA Leadership team will break the cycle of rushed administrative decisions whose wider implications have not been considered and discussed by the appropriate bodies on campus. Many of these rushed administrative decisions have had to be walked back or abandoned, but not without considerable damage to the University’s reputation.

The recent proposed changes to UA’s workload policy threaten to be another rushed policy whose broader impact will likely do further damage to the
University’s reputation and, most importantly, to the ability of faculty to mentor, train, attract, and retain students.

APC will be happy to share with the administration examples of the ways in which the proposed increase in teaching load and its corresponding de-emphasis on research and service will—without a doubt—decrease the quality of education students receive at the University of Akron.

3359-20-05.1  Grading system, discipline, academic probation and dismissal.

(A) Faculty grade records.

(1) The faculty member is expected to maintain a careful and orderly record of each student's academic performance in each class. The records may be maintained in grade books provided by the university and all such records are the property of the university. When a faculty member leaves the employ of the university, or accumulates grade records no longer needed, these records should be surrendered to the department chair for disposition.

(2) The faculty member's grade records must be legible, understandable, and complete, as they are the ultimate information in case of questions concerning a student's or a former student's academic performance.

(B) Reporting grades.

(1) By the end of the fifth week of classes in normal academic semesters (pro-rated for summer sessions), faculty members teaching one hundred-level and two hundred-level classes will assign satisfactory or unsatisfactory performance indicators to all students. Such indicators will be assigned in the system used by the university registrar, and will be based on the faculty members' overall assessment of the students' classroom performance to-date. The system will in turn notify students of any unsatisfactory indicators and direct them to seek the advice of their faculty and/or academic adviser in order to improve their classroom performance.
(2) At the time for reporting final grades, the university registrar provides each faculty member with appropriate instructions for the reporting of grades.

(C) Grading system.

(1) Grades, as listed below, are used to indicate academic performance. Overall scholastic averages are computed on a quality point ratio basis, wherein the sum of the quality points earned is divided by the sum of the credits attempted. The quality point value per credit for each letter grade is shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>grade</th>
<th>quality points</th>
<th>key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>undergraduate/law courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>graduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>undergraduate/law courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>graduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>undergraduate/law courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>graduate courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>symbol</th>
<th>quality points</th>
<th>key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>in progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>audit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>no credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGR</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>no grade reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>invalid grade reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Permanent incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Incomplete "I" means that the student has done passing work in the course, but some part of the work is, for good and acceptable reason, not complete at the end of the term. Failure to complete the work by the end of the following semester (not summer session, except in engineering) converts the incomplete "I" to an "F." When the work is satisfactorily completed within the allotted time, the incomplete "I" is converted to whatever grade the student has earned.

It is the responsibility of the student to make up the incomplete work. The faculty member should submit the new grade to the university registrar's office on a change of grade form, which is available from each dean's office. If the instructor wishes to extend the "I" grade beyond the following term for which the student is registered, the instructor should submit an incomplete extension form, which is available from each collegiate dean's office, before the end of the semester.

(3) In progress "IP" means that the student has not completed the scheduled course work during the semester because the nature of the course does not permit completion within a single semester, such as work toward a thesis. An "IP" grade should be assigned only in graduate courses.

(4) Credit "CR" means that a student has shown college level competence by satisfactorily pursuing a regular university course under the credit/noncredit registration option. An undergraduate student who has completed at least fifty percent of the work toward a degree, or a postbaccalaureate student, may register for selected courses on a credit/noncredit basis. The student should consult his/her academic adviser for details.

Noncredit "NC" is assigned if the work pursued under this option is unsatisfactory. The student may secure information about this option from an adviser or from the university's "Undergraduate Bulletin."
(5) Permanent incomplete "PI" means that the student's instructor and the instructor's dean may for special reasons authorize the change of an "I" to a "PI."

(6) No grade reported "NGR" indicates that at the time grades were processed for the current issue of the record, no grade had been reported by the instructor.

(7) Invalid "INV" indicates the grade reported by the instructor of the course was improperly noted and thus unacceptable for proper processing.

(D) Dropping courses - applicable to undergraduate and graduate students.

(1) It is the responsibility of the student to determine the impact of dropping from courses on matters such as financial aid (including scholarships and grants), eligibility for on-campus employment and housing, athletic participation, and insurance eligibility.

(2) Students may drop a course through the second week (fourteenth calendar day) of a semester or proportionally equivalent dates during summer session, intersession, and other course terms. No record of the course will appear on the student's transcript. For purposes of this policy, the course term for a course that meets during a semester but begins after the beginning of a semester and/or ends before the end of a semester begins when its class meetings begin and ends when its class meetings end.

(3) Dropping a course shall not reduce or prevent a penalty accruing to a student for misconduct as defined in the code of student conduct.

(4) Degree-granting colleges may supplement this policy with more stringent requirements.

(5) This policy shall take effect at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester for all newly enrolled undergraduate students. In addition, this policy shall take effect at the beginning of the fall 2013 semester for all currently and previously enrolled undergraduate students who have not graduated prior to the start of the fall 2013 semester.

(E) Withdrawing from courses - applicable to undergraduate and graduate students.

(1) It is the responsibility of the student to determine the impact of withdrawing from courses on matters such as financial aid (including scholarships and grants), eligibility for on-campus employment and housing, athletic participation, and insurance eligibility.
(2) After the fourteen-day drop period, and subject to the limitations below, students may withdraw from a course through the seventh week (forty-ninth calendar day) of a semester or proportionally equivalent dates during summer session, intersession, or other course terms. A course withdrawal will be indicated on the student’s official academic record by a grade of "WD."

(3) This policy shall take effect for all students at the beginning of the fall semester of 2011.

(F) Withdrawing from courses - applicable to undergraduate students only.

(1) Undergraduate students may not withdraw from the same course more than twice. If a student attempts to withdraw from a course after having withdrawn from it twice before, he or she will continue to be enrolled in the course and will receive a grade at the end of the semester.

(2) Full-time undergraduate students who need to withdraw from all courses for documented extraordinary, non-academic reasons (e.g., medical treatment or convalescence, military service) must obtain the permission of the dean of their college. For purposes of this paragraph,

(a) Students are considered full-time if they were enrolled as full-time students at the beginning of the term; and

(b) Courses for which the student has completed all requirements are excluded.

(3) Undergraduate students who withdraw from two courses either before they have earned thirty credits, or after they have earned thirty credits but before they have earned sixty credits, are not permitted to register for additional courses until they have consulted with their academic adviser. The purpose of this consultation is to discuss the reasons for the course withdrawals and to promote satisfactory academic progress by helping students develop strategies to complete their courses successfully.

(4) Except as otherwise provided below, undergraduate students may not withdraw from more than four courses before they have earned sixty credits. Students who attempt to withdraw from more than four courses will continue to be enrolled in those courses and will receive grades at the end of the semester.

(5) Undergraduate students who need to withdraw from all courses for documented extraordinary, non-academic reasons (e.g. medical
treatment or convalescence, military service) may, after consulting with their adviser, submit a written petition to

the dean of their college requesting that these courses not be counted toward the fourcourse withdrawal limit. The dean may grant this permission if, in the dean's judgment, it is consistent with the best academic interests of the student and the best interests of the university.

(6) After the withdrawal deadline, undergraduate students may submit a written petition to the dean of their degree-granting college requesting partial withdrawal, after the deadline, for documented extraordinary, non-academic reasons (e.g. medical treatment or convalescence, military service). If the student is not yet admitted to a degree-granting college, the withdrawal request must be submitted to the dean of the student's intended degree-granting college or, if the student has not declared a major, from the deans of the degree-granting colleges offering the courses. The dean may grant this permission if the dean finds that the withdrawal is necessitated by circumstances beyond the student's control and is consistent with the best academic interests of the student and the best interests of the university.

(7) Undergraduate students who have reached the four-course withdrawal limit as noted above may, after consultation with their adviser, submit a written petition to the dean of their college seeking permission to withdraw from one or more additional courses. The dean may grant this permission if the dean finds that the withdrawal is necessitated by circumstances beyond the student's control and is consistent with the best academic interests of the student and the best interests of the university.

(8) Withdrawing from a course shall not reduce or prevent a penalty accruing to a student for misconduct as defined in the student code of conduct.

(9) Degree-granting colleges may supplement this policy with more stringent requirements.

(10) This policy shall take effect at the beginning of the fall 2011 semester for all newly enrolled undergraduate students. In addition, this policy shall take effect at the beginning of the fall 2013 semester for all currently and previously enrolled undergraduate students who have not graduated prior to the start of the fall 2013 semester.

(G) Changing grades.

(1) A faculty member who, because of an error, wishes to change a final grade already awarded to a student must submit a written request on
the change of grade form for that change to his/her dean. The dean notifies the faculty member and the university registrar of the decision.

(2) Re-examination for the purpose of raising a grade is not permitted.

(H) Retroactive withdrawal.

(1) A retroactive withdrawal may be granted only when a student has experienced unforeseen, documented extenuating medical or legal circumstances that he/she could not have reasonably expected.

(2) The student must submit all retroactive withdrawal requests within one calendar year of resuming coursework at the university of Akron.

(3) The student must initiate the withdrawal request by providing written documentation of the circumstances, a current university of Akron transcript, current contact information, and a cover letter of explanation addressed to the dean of the college in which he/she is enrolled.

(4) Upon receipt of required materials from the student, the dean of the student's college will discuss the request with the instructor(s) of record, relevant chair(s), and other deans (if the student is requesting retroactive withdrawal from courses in other colleges). Based on these discussions, a coordinated joint response regarding the request will be formulated by the dean. If approval of the request is recommended by the dean, the university registrar will initiate the retroactive withdrawal. The dean will notify the student of the action taken. If the student is not yet admitted to a degree granting college, the withdrawal request must be submitted to the dean of the student's intended degree granting college or, if the student has not declared a major, from the deans of the degree-granting colleges offering the courses.

(5) Requests that have been denied can be appealed to the office of the provost.

(6) This process addresses academic changes to a student's record only. Once the academic record changes have been made, the student has the right to submit an appeal for tuition and/or fee changes.

(I) Course credit by examination.

(1) Qualified students may obtain credit for subjects not taken in a course by passing special examinations. The grade obtained is recorded on the student's permanent record and counts as work attempted whenever quality ratio calculations are made.
(2) Any student desiring to take special examinations for credit, before beginning to study for the examination and before asking the course instructor for direction, must first receive permission from both the student's dean and the dean under whose jurisdiction the course is listed. After permission is granted, the student prepares for the special examination without faculty assistance. Faculty members may describe only the objectives of the course and the work to be covered. The examination must be comprehensive and demand more from the student than is expected on a regular final examination in the course. The faculty member will file copies of the examination and the student's answers with the faculty member's dean.

(3) Credit by examination is not allowed during a student's last semester before graduation.

(J) Exemption from required courses.

Qualified students may be exempted from courses by examination, testing, or other means approved by the college faculty in which the course is offered.

(K) Faculty tutoring.

If a faculty member tutors a student in a credit course, the student's examination and other performance in the course must be planned and evaluated by another faculty member or by an approved faculty member from another university.

(L) Repeating courses.

Any course may be repeated twice by an undergraduate student subject to the following conditions:

(1) To secure a grade ("A" through "F") a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was a "C-," "D+," "D," "D-" or "F," "CR," "NC," or "AUD." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.

(2) To secure a "CR," a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was a "NC." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.

(3) To secure a grade ("A" through "F"), "CR," "NC," a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was an "AUD." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.

(4) A graded course ("A" through "F") may not be repeated for a grade of "AUD."
(5) A course taken under the "CR/NC" option may not be repeated for a grade of "AUD."

(6) With the dean's permission, a student may substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered. Courses must be repeated at the university of Akron.

(7) Grades for all attempts at a course will appear on the student's official academic record.

(8) Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the grade point average.

(9) All grades for attempts at a course will be used in grade point calculation for the purpose of determining graduation with honors and class rank if applicable.

(M) Approbation, probation, and dismissal.

(1) An undergraduate student who carries twelve or more credit hours during a semester and earns a quality point average of 3.50 or better is listed on the dean's list of the student's college.

(2) An undergraduate student who carries twelve or more credit hours during a semester and earns a quality point average of 4.00 is listed on the president's list of the university.

(3) An undergraduate student whose cumulative grade point average falls below 2.0 is placed on academic probation and is subject to such academic action, including but not limited to mandatory repeat for change of grade, credit hour restriction, and student success programming, as may be imposed by the dean of the student's degreegranting college, or by the dean's designee. While on probation, an undergraduate student may not change major or transfer to another degree-granting college.

An undergraduate student whose cumulative grade point average falls below 2.0 for each of two consecutive semesters will be evaluated for dismissal from the university by the dean of the student's degree-granting college, or by the dean’s designee. The dean may retain an undergraduate student for one additional semester if the term grade point average has improved significantly but the cumulative grade point average remains below 2.0. An undergraduate student whose cumulative grade point average falls below 2.0 for each of three consecutive semesters will be dismissed.
from the university. An undergraduate student not yet enrolled in a degree-granting college will be evaluated for dismissal, according to the criteria above, by the head of the division of student success, or by the head’s designee.

(4) Probation is a warning to the student whose academic record is unsatisfactory and who is in danger of being dismissed from the university. A student may, however, be dismissed without having previously been placed on probation.

(5) Students dismissed from the university are not eligible to register for any credit courses. They may, however, register for noncredit work. To be eligible for readmission, the student must have either:

(a) Completed at a regionally accredited college or university, with a grade point average of 2.5 or higher, at least eighteen credit hours that will transfer to the university of Akron and apply toward a degree, or;

(b) Satisfied both of the following:

(i) Wait a minimum of five calendar years from the date of dismissal, and;

(ii) Submit a written statement describing the causes of poor academic performance and steps taken toward improvement since dismissal.

(6) Students readmitted under paragraph (M)(5) of this rule will be evaluated for dismissal immediately following the first semester after readmission, with the option to retain for one additional semester if the term grade point average has improved significantly, but the cumulative grade point average remains below 2.0.

(7) Students dismissed from the university for reasons other than failure to meet academic standards are readmitted by action of the president only.

(N) Auditing courses.

A student choosing to audit a course must elect to do so at the time of registration. The student pays the enrollment fee and may be expected to do the work prescribed for students taking the course for credit, except
that of taking the examination. Any faculty member may initiate withdrawal for a student not meeting these expectations.

(O) Scheduling field trips.

The university encourages faculty members to arrange worthwhile field trips which they believe will add substantially to the course they teach. Before scheduling a field trip which is not listed in the university "Undergraduate Bulletin" as an integral part of the course, faculty members should receive approval from their dean. The request for approval should state the name and number of the course, the number of students and faculty members making the trip, the nature of the trip, the destination and the time required for the trip. If students will miss other classes, they must consult their instructors so that work missed because of an approved trip can be made up. Faculty members should contact the purchasing department about insurance coverage.

(P) Dealing with academic misconduct.

(1) The university reserves the right to discipline any student found responsible of academic misconduct in accordance with the code of student conduct. The student's faculty member shall refer the matter to the office of student conduct and community standards or a designated representative of that office to investigate the alleged misconduct and determine the outcome.

(2) A faculty member who has evidence that a student has cheated in any term papers, theses, examinations or daily work shall report the student to the department chair who in turn shall report the matter to the student’s dean. Faculty members should be familiar with the student disciplinary procedures in order to protect the rights of students who have been alleged of academic dishonesty or other misconduct.

(3) All tests and examinations shall be proctored except in colleges of the university with honors systems which have been approved by the faculty senate.

(4) Members of the faculty of the school of law should consult with their dean as to procedures under the honor system of that school. Faculty members should become familiar with the student disciplinary procedures and the school of law honor system.

Effective: 4/20/2019
3359-60-03.1 Credit by transfer and/or examination.

(A) Transfer credit for undergraduate courses.

(1) A total for all non-remedial, non-developmental college-level course work completed with earned grades of "D-" or better taken at an institution of higher education in the United States which is fully accredited or has been granted candidacy status by one of the following regional institutional accrediting agencies: middle states association of colleges and schools, commission on higher education; new England association of colleges and schools, commission on institutions of higher education; north central association of colleges and schools, higher learning commission; northwest commission on colleges and universities; southern association of colleges and schools, commission on colleges; western association of schools and colleges, accrediting commission for community and junior colleges; western association of schools and colleges, accrediting commission for senior colleges and universities will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record. Each course posted to the degree audit system will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record; however, grade-point average may be considered for purposes of evaluating,
ranking or otherwise determining admissibility to the university or to specific programs. In addition, the name of the institution, as well as the time period during which the courses were taken, will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record.

(2) No grade-point value will appear on the record, and no grade-point average will be calculated for the course work listed. Transfer students shall be accorded the same class standing and other privileges as all other students on the basis of the number of credits earned.

(3) All residency requirements must be completed successfully at the receiving institution prior to the granting of a degree.

(4) "CLEP" or advanced placement credit posted on transcripts from regionally accredited previous Ohio college and universities is eligible for credit at the university of Akron. "CLEP" or advanced placement credit posted on transcripts from previous non-Ohio institutions is not eligible for credit at the university of Akron. Students must present original documentation attesting to scores earned prior to receiving alternative credit considerations.

(5) The university of Akron does not guarantee that a transfer student automatically will be admitted to all majors, minors, or fields of concentration at the institution. For courses that have been taken at an institution of higher education noted in the reference above, the dean of the college in which the student intends to obtain a degree will specify which courses listed, other than general studies, will apply toward the degree requirements at the University. This specification will be made at the time the student enters the degree-granting college. The office responsible for transfer student services will specify which courses listed will apply toward the general education requirements when the student enters the university.

(B) Transient student. A university of Akron student may take coursework at another institution of higher education as a transient student. The purpose of transient work is to provide the university of Akron student with opportunity to: 1) take a course that is not offered at the university of Akron; or 2) if the student is away for the summer, to take a course in a distant location; or 3) in rare cases, a student who is only a few credits shy of graduation and must leave the university of Akron due to extenuating circumstances, to take a course at a distant location. These courses will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record. Each course
will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record and the grade for such course will not be included in the university of Akron grade-point calculation. The name of the institution will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record as well as the date that the coursework was taken.

(1) Coursework must be taken at a regionally accredited institution.

(2) For all transient coursework, prior written permission to take the course must be received from the dean of the student's degree-granting college. If the student is not yet admitted to a degree-granting college, written permission must be received from the dean of the student's intended degree-granting college or, if the student has not declared a major, from the dean of the degree-granting college offering the course.

(3) A student must earn a grade of "D-" or better in the course at the other institution in order for the credits to apply towards the student's degree requirements at the university of Akron unless otherwise specified by the degree granting college. The student must provide the official transcript for the course in order to receive credit.

(4) No more than eighteen total credit hours of transient work may be approved prior to the granting of a baccalaureate degree. No more than nine total credit hours of transient work may be approved prior to the granting of an associate degree.

(5) Approvals for transient attendance at other institutions are valid for only the requested term and are subject to all restrictions of the dean of the college approving the request for transient credit.

(6) Students who are on probation or dismissed are restricted or denied transient permission except in rare and compelling circumstances. Note: Students nearing degree completion should review university graduation requirements.

(7) Coursework taken at another institution cannot be considered for the university of Akron repeat for change of grade policy or academic reassessment policy and will not be calculated into the university of Akron grade-point average.
Credit by examination. A student interested in earning credits by special examination may do so with the permission of the dean of the student’s college and the dean of the college in which a particular course is offered and by payment of the special examination fee. The grade obtained in such an examination is recorded on the student's permanent academic record. Credit by examination is not permitted in the semester before graduation. Credit by examination may not be used to repeat for change of grade.

Bypassed credit. Certain courses designated in the general bulletin by each department enable a student to earn "bypassed" credit. A degree-seeking undergraduate student who completes such a course with a grade of "C" or better is entitled to credit for designated prerequisite courses which carry the same departmental code number. Credit for such bypassed prerequisite shall be included in the total credits earned but shall not count in the quality point ratio, or class standing, or hours required for graduation with honors. Bypassed credit is not awarded on the basis of completing a course either credit-byexamination or credit/noncredit. Bypassed credit may not be used to repeat for change of grade. The appendix to this rule outlines courses approved for bypassed credit.

The university shall from time to time publish a list of courses approved by the faculties of the college for bypassed credit.

Effective: 08/27/2017

Certification:
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3359-60-03.3 Repeating courses.

Undergraduate students may repeat a course twice. Undergraduate students may repeat a course more than twice with the permission of the dean of their degree-granting college or, if they are not yet admitted to a degree-granting college, by the dean of their intended degree-granting college or, if they have not yet declared a major, by the dean of the college offering the course. All course repeats are subject to the following conditions:

(A) To receive a new grade of "A" through "F" a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was a "C-", "D+", "D", "D-", "F", "CR", "NC", or "AUD."

(B) To receive a new grade of "CR" or "NC", a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was a "NC." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.

(C) To receive a new grade of "A" through "F", or "CR" or "NC," a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was an "AUD." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.

(D) A course in which the previously received grade was "A" through "F", or "CR" or "NC", may be repeated for a grade of "AUD"; however, the grade of "AUD" does not replace the previously received grade.

(E) With the dean's permission, a student may substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered.

(F) Grades for all attempts at a course will appear on the student's official academic record.

(G) Only the grade for the last attempt at a course at the university of Akron will be used in calculating the grade point average.

(H) Grades for all attempts at a course at the university of Akron will be used in the grade point calculation for the purpose of determining graduation with honors and class rank if applicable.

A student who wishes to receive credit or satisfy a prerequisite by repeating a course at another institution must satisfy the conditions and receive the permissions specified for transient students in paragraph (B) of rule 3359-60-03.1 of the Administrative Code. A course repeated at
another institution for transient credit will count toward the two repeats allowed without the dean's permission. A course repeated at another institution will not be used in the calculation of the grade point average.

3359-60-03.3

(4)(1) Regardless of where a course is taken, credit for the course or its equivalent will apply only once toward meeting degree requirements.

Effective: 12/18/2017
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3359-60-03.4 Academic reassessment and discipline.

(A) To be eligible for academic reassessment, a student shall:

(1) Have not attended the university of Akron for at least three calendar years. A semester or summer session in which the student received all "WD" grades cannot be counted as part of the separation period; and

(2) Have reenrolled and maintained a grade point average of 2.50 or higher for the first twenty-four letter-graded ("A" through "F") hours attempted at the university of Akron; and

(3) Have not used academic reassessment before at the university of Akron; and

(4) Submit a written request for academic reassessment to the student's college dean's office.
To apply for academic reassessment, the student shall complete the appropriate form in consultation with his/her academic adviser.

The office of the university registrar shall confirm eligibility and make the adjustments to the student's academic record.

1. The student begins with a new cumulative grade point average and adjusted credit hour totals.
   a. Credit hours are defined as semester hours.
   b. Only grades with a "C-" or lower may be reassessed.
   c. The student, in consultation with his/her academic adviser, shall identify the courses to be reassessed.
   d. Grades to be reassessed shall come from the time period prior to the student's reenrollment following the three-year absence.

2. Grades earned for the courses that are reassessed at the university of Akron are excluded from the calculation of the cumulative "GPA," but will remain on the student's official transcript.

3. Credit hours earned for courses at the university of Akron during the previous enrollment with a grade of "C" or better, including "CR," are retained.

4. Credit hours from all reassessed courses taken during the previous enrollment at the university of Akron with a grade of "C-" or lower are removed from the calculation of the cumulative "GPA" (although the grades are retained on the academic transcript with the notation "academic reassessment policy").

The office of the university registrar will apply the following provisions of the academic reassessment policy.

1. When counting the first twenty-four credits attempted, if the twenty-fourth credit is part of other credits earned during a semester, the entire number of credits earned for that semester will be calculated into the grade-point average.

2. An undergraduate student may utilize this academic reassessment policy only one time in his/her career at the university of Akron.
(3) This policy applies to undergraduate course work taken at the university of Akron and only for undergraduate students earning a first undergraduate degree. (The graduate school has adopted its own academic reassessment policy, rule 3359-60-03.4(E) of the Administrative Code.)

(4) Grades from all courses ever taken at the university of Akron and the resulting "GPA" (unadjusted by the academic reassessment policy) will be used for purposes of determining eligibility for university, departmental or professional honors or other recognition based upon the student's undergraduate academic career and record of academic performance.

(5) Any academic probations, suspensions or dismissals from reassessed semesters shall not be forgiven. They will count when the probation-dismissal policy is applied to the student's record after readmission.

(6) A student may seek an exception to this policy through an appeal to the senior vice president and provost and chief operating officer whose decision will be final.

(E) Academic reassessment: graduate.

(1) A student who meets all the criteria described below may petition the vice president for research and dean of the graduate school to remove from her/his graduate cumulative grade point average all those grades earned under the student's prior enrollment at the university of Akron.

(a) Degree-seeking graduate student,

(b) Previous graduate enrollment at the university of Akron,

(c) Not enrolled at the university of Akron for at least five years prior to current enrollment, and

(d) Maintain a current graduate grade point average of at least 3.00 or better for the first fifteen hours of re-enrollment credit.

(2) If the student's petition is granted, the following will apply to the reassessment policy:

(a) This policy only applies to the student's graduate grade point average.
(b) All university of Akron grades will remain on the student's official, permanent academic record (transcript); this process will affect the cumulative grade point average only. It will not remove evidence/documentation of the student's overall academic history at the university.

(c) No grades/credits from the student's prior graduate enrollment at the university may be counted toward the subsequent degree program requirements. Degree requirements may only be met by courses included in the calculation of the student's cumulative graduate grade point average at the university of Akron. Thus, the student who successfully petitions for cumulative graduate grade point average recalculation under this policy automatically forfeits the right to use any of the excluded course work toward the current degree requirements.

(3) A student may exercise this graduate reassessment option only once, regardless of the number of times the student enters/attends a graduate degree program at the university of Akron.

(F) Discipline. Continuation as a student of the university is dependent on the maintenance of satisfactory grades and conformity to the rules of the institution.

Replaces: 3359-60-03.4
Effective: 01/31/2015
Certification: ________________________________
Ted A. Mallo
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Board of Trustees
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Academic Policies Committee Statement on 2019 Workload Policy

The Academic Policies Committee (APC) is a committee of Faculty Senate that—among other things—is tasked with reviewing and recommending policy changes that have an impact on individual academic programs as well as the overall academic mission of the University of Akron. Policy shifts that can improve or damage the academic integrity of the University and its programs are vetted by members of APC to ensure that the best possible practices are put forth, with the goal of maintaining and advancing the University’s academic reputation and attracting and retaining students, both of which are interrelated agendas.

In the spirit of shared governance, we respectfully request that the UA Leadership team delay the implementation of any workload policy in order to continue to work with units to develop workload policies that reflect the academic mission of each unit. The workload guidelines distributed by the administration on 8.26.19 categorize units with “similar missions.” These reductive categorizations are not in line with the board rule descriptions on workload. The guidelines do not provide an explanation for how units were deemed similar to other units, nor a transparent pathway for changing categories.

The APC hopes that the UA Leadership team will break the cycle of rushed administrative decisions whose wider implications have not been considered and discussed by the appropriate bodies on campus. Many of these rushed administrative decisions have had to be walked back or abandoned, but not without considerable damage to the University’s reputation.

The recent proposed changes to UA’s workload policy threaten to be another rushed policy whose broader impact will likely do further damage to the University’s reputation and, most importantly, to the ability of faculty to mentor, train, attract, and retain students.

APC will be happy to share with the administration examples of the ways in which the proposed increase in teaching load and its corresponding de-emphasis on research and service will—without a doubt—decrease the quality of education students receive at the University of Akron.
The intent of this resolution is to change the wording in University regulation 3359-20-6.1, Section (H)3. This section refers to the “planning and budget committee” of Faculty Senate, which no longer exists. We would like to replace that committee with the Budget and Finance committee of University Council.

Rough draft of resolution:

Whereas, The Faculty Senate has approved wording changes to OGC Rule 3359-20-6.1, Section (H), (2)(a)(i), (2)(b)(i), (2)(c)(i), and (3), and,

Whereas, The Budget and Finance Committee of Faculty Senate in the aforementioned section (3) no longer exists, therefore, be it

Resolved, That OGC Rule 3359-20-6.1 (H)(3) be amended by the Board of Trustees as follows:

Salary ranges in all part-time categories shall be reviewed annually by the planning and budget committee of University Council.
Senate Resolution regarding Administration Teaching Assignment
October 3, 2019

Whereas, The University identified undergraduate teaching as a priority in its 3-Year Action Plan;

Whereas, Student time spent with full-time faculty has been shown to significantly contribute to student success;

Whereas, Most administrators at the University either hold faculty rank or are qualified to teach an undergraduate-level course; and

Whereas, Many units on campus have an unmet need for undergraduate instructors, and undergraduate students would benefit from the instruction that many in the administration could provide; therefore, be it

Resolved, That The University of Akron Faculty Senate urges all administrators who hold faculty rank, or meet the qualifications required for undergraduate instruction in a particular discipline, teach at least one undergraduate course per year.
Faculty Research Committee
Report for Faculty Senate
March, 2019

The Faculty Research Committee met in the College of Arts and Sciences Building Room 124 for their Spring Decision Meeting on Friday, March 15. The committee met to select the summer 2019 fellowship winners.

Fellowship winners for Summer 2019 (all at $10,000)

Barton, Hazel
Bastidas, David
Bisconti, Toni
Farhad, Siamak
Giffels, David
Klein, Janet
Kocsis, Jin
Kolodziej, Matthew
Makarius, Erin
Patton, Rikki
Peng, Zhenmeng
Reif, Angela
Tan, Kwek-Tze
Triece, Mary

Submitted by James Diefendorff, FRC Chair
Submission Deadline (due by 4:00 p.m.): Friday, January 25, 2019

Award Information and General Eligibility
- Maximum Amount: $10,000
- Proposals from all disciplines are welcome!
- All full-time tenure-track and non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty are encouraged to apply. Faculty who receive summer fellowships in the previous two consecutive years are ineligible this year. See full details below.
- Certain types of research grants and certain items within approved proposals are ineligible. See full details below.

General Information
Program Title: UA Faculty Research Committee Summer Fellowship

Faculty Research Committee
The University of Akron annually provides funds for faculty research summer fellowships. The Faculty Research Committee (FRC) is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate and members are appointed by the Executive Committee. The FRC is composed of representatives from the various colleges and is charged with evaluating proposals submitted by the faculty and determining which of these will be funded.

The Office of Research Administration (ORA) is responsible for the administration of this program on behalf of the FRC.

Description of FRC Summer Fellowship Program
The goal of the program is to support and encourage the development of strong programs of research by faculty members throughout the University. It is recognized that the nature of research varies significantly from discipline to discipline. In the evaluation of the research proposals, the reviewers attempt to judge the merits of each proposal from the perspective of what would be considered significant research within the field from which the proposal is submitted.

Grants for this program, in the majority of situations, are intended to support the development of new programs of research and creative scholarship. In this sense, the grants may be considered “seed money” for research in that they should lead to the growth and development of continuing programs of research. They are not a source of funds for programs already developed to a level that normally would justify support from external agencies. Certain types of research grants and certain items within approved proposals are not considered eligible for funding from this program.
Eligibility – Full Details

1. All full-time tenure-track and NTT faculty are encouraged to apply. Faculty who receive summer fellowships in two consecutive years are ineligible in the third year. The Committee will consider exceptions only in extraordinary circumstances. Those ineligible to apply for these fellowships include (a) administrators with more than four credit hours of summer administrative duty and (b) Visiting Professors.

- A principal investigator who has not submitted a final report, or is in deficit with a previous FRC award is ineligible.
- Certain types of research grants and certain items within approved proposals are ineligible. These are:
  a. Publication charges for papers, articles or books.
  b. Research or other work to be submitted by the faculty members as part of a degree requirement.
  c. Work by students or others without substantial involvement by the faculty member.
  d. Long-term projects that have received or will require repeated support from the Committee.
  e. Commercial ventures.
  f. Administrative aspects and/or writing of proposals.
  g. Expenses for attendance at professional meetings. (This is considered a departmental responsibility.)
  h. Work intended solely to improve the teaching skills or resources of the faculty members. However, the Committee may support proposals concerning the scholarship of teaching. To qualify, the outcomes of the proposed research project should be generalizable and applicable beyond the participants in the project. The researcher should have a plan to disseminate project findings to an audience outside The University of Akron.
Proposals focusing on course improvement or curriculum development without the above focus are more appropriate for submission to the Institute for Teaching and Learning.

**Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions**

In preparing proposals for this program, applicants should remember that the members of the Faculty Research Committee who will be reviewing proposals (usually 20 – 30 members) come from a wide variety of backgrounds. It is very important that the applicants be able to communicate the proposed research and the significance of this research to scholars from other disciplines, as well as provide enough detail to permit technical evaluation by those more familiar with the area.

- The formal requirements for proposals are given below and follow the checklist provided on the coversheet. Proposals must follow these guidelines.

- Proposals are to be submitted as a single pdf document, via email, to RschSrVsGA8@uakron.edu.
- Use a 12 point font for the proposal, with 1-inch margins.
- The proposal must be in full-page format (no columns).
- A proposal coversheet must be signed by Chair and Dean.
- The Research Plan is limited to 7 pages.
- If you are submitting a revision of a previously unfunded proposal, please explain in detail (in bold face type) the specific changes that you made per the Committee’s recommendations, if any.

**Required Format**

1. **Application Checklist.** Complete the checklist. This will serve as the first page of the proposal. Submit a pdf of the completed proposal (including the fully signed checklist), and any appendices, to the Office of Research Administration (ORA) at RschSrVsGA8@uakron.edu by 4:00 pm on 1/25/2019.

   A single copy of appendix materials that cannot be scanned must be delivered to the ORA office located in Polsky Building Suite 284, by 4:00 pm on the deadline date.

2. **Budget Page with Justification.** This is the application’s second page. The Summer Fellowship can be used entirely for salary support or can be split between salary and other research-related expenses. Please provide a clear justification for the need for summer salary. Please justify money for other expenses (e.g., purchases, travel).

3. **Non-Technical Abstract (not to exceed 300 words).** The abstract provides elementary review of the proposal content and must be easily understood by diverse reviewers.

4. **Research Plan.** This entire section (a-i) must not exceed 7 single-spaced pages. The Research Plan is composed of the following sections:

   a. **Nature of the Research and Significance.** This is the description of the research and should include an introduction suitable for the diverse faculty grant reviewers, a summary of what you intend to do, how it relates generally to research or creative work in your field, and why it is significant. If applicable, describe consortia or collaborative research arrangements involved in your project.

   b. **Goals and Objectives.** The research program must be clearly defined. In the case of quantitative research, you should specify the hypotheses being tested or the questions being asked. In other fields describe the basic ideas, problems, works or questions the study will examine, and explain the planned approach or line of thought.

   c. **Procedures.** This section should provide a detailed description of what you propose to do, including (as appropriate) methods, techniques, equipment and facilities available for the project.
For all proposals, a timetable for completing the work is essential (e.g., a writing schedule, data collection schedule). Proposals involving quantitative measures should use the Systems International (SI) units in Federal guidelines.

d. **Expected Results and Data Analysis.** This section should describe the types of results that are expected and how the data will be analyzed. Good data often has preset limits that are used to confirm or reject your hypotheses.
e. **Publication or Presentation.** In what form will the results of the research be communicated and to what audience? Explain how this is viewed as substantive in your unit’s RTP and/or merit guidelines.

f. **Feasibility of the Project.** This includes the consideration of the background and expertise of the proposer as they relate to the project. Discuss as applicable access to primary sources such as archives, travel, and foreign languages needed along with your competence in them. A list of your previous work or research relevant to the proposal should be included. This section should assure the reviewers that you have the ability and/or the experience to complete the proposed research successfully.

g. **Pertinent bibliography.** This generally consists of 5 to 10 references in the field of study, but can occasionally be longer.

h. **Collaborators.** Please list all collaborators (and their roles) in this research proposal. FRC reviewers may not collaborate or submit proposals.

i. **Funding Status.** Please list current funding, pending funding with status, and any start-up funding.

*This is the end of the Research Plan, limited to 7 single-spaced pages*

5. **Previous, Current, or Future Efforts to Obtain External Funding for this Research.**

a. One of the purposes of the Faculty Research Committee is to provide seed money for research with potential for external funding. This section helps to assure that the faculty member is thinking along these lines. If the proposed research is in any way related to other external funding that has been planned, proposed or funded, explain how the projects relate. Failure to address this section will significantly decrease your score.

b. Summary of funding and results of any previous University of Akron Faculty Research Committee support. If prior support has been received from the Committee, a short summary of the amount of funding, a sentence or two describing results, and a listing of any publications or proposals (submitted and/or funded) should be included. If funding was received from the Committee within the previous three years for a similar project, explain how this proposed project is different.

c. Proposers who are submitting to outside agencies substantially similar proposals in the same cycle as this proposal should note this in the FRC proposals. In the event that such an outside application is successful, it is required that the committee be notified immediately. At that point a further review will determine whether there is substantial overlap in the budgets; if there is, the committee may, depending on individual circumstances, require the proposer to relinquish the Summer Fellowship. Violation of this requirement may result in the proposer being ineligible to receive future funding from this committee.

d. Recipients of FRC Summer Fellowships are required to present the results of their research at an on-campus venue.

6. **Vita.** There is a two-page limit. Focus on the aspects of your vita significant to the proposed research.

7. **Appendix.** Survey or data collection instruments that are being developed for the proposed project should be submitted at the end of the proposal as appendix materials. These materials are not counted in the 7-page limit.

8. **Institutional Committee Approvals.** If the research requires approval from Biohazard, Radiation Safety, Human, or Animal Committee(s), the protocol for such approval must be submitted with the proposal. The protocol will be forwarded to the appropriate University committee if the proposal is selected for funding. Regulatory committee approval is required before any work can begin.

All proposals are reviewed by the members of the Faculty Research Committee. All proposals must be written so that committee members of diverse academic backgrounds understand the project and its significance. Proposals that only include highly technical details and discipline-specific jargon may be returned without a review.
Proposals are reviewed for their strengths and weaknesses in three areas: (1) significance, (2) methods, and (3) additional reasons to support the project. Each category has a maximum of five points for a potential total score of 15. Below are anchors for the 0-5 scale used for each of the three areas:

- Score of 5 ~ Truly excellent, no critical weaknesses.
- Score of 4 ~ Very strong with very few weaknesses.
- Score of 3 ~ Strong, but with some weaknesses.
- Score of 2 ~ Some positive features, but with significant weaknesses.
- Score of 1 ~ Several critical weaknesses.
- Score of 0 ~ Inadmissible.

Please note that decimals are allowed in the scoring.

### Award Notification and Administration

- All persons submitted proposals will be notified of the FRC’s decision.
- Awards are generally made within six to eight weeks after the proposal submission deadline.
- The ORA will set up an account specifically for each funded proposal.
- Unsuccessful applicants may request FRC committee comments (email: RschSrvsGA8@uakron.edu)

### Award Conditions

1. Paid assistants must be University of Akron students.
2. University travel regulations apply, and costs for travel to conduct research must be at the lowest reasonable rates.
3. Upon completion of the project, equipment becomes the property of the department or any other university unit designated by the Committee.
4. Faculty members who receive summer fellowships are permitted to teach **no more than four (4) credit hours in the summer**. Those ineligible to apply for these fellowships include (a) administrators with more than four credit hours of summer administrative duty and (b) Visiting Professors.
5. Publications must credit support from the Committee with wording similar to, “Financial support for this research was received from the Faculty Research Committee of The University of Akron.”
6. If the faculty’s research grant account becomes overdrawn, it is the responsibility of the faculty member or his/her department to cover the overage.
7. The FRC will not review or fund any proposals in which the principal investigator is in a deficit with a previous FRC award. Also, the funds awarded by this Committee will not be used to pay off any grant(s) that are in a deficit.

### Reporting Requirements

A final report, [http://www.uakron.edu/research/ora/docs/FRC_FinalReport.pdf](http://www.uakron.edu/research/ora/docs/FRC_FinalReport.pdf) (generally one page in length) must be submitted to the Office of Research Administration at the end of the funded period of time. The report should
include a listing of publications, grant proposals submitted, additional funding received, and other significant outcomes from the research.

**FRC Contacts**

General inquiries regarding this program should be made to:

- James M. Diefendorff, Chair, x-7317, email: jdiefen@uakron.edu.

For questions regarding viewing sample awarded proposals, receiving committee feedback, award set-up, contact:

- ORA Assistant, x-7774, email: RschSrsvsGA8@uakron.edu.

For technical questions relating to forms, Brightspace, award-setup, or other ORA administrative components of the FRC, contact:

- Kathee Evans, ORA Coordinator, x-8579, e-mail: Kathee@uakron.edu.
**Graduate Council Report to Faculty Senate**

Graduate Council met on 9/23. Dean Midha delivered his report, describing budget deficits and budget cuts across departments (not equal and determined, in part, by student and faculty count), decreased enrollments (10% decrease for graduate students at 140 day count), faculty voluntary retirement (n=41), new hires over the next year (N=17), and upcoming searches. GC members volunteered to fill positions for vice chair, secretary, and three standing committees (Curriculum Committee, Graduate Faculty Membership Committee, and Student Policy Committee).

New business:

- Accelerating Combined Undergrad/Grad Degrees with Double Counting with focus on identifying inclusion criteria of “exceptionally well-prepared students.”
- Program Review Timeline with three GC members volunteering to participate on the CRC and independent assessments of program review reports.

Written report submitted by Chris Graor