

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

11-7-2002

## Faculty Senate Chronicle November 7, 2002

Heather M. Loughney

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

*Corrected*



2002-2003, No. 3

November 7, 2002

59 Pages

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 7, 2002	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of November 7, 2002	
A. Final draft - 3359-20-031, <u>Salaries (Full-time faculty)</u>	26
B. Report of <i>University Well-Being Committee</i>	33
C. Report of <i>Graduate Council</i>	36
D. Report of <i>Academic Policies &amp; Calendar Committee</i>	
1. Bypassed Credit Policy	38
2. Recommendation and Academic Calendar	39
E. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	41
F. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	47
G. Report of <i>University Libraries Committee</i>	49
H. Report of <i>Faculty Research Committee</i>	53
I. Report of <i>Planning and Budgeting Committee</i>	55
J. Report of <i>Ohio Faculty Council</i>	57

---

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Dr. Elizabeth Kennedy (x6932)  
[facultysenate@uakron.edu](mailto:facultysenate@uakron.edu)

## **MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 2002**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 7, 2002, in Room 202 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education by Faculty Senate Chair Dan Sheffer.

Fifty-two of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Garcia, Kennedy, Matney, Stinner, Walker, and Wilkinson were absent with notice. Senators Calvo, Graham, Redle, Soucek, and Trotter were absent without notice.

### **SENATE ACTIONS**

- \* APPROVED APCC'S CHANGES TO RULE 3359-20-031 SALARIES, FULL-TIME FACULTY, AS AMENDED.**
- \* APPROVED MOTION THAT THE WELL-BEING COMMITTEE AND THE FACULTY SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL TAKE UNDER ACTION HOUSE BILL 173.**
- \* APPROVED INCLUSION OF ONE ELECTED RETIREE REPRESENTATIVE TO WELL-BEING COMMITTEE.**
- \* APPROVED RECOMMENDATION THAT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINT A TASK FORCE WHICH WILL INCLUDE AT LEAST TWO MEMBERS OF APCC TO INVESTIGATE ISSUES RELATED TO THE CALENDAR RESULTING FROM THE CREATION OF THE 15-WEEK SUMMER SESSION.**
- \* APPROVED PROPOSED 2003-04 CALENDAR AND REFERRED THE PRELIMINARY 2004-05 CALENDAR TO THE TASK FORCE.**
- \* APPROVED CFPC RESOLUTIONS REGARDING SPACE REALLOCATIONS.**
- \* APPROVED LIBRARY RESOLUTION REGARDING LIBRARY BUDGET.**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Chair Sheffer called for approval of the meeting's agenda. Senator Lee moved to amend the agenda so that Unfinished Business would immediately



follow the Special Announcements and come before Reports. This was because the Senate had some items that had been pending since last May which really needed to be addressed. Senator Norfolk seconded this motion, and the body voted its approval.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF OCT. 3, 2002** - As Secretary Kennedy was absent, Chair Sheffer reported one correction. This was on page 29 of the Chronicle. Senator Norfolk's name had been misspelled; this had been corrected. The body then voted its approval of the minutes.

**III. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS** - Chair Sheffer introduced a new Senator, Maryhelen Kreidler, from Nursing. Senators welcomed her with a warm round of applause. Next, the Chair called for approval the Fall 2002 Commencement Candidates. Marilyn Quillin had the list with her. Senator Harp made the motion to approve; Senator John seconded the motion. The body then voted its approval of the candidates.

**IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - The first item of unfinished business was from the APCC, the final draft of 3359-20-031, Salaries full-time faculty (**Appendix A**). Chair Sheffer asked Assoc. Provost Stokes to lead the Senate through this.

Associate Vice Provost Stokes began by stating that Senators would recall a Salaries Task Force established Fall of 2001, charged with tying together the merit increases process with the salary rule as it existed. That task force presented its findings to the Academic Policies & Calendar Committee early in 2002, and APCC determined that it did not like it in that form and wanted to review it some more. So APCC worked on the document all through Spring 2002 and presented it to Faculty Senate in May 2002, and it was postponed until October. In October we ran out of time at that meeting. Thus, the proposal was the draft Senators had had since that time.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion. Senator Witt stated he had a few items which he would take in reverse order, starting with I(4), "Merit procedures shall require that each recommending person or body provide to the faculty member a written explanation of the merit award recommendation." As written, this seemed that there would be three or four letters that would come our way for each faculty member every year; each recommending person - our department head, our chair, our dean. The intent here was for this to happen? This appeared cumbersome, especially in years when the merit pool might not reach the previous year's inflation rate. It would cost more money to write the letters than would be obtained by the raise. Therefore, he proposed the following motion: Replace the words, "each recommending person or body" with the definitions from (C), which was "department chairs, school directors, or deans in colleges without departments." This was seconded by Senator Rasor-Greenhalgh.



Senator W.Yoder then asked whether there could be differences between the letters from deans and department chairs in situations where two letters were written? Assoc. Provost Stokes stated that there would not be a dean's letter unless it was a college without a department. No further discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the amendment with only one nay vote.

Senator Witt continued with I(5) and H(6) which had to do with the appeals process. Both of those elements asked for an appeals process, one for the annual evaluation procedure and then one for the merit procedure. Earlier on in the document, if faculty approved these procedures through deliberation and a vote, most of these arguments would have been resolved in discussions. This would then make an appeal most likely unnecessary. All the faculty would know what to expect from the merit document they created. A grievance, on the other hand, could be filed if those approved procedures were somehow violated, and that would not be an appeal but a regular grievance procedure. And that worked for both H(6) and I(5). In the case of I(5), only in cases where there was violation of faculty-approved merit procedures would a hearing of some kind be necessary. That would fall under existing grievance procedures. He then proposed an amendment to change the wording in H(6) to read, "Annual evaluations are subject to regular faculty grievance procedures." Then also amend I(5) to read, "Merit awards are subject to regular faculty grievance procedures."

This amendment was seconded by Senator R. Huff. The Chair called for discussion. Senator Lee asked for a better description of the regular grievance procedure for comparison to this amendment.

Senator Witt stated he could speak to that. Up to now without this document, there had been no way to grieve a merit increase, to have that reviewed. There were not mandated procedures in the Faculty Manual. Now that they were there, those procedures like any other rule pertaining to faculty could be reviewed and assessed through the Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee. This was pretty well spelled out in the Faculty Manual. Assoc. Provost Stokes added that some colleges had appeals committees that allowed for these kinds of things.

Senator Braun had a question. Could the grievances be only of a procedural nature, or could they be of substantive nature? In the RTP process the grievance was only of a procedural nature. Only the process and not the content could be disputed. To him, that was bothersome. His point was that procedure meant the correct procedure had not been followed. Most of the time the correct procedures were followed, and the problem resided with the decision itself. He would want to be able to actually dispute the decision itself. So the grievances had to be both procedural and substantive in nature. The person who wanted to take action on the grievance had to be able to dispute both the procedure and the decision itself as being followed.

Senator Witt argued that he was having a hard time understanding this. How could we argue that we should get more money out of a merit pool if we in fact knew in advance what we



had to do to achieve additional merit points? Senator Braun replied that it was a matter of principle, not a matter of a particular thing. A matter of principle of how the system should be set, that maybe no salary increase was fine. The point was that the principle had to be there in case a faculty member felt wronged. That was what he was advocating.

Senator Jordan then asked whether this were an appeals process within the unit making the decision, whereas the grievance process would be a grievance from the decision that the unit was making? If this was correct, it would eliminate a consideration point by simply going to a grievance process. It was an important decision.

Senator Witt added that the way the rules were written, the appeal would have to be outside the unit and not within it. Assoc. Provost Stokes stated that that was incorrect; the appeals was within the unit.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on this amendment. The motion failed, 24 against and 16 in favor.

Senator Witt then stated that he had one more amendment. This was in D(2), "Academic units may use information from more than one year of annual evaluations in determining salary adjustments." He needed some clarification by what was meant here. Could we in fact, for example, save up achievements and wait for a robust merit pool?

Senator Hebert offered an example from the Business School which used a rolling 3-year average in taking a look at research. Things could be looked at over a longer period of time. Assoc. Provost Stokes concurred that that was what was meant by this item.

Senator J. Yoder then proposed an alternative to part (D), which stated, "Salary adjustments shall be based on merit." The alternative she proposed would state, "Salary adjustments shall be based at least in part on merit." This would allow use of a full merit criteria if so desired but would give more flexibility for departments and units that might want to use it for something beyond merit. Senator Hebert seconded this amendment.

Senator Gerlach supported the motion but wished it were a little bit more forceful so that it read, "Salary adjustments shall be based on merit and cost of living items." He stated this because he was speaking from what he regarded as his experience as the body's retiree Senator. In 30 some years at this University he had experienced both of these conditions. In more recent years the focus was supposedly exclusively on merit, which he thought unfortunate. Merit was in the eye of the beholder and not always impartial.

Senator Gerlach then quoted Diomedes, "Eyes and ears are poor witnesses when the soul is barbarous." On some occasions unfortunately we had had too many instances of barbarous souls at work. Some combination of these things was the way to go; it was the middle way. He thought it extremely cruel and callous not to make allowances for cost of living. If a faculty



member was doing conscientiously his duty, not neglectful in any way and taught his classes, he did not always have a fruitful year in which he had published a dozen books or even one. Yet those who bore down on the publishing would hold him or her to that and say there was no extraordinary merit and therefore no other consideration. That was highly unfair and demoralizing. Therefore, he felt the motion which he supported could be made better. He did not feel it was up to him to do that given his status as a retiree; he was just giving advice.

Chair Sheffer asked whether Senator Gerlach was putting this forth as a friendly amendment to the last impart on merit. Senator Gerlach replied he hesitated to do so based on the virtue of his being a retiree but suggested that if any Senator believed this, he/she might more suitably make that motion.

Senator J. Yoder then stated that her intent was to allow for 100% merit as an option, but to allow then for other possibilities in addition to that. She wanted to keep this motion as it stood at this point unless someone wanted to offer an alternative. No Senator, however, proposed this motion. Therefore, the Chair directed the body's attention back to Senator J. Yoder's original amendment, "Salary adjustments shall be based at least in part on merit."

No further discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote and the Senate passed this amendment.

Senator Witt continued with a motion to delete the statement from H(1)(a) regarding, "An abstention, while allowed, shall be considered as a negative vote."

The Chair called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval of this amendment. Senator Gerlach then proposed an additional amendment to H(7). He wished to strike the word "time" from the phrase, "time period." Senator Gunn seconded this motion. Senate approved this amendment.

Senator Gerlach had another motion regarding item G on the second page. He urged the original edition of Robert's Rules, one that was consistent with the University Senate's bylaws. This original Robert's was the simplified rule book and it was all that we ever needed. Therefore, he made a motion that the original version of Robert's Rules of Order be accepted instead of the most recent edition. Senator Sugarman seconded this motion.

Senator Hebert then asked for a point of clarification. Typically, when things were updated, it was for clarification. What was the reason that it was not getting better as opposed to getting worse? Senator Gerlach replied that based on his experience, the answer was that it got more and more complicated, complications that were unneeded. Assoc. Provost Stokes added that the RTP process was ruled by the most recent edition of Robert's Rules as determined by the Faculty Senate last year. This was not a Senate rule; this was a University rule. It was not a Senate bylaw so it did not require action. Senator Dechambeau then stated that if electronic



voting or anything else electronic took place, the new rules would take precedence over the old rules.

A vote was then taken on this amendment; the motion failed.

Senator W. Yoder then asked that since Senate had removed under 1(a) the reference to abstentions, were there any guidelines in this document to the colleges about how abstentions could be handled? Assoc. Provost Stokes replied, stating that Robert's Rules handled this too. To which Senator Sterns asked whether the Senate had not had a discussion about a year ago on this very point. Chair Sheffer stated, yes, the Senate had had this discussion. Senator Sterns replied that he thought the Senate had decided that an abstention was not a negative vote. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that Robert's Rules stated that - an abstention was a non-vote.

Chair Sheffer called for further discussion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken on the proposed rule changes. The motion passed with one nay vote.

The Chair then directed the body's attention to the second item of old business. This was a request made by Senator Gerlach at the September meeting. The request was to amend the composition of the University Well-Being Committee so that one Senate representative from the Retirees Assoc. be added as a member of that committee. Senate referred this to the University Well-Being Committee which at last month's meeting of the Senate indicated they would like to introduce this as an amendment if the wording were changed to one representative *elected* by the Retirees Assoc. The simple addition amendment was now on the floor. A motion was now needed to amend the amendment to read, "one representative elected by the Retirees Assoc. Senator Erickson so moved; Senator Steiner seconded her motion. Senator Sugarman asked whether the amendment could be put forward as a friendly amendment. Chair Sheffer replied affirmatively.

Senator Hebert asked for clarification. Would the Retirees Assoc. member be a voting or non-voting member? Chair Sheffer replied that the member would be a voting member.

Senator Harp asked what the composition of the committee was, and who was on it? Senator Erickson replied that the Well-Being Committee was not a Faculty Senate committee but a separately elected committee. As a University committee, it represented all of the constituencies that were represented in the Senate. There was an elected representative from each of the colleges, a representative from contract professionals, from the staff; this would be an extra representative for the retirees. The argument given was that retirees represented a constituency whose well-being was directly affected by the University policy. Faculty members hired before 1992 had their dependents covered by University health insurance upon their retirement. At present there were over 700 persons using this insurance, half over and half under 65. In the future this number may be greater. The committee considered they should have a vote on issues relating to well-being. They also noted that emeritus retirees had other items that related to well-



being - parking, office space, etc. Therefore, the committee considered that they too met the requirements of the constituency whose direct interests were under this particular committee.

Senator Harp expressed concern, as he had done previously with the election from the Retirees Assoc. with dues paying. He thought that all retirees should have the right to vote if this was representing the constituency, just as all staff had the right to vote for staff, all faculty had the right to vote for faculty.

Senator Erickson then pointed out that the staff representatives came from SEAC and she did not know whether all staff automatically belong to SEAC. Senator Schmith replied that SEAC members were elected by the staff.

Senator Erickson then asked Senator Harp whether he wished to make an amendment. He replied that he did not.

Senator Sugarman then spoke, stating that right now there was no representative from the retirees and they did have some interests. Dr. Erickson had invited her to attend some of the meetings so that she could get that information, but without a retiree representative on the Well-Being Committee there was no guaranteed procedure for retirees to comment on any changes that affected them or to give any input and suggestions to the committee. There was no way for communication to take place between that committee and the retirees. She urged all to please vote for that.

She then addressed the idea of all retirees voting of this issue. She thought, procedurally, it would be impossible. Who would pay for it? And how would contact with every single retiree be made? We had the addresses of members of the organization, but not everyone contacted had joined. There were also people that the Assoc. could not find. Senator Sterns interjected that the Dept. of Lifespan and Gerontology maintained a mailing list for all University retirees. His unit sent mail to them; there was a new list that did exist.

Senator Dalton then had one more point. Senator Erickson had stated that the Well-Being Committee represented all constituencies that had interest in University well-being issues. However, there was no student on the committee. While Senator Erickson concurred with Senator Dalton, he did not offer this as a motion to the body.

No further discussion forthcoming on the motion to amend the membership for the University Well-Being Committee by adding an elected representative for the Retirees Assoc., a vote was taken. With only three nays, the Chair stated that this motion passed by the required 60% of the votes of the members of the Faculty Senate who were casting votes.



## V. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Chair Sheffer gave the report in place of Secretary Kennedy. The Executive Committee met twice during the month of November, once with committee members only, and once with President Proenza, Provost Hickey, and Mrs. Becky Herrnstein. Discussion at those meetings centered primarily on two issues in the budget memo sent from VP of Business and Finance and Chief Financial Officer Roy Ray in the Email Digest dated Oct. 16. As Senators recall, this memo outlined the University's current budget situation and reported three actions that were to go into effect immediately. The Executive Committee had a concern over notification and timing of the memo. Specifically, our question was, why didn't the PBC as the planning and budgeting committee of the Senate, receive notification first, especially given that their next meeting was the following morning? Apparently, it was a timing issue, that of trying to get the information out to as many as possible simultaneously. Also, these measures were part of discussions that had taken place in the PBC. Vice President Ray thought they had been discussed; this was not a deliberate avoidance of the PBC on his part. Secondly, the Balanced Scorecard initiative was addressed. Group discussion of the status of the University project occurred with the Executive Committee providing feedback as to how the special meeting held in October had been received by Senators and other faculty present. Some future goals were outlined for the Executive Committee as well. Finally, the Executive Committee had referred to APCC, CRC and PBC the college proposal from Director Dale Mugler to study the feasibility and report back to the APCC.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - Chair Sheffer then invited President Proenza to deliver his remarks to the body.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In the same spirit that our good colleague Senator Gerlach offered an amendment to remove time from time period, I might suggest - what was that phrase you used, Senator Gerlach, 'Believe you me.'

Colleagues, good afternoon, and let me share a couple of points of information with you. As you know, our nation, our state, has been occupied for the last several months with political campaigns for various offices. Those were concluded a few days ago, and so we move forward. Importantly for this body and for this University is the fact that during this campaign for the first time in a long time it was a consistent evidence of higher education being on the minds of most of our potentially-to-be- elected officials that is noteworthy. The first year I was in Ohio I don't believe that a single elected official honored in any campaign speech or in any related rhetoric the words higher education, or university, or college, etc. Two years ago during the midterm elections I daresay that mention was minimal, if at all.

By contrast, during this election I think you saw that very prominently an issue. I certainly didn't count and compile a statistical profile, but it was very prominent. Certainly in gubernatorial candidates, certainly in many of the state and Senate representative bodies, it is on the public agenda.



The Governor during his own statements which presumably we can now look for some action, talked about two issues, one very encouraging, one troubling. The encouraging part is that he intended, and I stress continues to intend to propose a budget for the next biennium which would include an increase for higher education. I look forward to seeing what his recommendation is and will endeavor to work with him and his staff as well as with the Board of Regents to be sure that the recommendation from his office is as high as it can possibly be, and to subsequently work with our legislative representatives to see that appropriate special allocations that might come to The University of Akron are considered seriously.

The second recommendation is a little less appealing, and that is that both in Mr. <sup>Hugan</sup> Higgins' remarks and of course he is unable to act upon those, but also in Mr. Taft's remarks was the notion that some form of tuition caps might return. Please do not misunderstand me, I am not in favor of just raising tuition for the sake of raising tuition. That is wholly inappropriate. The facts of the condition of our state are very simply these: The state's per capita support for higher education ranks 41st in the nation. The state's average expenditure net cost of providing a higher education are slightly below the national average. But because state appropriations are 41st well below the national average, is it any surprise that tuition is the 8th highest in the nation and I think rose to 7th this past year? No, no surprise. The single most cited reason in every state I've been following to find information about rising tuition costs in public education is diminished state appropriations, pure and simple. So again, in that context, the suggestion that tuition caps might return are troubling, not just for the sake of tuition caps, per se, because without the accompanying increase in state support, tuition caps would not be answered.

You also are well aware that because we have such a range of tuitions in the state, from 7,600 at one end to about 3,800 at the lower end, imposing a percentage cap on tuition is grossly unfair. Six percent of a large number is always a larger number than 6% of a smaller number - it follows mathematics. So in any case, let us be optimistic and let us work very hard towards enabling some dialogue. Again, I ask that if it's possible for you to personally direct a letter on your own stationery from home, etc., to your state representative or senator about higher education for the state of Ohio, I think it would be important for you to do so.

In that context, during this past several months State Representative Jim Hughes and a committee that he assembled went around the state receiving testimony about various issues regarding higher education. We were asked to present testimony, and Senior VP & Provost Hickey delivered that testimony on my behalf at Dennison University. Surprisingly, he tells me because during the time he was presenting the testimony the committee was eating their lunch, they appeared to have listened.

As a result, they invited Provost Hickey to communicate to me their desire to receive a white paper with more detail on the recommendations that I outlined in that paper as well as commentary from us on the formula. I am in the midst of preparing that document, and I have given your chairman a copy of it which I would invite him to chat with you about. It is not



ready for comprehensive circulation, but I've asked for feedback to be given back to me by November 22. At this time I will finalize the document and submit it to Representative Hughes.

The document is also being reviewed at this point by the IUC, that is the other university presidents, some of whom aren't likely to like it by the IUC legislative representatives who know more about how these messages are received, by the Board of Regents staff, and tomorrow I will be sending it to the members of the Board of Regents alone. It makes some strong recommendations, and I trust based on the input of my colleagues that they're well supported. But as with many things that we do in life, there is no guarantee of course that one particular event is the one that succeeds. Anyway, the paper is circulating, and I do invite your chairman to discuss it with you.

Let me just close with three observations about notable achievements at the University. Cynthia Capers is here, and I'm informed that you've received laudatory comments from the State Nursing Association, and congratulations on that. Equally, and is there any representative here from the College of Education? Three of you; congratulations. If I'm informed correctly, you're the first university in Ohio in recent years to receive laudatory comments on all six of the new accrediting performance standards that the NCATE examines. More to the point, the representatives from the State Board of Regents who assist in this process and the State Board of Education complimented our programs and said that they would be touting them as a model to others. Last night Dean Stroble in a most appropriate way of communicating these achievements, while presiding over a dinner received three phone calls from none other than The Ohio State University, Cincinnati, and Oberlin. So we have something to teach these good people.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, it is notable that in the 2002 USA Today, the NCAA Academic Achievement Award showed The University of Akron to be ranked nationally in one of three categories of Division IA for academic performance. They finished fifth in the U.S. when comparing the graduation rates of our athletes as compared to the overall student body. Thank you, and I welcome any questions you may have."

Senator Steiner then addressed the President. As President Proenza might recall, at the last Senate meeting Senator Steiner had asked about when the previous year's budgets would be rolled over to the departments to use. Vice President Ray had indicated that there was a difficulty with PeopleSoft and that the rollover would probably happen within a week to ten days. Senator Steiner had just been informed that that still had not yet happened. Given the memo which stated that 20% of last year's budget would be held back was now in circulation, could an update be given on the status of that? President Proenza asked Mr. Hank Nettling to respond in Vice President Ray's absence. Mr. Nettling replied that the last he had heard was that the testing had been completed and budgets should be coming forward. President Proenza then asked Senator Steiner to provide his email to Mr. Nettling so that the moment it was done, Senator Steiner would have that communication.



Senator Dalton then stated he had a question about scholarship funding for academic scholarships. When he started here he received a scholarship for excellence. It was a certain amount meant to pay tuition and room and board expenses. This semester he ended up having to pay \$1,560. That was an additional scholarship he received from his fraternity. His scholarship ran out at the end of the year; it was really not going to affect him. But he was wondering about these other students coming in that had been told that that was going to cover their tuition and expenses, at the same time student activity dues were going up to pay for athletes to cover their room and board and their tuition. It seemed that a priority was being placed on athletics as opposed to our students that were coming here specifically for academics.

President Proenza addressed Senator Dalton's statement. He pointed out that the state of Maryland was considering a very large increase in tuition, something like 40%. And while that did not address his immediate concern, each time that the University increased fees, etc., we did increase the financial aid and scholarship budget. Not all scholarships covered the difference because some of them were fixed dollar amounts. Those were reviewed periodically, as for example when the endowment enabled us to adjust it to a new level or additional donations came up to par. Many scholarships were labeled tuition and would cover that tuition. Other scholarships were \$1,000 or \$5,000 scholarships. Whatever the level, and, obviously, depending on the value, it either covered a great deal or not enough. With regard to the student fees, while a certain proportion did go to athletics, it was in keeping with previous years. Again, each time there was an increase, a comparable increase was made to the student financial aid budget. We never increased a tuition without increasing the student financial aid/scholarship budget by a comparable amount.

Senator Dalton replied that he knew of scholarships that had not been adjusted for four years.

President Proenza replied that as he had said, not all of them got adjusted simultaneously. The scholarships for excellence had been a fixed-dollar amount. However, it was probably time that we did so. He then asked the Provost and Vice President Roney, both of whom were present, to be sure that all of the scholarships for tuition receive attention and review.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - The Chair then invite Provost Hickey to deliver his remarks to the Senate.

"First, so there's no misunderstanding, the calls that Dean Stroble got last night should remind you of the old Bob Newhart telephone routines, so Beth would've done Bob Newhart proud. I don't really think her phone rang, but she has actually gotten calls from all of the institutions she mentioned last night and others asking whether they could come up and essentially learn from the College of Education.

What I would like to tell you about today is the second phase of the first year's compression allocation. I see Jack Braun so I have to be very careful how I choose my words



here so that I get it correct. If you remember, we kept some money back in a reserve fund from the first phase that we did earlier in the fall semester with the understanding that once the dust settled from that, we would do a second round of allocations. There was approximately \$170,000 left in the reserve pool after the first phase of round one.

The Academic Salary Affairs Task Force decided to allocate those dollars to associate professors in the hopes of bringing associate professors to the median position among the state benchmark institutions. You'll remember that our assistant professors are at the 75th percentile of those benchmark institutions. Phase one of round one brought full professors to the median position, but only moved associate professors from the 9th position to the 8th position. Our calculation was by focusing the \$170,000 on associate professors, we could bring them to or very near the median point among our state benchmark institutions, and that is in fact what we have done.

The worksheets went out to the deans early this week. I already have several of the worksheets back, so the allocations will be made and those second-phase round one allocations will be in effect retroactive to the same start dates as phase one round one. So those getting increases will get a check sometime in the future, and I won't say when because I don't know how long it will take, but when you get it you'll have a lump sum payment going back to the retroactive start date and then your salary will be increased on a monthly basis as prescribed by the new increase.

Now the calculations that the Task Force has done, and I shared this with the campus community earlier this week in an email message, moves the average salary of associate professors from the eighth position to the sixth position in the state. Now we have to get to the fifth position to be at the median, so we didn't get quite to the median but we are approximately \$150-170 on average per associate professor away from the median position, so we came very close. We moved past Ohio University and the University of Cincinnati in our associate professors.

So after the first year's allocation of the compression money we have the full professors at the median position and we have the associate professors very close to the median position. That will end the first year's allocation.

The sum of \$1.2 million was set aside, and all but \$8,000 of that has been used. Some was kept back, again in case there are appeals that are bound to have merit that we can deal with. I'm not inviting appeals; with only \$8,000 left that won't go very far, but I hope with your understanding we are not going to do a third phase of round one to distribute \$8,000. We can add that to next year's allocation if it's not taken up in the appeals process.

Let me again thank the Academic Salary Affairs Task Force for the job they have done. It has been a very difficult and time-consuming job, and they've done an excellent job of it. Now their task is to, and I've had to keep Chand rather focused because he now wants to take



on every analyses known to man, and he can do that but we have to do them one at a time. The next task is to model what we're going to have to do on an annual basis in order to get all faculty to at least the 75th percentile, and that in turn will guide us and guide the PBC as we try to identify and set aside the amount of money necessary to continue these compression allocations until we have reached at least the 75th percentile. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Senator Hebert then addressed the Provost. There were a number of deans that were under review this year. From the faculty's perspective, that process seemed a little ambiguous. He wondered whether at this time or maybe in a published form the Provost could share with us the factors that were being considered and the weights that were attached to those factors in the reviews of deans.

To which, Provost Hickey replied that there were a standard set of questions that were sent out for people to answer. Associate Provost Stokes could certainly share copies of those questions. The Provost stated that he then looked at the input that came back from all of the stakeholders including those within the college, input from other deans, input from vice presidents, input from community members, and weigh all of that information. He could not tell what weights he put on any individual item because there were no particular weights. He looked at the information in toto and tried to make an evaluation about how well the dean was doing his or her job. So, he could not share any specific weights; he would be happy to share the questionnaires that were sent out. Those were no secret because they were sent out to a large number of people. His office had sought broad input this year from people whether we should change, add to, or amend the questions that we sent out. They had gotten some feedback and made some changes based on that feedback.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE - Senator Erickson began her report (**Appendix B**), by asking all Senators to be sure to pick up a copy of her report. It contained the recommendations that were passed in the May meeting of the Senate that related to health care. The committee was trying to follow through on those recommendations.

She continued. The committee had met twice in the past month; the chair also had met with PBC at their Sept. 24 meeting. We received reports from Desnay Lohrum from Human Resources who was the ex officio, non-voting member of our committee. She reported on enrollment and noted that the retiree dependents now had the option of staying on the PPO or with Kaiser HMO, which would reduce the cost to the University. The committee did not know yet the result of that. Only Kaiser put in a bid that was acceptable. Summa said they would do so but at a cost greater than traditional indemnity, so they were not included.

Desnay Lohrum also reported on the discussions with Steve Likovich of Watson Wyatt. Human Resources needed an effective cost-tracking system. This system was extraordinarily important if the committee tried to follow the Senate recommendations mentioned above. Steve Likovich is putting in a cost estimate. To do so, he needs an estimate of the potential health care



cost increase for next year. The Well-Being committee needs to start working on that and put bids out before spring. It needed to be taken to the Board in August.

As for the dental contract, it appeared that they were running 15% above the estimated costs. Summa, who changed its HMO for one year, added another 15%. That, in addition to all of the outside things the committee had been looking at, suggested strongly a 15% annual increase in health care costs at the moment nationwide. That meant that as it was a 2-year contract, potentially there could be a 30% increase.

She continued. The committee also had asked that PBC stay in contact with the Well-Being Committee. There should be interaction here because it was PBC that needed to make the overall decision on how much of a health care cost was to be absorbed by the University budget. This meant giving up other things as well as coming up with employee premiums. Senate recommended that there should be a cap on the percentage (as determined by the Well-Being Committee) of total medical costs to be paid by employees and that the contribution should only be initiated when we got salaries to the median. However, the committee had not yet addressed this further.

They were, however, asking PBC to give their input. As Chair, she had spoken at a meeting of PBC to recommend how much of any increase should be absorbed by the University and whether Well-Being would need to work on premiums that would reduce the benefit plan. If Senators recalled, the committee had said there should be one plan that did not involve a premium but maybe had reduced health benefits instead. We felt PBC needed to decide the overall tradeoffs necessary in the budget. So the committee has initiated dialogue with PBC.

The final item concerned trying to do something about wellness within our own University. It was very costly to outside vendors. The committee had spoken with Rachelle Kappler of Zip Fit and also our nursing representative who was prepared to be on this ad hoc committee. Anyone who had any recommendations for people to examine was being sought.

GRADUATE COUNCIL - Senator Drew began her report (**Appendix C**), by stating that Graduate Council had three items to report to the Senate. The first item was that Graduate Council at their last meeting had voted to approve curriculum proposals from Education, Engineering, and Nursing and had voted to approve revised graduate faculty membership criteria from Geology, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, Public Administration & Urban Studies, Theoretical & Applied Mathematics, Counseling, and Educational Foundations and Leadership. At that last meeting, Dr. Newkome continued the discussion of the numerous issues associated with the state imposed 85% funding cap for Ph.D. students. Dr. Newkome emphasized that the University needed to align its courses to allow for appropriate state subvention for masters- and doctoral-level courses. Also, the Graduate School would curtail stipend and tuition remission for all graduate students who were ineligible for state subvention. Accordingly, the revised rules (effective Spring semester 2003) covering graduate student tuition remission and stipends were presented for Senators' review. These rules were: 1) No scholarships for tuition remission will



be awarded after the 14th day of any semester or session; 2) Students in their first or second year of support will receive up to 15 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and over the combined summer sessions; 3) Students in their third year or greater of support will receive up to 9 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and up to 6 graduate credit hours remitted over the combined summer sessions; 4) Under no circumstances will the Graduate School provide stipends or tuition remission to a student who has acquired 174 or greater graduate credit hours, or 140 or greater graduate credit hours and has a graduate degree from another institution.

Senator Sterns then had a question for Senator Drew. He stated that there were some programs on campus that combined degrees with additional qualifications, such as the certificate in gerontology, which was always allowed for extra credit hours. What this meant was that we were closing down a very used option.

Provost Hickey then offered to explain the reasons for that, given that Dr. Newkome was not present. As far as the state was concerned once a graduate student got to 174 credit hrs., he/she did not exist. The University got no state support whatsoever for a student once he/she passed 174 credit hrs. For all sitting there thinking, how in the world could a graduate student accumulate 174 credit hrs., there were graduate students on the books with almost 300 credit hrs. taken as a graduate student. We had graduate students on the books with over 170 credit hrs. who had not gotten a masters degree yet. There were a significant number of graduate students who we were not getting any state support or credit because of the number of credit hrs. they had accumulated.

Senator Erickson then asked for a point of clarification. This was a report from the Graduate Council about rules that were apparently going into force. Did not this material have to come to the Faculty Senate? Did not this have to be passed by Faculty Senate, as it was her understanding that it did.

Senator Drew replied that she was not positive about that but could check. It had come to her from Heather Blake who was the secretary of Graduate Council. Chair Sheffer then stated that the Executive Committee would take this up at their next meeting as to whether the Senate needed to rule on this or discuss it.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Before Assoc. Provost Stokes began her report, she pointed out to the body that another item from the Salaries rule (voted upon earlier) needed to be addressed. This item was under I(1)(a) which contained a sentence about abstentions that should be eliminated. If so directed, APCC could just go ahead and do so. No objections arising from the body, Chair Sheffer asked that that be done.

Assoc. Provost Stokes began her report by stating that APCC had two items to bring to Senator's attention. In the form of a motion we had changes to the bypassed credit policy (**Appendix D1.**). This was brought to the attention of the committee to address the issue that there



was nothing in the policy that said what happened if a student was unsuccessful in their attempt at bypassed credit. So the change in the policy addressed that question and was brought to the body as a motion.

Senator Norfolk then commented on the motion. He stated that the students that he had known applied for bypassed credit after they passed the course. This was not a major thing. Students waited until they passed the course and then asked for the bypassed credit. This change was not substantial from the perspective of our courses. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that it was not the case anymore.

The Chair called for further discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote of the motion to approve the revised bypassed credit policy. The body then voted its approval.

Assoc. Provost Stokes continued by stating that the second issue was from the calendar part of APCC. Each year APCC brought to Senate a proposed calendar for the upcoming academic year and a preliminary calendar for the second year. There was considerable discussion this year over the academic calendar, particularly the starting date and the question of a break between summer session and fall semester. We had visitors from Student Affairs come and discuss this with us, and the final decision of the Calendar Committee was to present the calendar as attached (**Appendix B**). There was a week that would come between summer and fall in 2004-05 and because of the issues raised, APCC also recommends the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate appoint a task force which will include at least two members of APCC to investigate issues related to the calendar that results from the creation of 15-week summer session. That recommendation was also part of the request for approval of the proposed and preliminary calendars and this comes as a motion to Faculty Senate.

Chair Sheffer provided clarification by stating there were two motions; the first to approve the proposed calendar for 2003-04 and the preliminary 2004-05. He then called for discussion.

Senator Hebert wanted to point out to the committee that if the spring semester started on Monday, Jan. 5, we would also get a break between the spring and summer if we only took three weeks instead of four at Christmas time. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that that was correct but would mean that the faculty would only have three weeks instead of four. That was one of the issues that could be addressed by the task force, the shortening of the winter break. APCC was not prepared to recommend that as a blanket proposal without an investigation. Senator Hebert stated he would at least like some consideration to shortening the Christmas break in order to get a week between spring semester and the beginning of the summer term. It was very difficult to go through finals and start those summer sessions very quickly. They were very intense and that week was very important in terms of preparation, etc., particularly if one was teaching in the first summer session.

Senator Dalton then wanted to comment. He stated that he had been talking to a lot of students lately about the creation of a possible fall break. The fall break would probably be a



2-day break. This would be similar to such schools as Case Western that had a study period before their exams. It staggered exams but it was an idea of how to fit the calendar. Chair Sheffer indicated it would be a good idea to have student representation on the task force.

Senator Hebert then made the motion that the Spring semester be moved back a week to the 5<sup>th</sup> of January and finish on May 2, with start-up on the 10<sup>th</sup>. This was seconded by Senator Maringer.

Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that there was the consideration of graduation and commencement. EJ Thomas Hall had already been scheduled 10 years in advance. Honestly, it was for that long; it was uncertain as to whether the hall was available. So this was a serious consideration.

Senator Wyszynski spoke against the motion, suggesting that we wait to find out what other possible ramifications there were other than having to move the graduation ceremony.

Senator Lee stated that in the past there had been glitches or mismatches between the general calendar and the calendar at the Law School. He wanted to get a better chance to look at this and compare it to their current plan. Could the urgency of approving this be put off?

Senator Braun then wanted to speak against the amendment. There were colleges that were not using the first session but going to sessions 2 and 3. Between sessions 2 and 3 and the fall semester there was already just one week. Curtailing also the winter break when a lot of people actually caught up with things they were not able to do during the semester in terms of research, writing papers, and so forth, would make it very difficult to actually perform certain duties that were performed during the winter break. Alternatively, what I would like to propose would be to have a differentiated date when various colleges started for spring semester.

Chair Sheffer then pointed out to Senator Braun that he was not speaking directly to the amendment on the floor. Chair Sheffer asked whether there were anyone who wished to speak directly to the amendment.

Senator Gerlach made the motion that Senator Hebert's motion be referred to the task force and to be considered as part of this other business. Senator Dechambeau seconded the motion. However, upon discussion that Senator Gerlach's motion would result in sending the entire calendar to the task force, Senator Gerlach asked for unanimous consent from the body to withdraw his motion. However, there was one objection, so the Senate had to vote on the motion. Senator Dechambeau asked for the date that the calendar had to be fixed. Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that the Board had to approve it at the December Board meeting, which was before the next Faculty Senate meeting. Thus far, Senate had only approved the preliminary calendar.



Senator Steiner then suggested that Senate not refer this entire calendar to the committee which did not exist yet, but rather, make a decision on the 2003-04 calendar now, and perhaps at a later time refer this issue to APCC.

No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken on the motion to refer. The motion failed.

Senator Sterns then stated that one of the reasons for this long winter break was certain cost savings in heating. So the question was, was there any real cost saving as one of the reasons for this long winter break, and was this still in effect?

Senator Dalton then stated that he knew students would be in favor of it. Students only needed three weeks, in all honesty.

Senator Steiner wished to speak against the amendment. He thought at this time for the 2003-04 calendar Senate approve it as it stood but consider all the other issues raised. Those were things that should be sent with our referral to the committee.

Provost Hickey then added that at the very least, if the amendment went forward, it had to be pending the University's ability to get EJ Thomas to reschedule commencement. If we could not do that, then there was really no way to do this. Senator Hebert stated he would accept that as a friendly amendment but on the other hand did not see why the graduation immediately after the end of finals was important. If it happened the next week, it happened the next week. Provost Hickey replied that the problem was that many students would depart and we would end up with a very small graduation ceremony. Senator Hebert replied that everybody lived within 50 miles of the University. However, in deference to the Provost, he would accept the friendly amendment. This was seconded by Senator Maringer. The amended amendment was to move the start of the January 2004 semester to January 5 pending the ability to have graduation at the appropriate time, one week earlier.

Senator Harp then asked whether he could call the question on the amendment. Chair Sheffer replied that he could unless there was an objection. He could move the previous question with a two-thirds vote if it was approved. Or, he could wait until the debate was over and then we could vote on it. No further discussion forthcoming, a vote on the amendment to move the spring 2004 semester back one week pending the ability to move graduation back one week was taken. The motion failed.

Senate returned to the recommendation to approve the proposed calendar 2003-04 and preliminary calendar 2004-05.

Senator Steiner moved that the body approve the proposed 2003-04 calendar but refer the preliminary 2004-05 to the task force. Senator Erickson seconded this motion.



The body then voted its approval of this motion as well as the recommendation that the Executive Committee appoint a task force to investigate the calendar issues raised. The body approved both.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Assoc. Provost Stokes began with a point of information which had been sent to department chairs and members of colleges who did the curriculum system. The default setting and the curriculum proposal system were now set to check prereq.'s. Prior to this it was set to not automatically check prereq.'s. So if a proposal was going into the system and prereq's were not wished to be checked, there was a box that had to be clicked. This had caused considerable confusion, but the default had been changed. She would send this information out to everyone.

Next, there was a proposed change to rule 3359-20-052, curriculum changes (**Appendix E**). This was being brought as a motion from Curriculum Review Committee. It was discovered by CRC that there was no procedure by which new programs were reviewed by the University, the Curriculum Review Committee, the Provost, or anybody before the proposal went to the Ohio Board of Regents. The CRC felt that we should at least see those before they got sent off to the Board of Regents. Therefore, the committee had put language in here to accommodate that.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion. Hearing none, he called for a vote. The motion passed.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns began his report (**Appendix F**), by stating that the committee had had many follow-up activities. He was happy to report on an excellent updating session with Mr. Curtis, our Vice President for Capital Planning & Facilities Management, who brought us up-to-date on all of the activities, construction, and other issues the committee had not been apprised of for a long time. Probably the most important thing was the documentation and complete review of campus moves and space assignment. There were 8-pages worth of documented moves which he had not formally included here. He began with the first resolution: **The Faculty Senate endorses the reassignment of space in Olin, Carroll, Ayer Halls and Polsky building which resulted from the opening of the College of Arts & Sciences Building during Summer 2002. Ayer and Carroll Halls will temporarily house units being displaced when Gardner Student Center is demolished for Phase II of the Student Center project. In addition, relocations for Whitby Hall (primarily Chemical Engineering) during its renovation and moves from Leigh Hall (primarily to Polsky Building) due to the renovation are also endorsed. A full document on file with the committee.**

Senate approved this resolution.

Senator Sterns continued with the next item which was the request for incubator space. As part of the activities of The University of Akron Research Foundation, there was a formal request that the Superior Auto Body Service Building, which consists of 17,000 square feet, be



available to support activities or creating the University incubator facility for faculty and community start-up companies. So the resolution read as follows: **The Faculty Senate supports the assignment of space for the creation of a University incubator facility for faculty and community start-up companies.**

No further discussion forthcoming, the body then voted its approval of the resolution. Senator Sterns read the next CFPC resolution: **The Faculty Senate supports the assignment of service/storage space in the Student Administrative Services Building.** Senate voted its approval of the resolution.

Senator Sterns then offered some positive support to the creativity of Mr. Haskell and his associates, because in their development of the revisions and improvements in Schrank Hall N. & S. they had been able to develop an approach where people would be able to stay in their respective office areas and not have to move to temporary space. That was very helpful. That meant that the concern of the committee regarding the use of the former Psychology Counseling Clinic as a potential place for the counseling and testing bureau could now be released. Thus, the committee asked the approval for the following resolution: **The Faculty Senate supports the temporary assignment of Polsky 327 A-F and 325 F for use by Benefits Administration.**

The body voted its approval of this resolution.

Senator Sterns then congratulated George Newkome, the Provost and the President in the movement towards this incubator. It was a wonderful new step forward for our campus.

Senator Gerlach then asked whether Campus Facilities Planning Committee was considering the issue concerning Simmons Hall, or was it just killing it? Senator Sterns replied that it would be his pleasure to respond. First, based on our discussion last time, the committee had generated a document outlining the work of Donfred Gardner and forwarded that on to the President. The Simmons issue was ongoing; the committee did not discuss it at our last meeting. Senator Sterns reported that he had had a telephone conversation with President Simmons' daughter about three weeks ago. She called me about what was happening. He had made an appropriate referral to Mrs. Graves and Mr. Laguardia as well as saying that he personally would look into things himself. We were in the process of developing another statement regarding the history and reasons why the Simmons name should be perpetuated. The committee had not formally addressed it yet, however.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - Senator Harp began his report (See Appendix G). The Libraries Committee would like to confirm formally that our library no longer bought books. There was information that \$100,000 had become available from Dr. Gaylord's budget. These monies had been set aside for special projects that would take care of things in the library that Dean Del Williams had called "onesies." These would be special requests, teaching-related, and potentially research-related. But there would not be a reinstitution of the automatic purchase



plan. That would cost us. Even the paired down plan we had had for years, at least \$400,000, was not in the budget.

Senators could review this on the expenditures page (pg. 50). The \$36,000 Senators saw there should cover a few monograph series. These were ongoing commitments to be sure that the monograph series continued. A noteworthy fact came from Associate Dean Roger Durbin of the library. This was that, if the current rate of serials' inflation continued, even if we only bought serials and no books, the library acquisitions budget would virtually deplete our library acquisitions budget in the next five years. That says something about the rate of inflation in general. This was obviously an enormous danger to our institution for undergraduate programs, for graduate programs, for everything. The committee thought it to be out of sync with our desire to be a premiere university in Ohio.

Senator Harp then referred to his written report. The attached data, put together by our librarians, would track expenditures for the past ten years. The tables provide a look at where we stood vis-a-vis other institutions including those we would consider already to be our inferiors, certainly our desired inferiors over the next ten years. The institution to keep an eye on was Cincinnati, which by and large doubled us in all respects, since that was the kind of institution we aspire to be.

He continued by stating that the Libraries Committee had not decided to recommend some kind of short-term fix. We intended to come in every year or two or three to recommend some kind of "bandaid," forcing money to be moved from personnel, which was already pathetic. The Libraries Committee would be supportive of any short-term budget, should Dr. Gaylord come up with another \$300,000. The committee did want to focus the Senate's attention on the possibility of a longer-term solution, one tied to the norms of the Association of Research Libraries and to this resolution: **The Libraries Committee strongly recommends that the Faculty Senate charge the Planning and Budgeting Committee to ensure sufficient funding to raise the library within the next decade to the status of a research library as defined by the Association of Research Libraries.**

He had seen different norms as to how much that would cost. He had been told it was \$12 million. Kent right now, skating on past success and beefing up their budget with gathering old volumes in, was getting by with \$8 million. But our library budget was still only \$5-6 million; we were bested by Kent by about \$2-3 million per annum. In short, the Libraries Committee believed strongly that the library must be treated as a fundamental part of attaining status as a premiere research university. It was as important as salaries, benefits, an adequate physical plant, and strong academic programs. Without a strong library we could not be a strong university.

On the second issue, the Libraries Committee also discussed various proposals that had been submitted to us, recommending that the administration move the library from the domain of the Vice President for Information Services to that of Senior Vice President and Provost.



Those discussions were ongoing; there was not a formal recommendation at this time. Senator Harp then called for Senate support of the committee's resolution.

President Proenza had a comment and a question. First, he wanted to thank the Senator for his report. Those were very important issues that we needed to look at. He did wonder, however, whether you had had some discussions with Vice President Newkome about the special elections that were accruing to our library and what difference those make. Equally and very importantly, there were two other considerations that he would ask be entertained very carefully. There was no question that the price of serials was outpacing anybody's capacity for keeping up with it and was rivaled perhaps only by health care issues. In that context, a couple of questions for information basis. First, the question of what linkages existed through the other networks in the state that enabled us to access the other materials virtually. Secondly, the linkage very importantly that was being made today with information technology not only to reduce costs but to in fact expand access. President Proenza felt it to be very important that the Libraries Committee continue to look at that so we did not lose track of it. While he was not opposed to considering movement of responsibility, unless more money was found, that movement did not buy what he thought was wanted.

Senator Harp responded that he had not talked directly with Dr. Newkome about that. As for the linkages, we discussed that at length in terms of the access, particularly for downloading serials. It worked relatively effectively for serials; the OhioLink was part of this journals data. It worked effectively for serials because one could hit a button and download it. For books, which parts of Social Sciences and Humanities used almost exclusively, or for serials, the only thing that could be done was to order the serials through interlibrary loans. That cost money. For books, one would have to order the book. If it were a book referenced to regularly, that cost was then getting pushed either back onto the students or to the departments. For students, provided we could get them to use OhioLink, as there was a learning curve even for some of our best students, that put the cost of time and money on their backs, with them standing at a photocopy machine. What departments were doing in Arts & Sciences was putting a staff person in front of a photocopy machine and copying chunks of books. We had been doing that for years and OhioLink had definitely improved things. What we were talking about at this point was a situation where a researcher or a student literally would have almost all of their books on a topic from our own institution. That eliminated the possibility of browsing, but either you spent a huge budget on photocopying those materials to use or you spent it on buying the book. The accumulated cost might well be comparable.

Senator Lee then expressed a concern. He thought it was really important and was a good goal, but the Libraries committee had presented in this motion as a charge to PBC to ensure. That did not seem to allow any flexibility. He read this to mean that PBC had to ensure this regardless what the impact might be on health care premiums, any tradeoff on salaries, on any other budget priorities we might have. This seemed inflexible. He would like to make an amendment which would state that the Libraries Committee strongly recommended that the Faculty Senate instruct the Planning & Budgeting Committee that it was an important priority to



ensure funding. He thought it important to ensure some flexibility. This was seconded by Senator Jordan.

Senator Covrig then said it seemed unnecessary because the particular resolution did not have all the teeth of specific goals. He did not see why this friendly amendment was necessary. Chair Sheffer corrected him; it was not a friendly amendment but an amendment.

No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken. The amendment failed.

Senator Kreidler then stated that having sat on her first PBC meeting, this body could not make a resolution to ensure anything. Because the Senate did not pass the amendment, we could not pass this resolution. PBC could not do this. Senator Hoo Fatt stated it was within the next decade. That was ten years. It did not have to be in the next year. She did not see why we could not do this in ten years.

No further discussion forthcoming, Chair Sheffer called for a vote on the motion. Senate then voted its approval of the motion with one dissention.

Senator Dechambeau then commented. She wanted to make sure that it was understood that thinking about electronic journals as a replacement for paper subscriptions was not in fact necessarily a cheaper substitution. Quite often it was much more expensive. Canceled subscriptions meant losing the back issues. The beauty of the electronic journal center in OhioLink was that they maintained the back issues for us. This was a common concept that people had, that we could get it electronically for free or for less.

Senator Witt then stated he wished to know a little bit more about all the options for the library, as he thought that electronic options were more economical. Senate could use a little education on this.

Chair Sheffer then stated that Senator Harp had now been charged with educating the Senate on this issue.

Senator Sterns added that he thought we should also keep in mind that there were many ramifications. There were certain certification bodies that reviewed the status of certain honoraries, evaluated library holdings, as well as many other ramifications that happened from not maintaining our library. It could begin to effect our academic programs if we were not careful. He was sure that was an obvious thing but did want to say it formally.

Senator Harp continued with a report that was prepared by Associate Dean Roger Durbin. He could get the electronic version and make that available to Senators. That report specified some of the ARL (Association for Research Library) measures. More importantly, it dealt with the issues involved in these determinations and the kinds of measures we might use over time to assess how our library was doing, much like had been done with the issue of salaries.



FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - See (Appendix H) for report and 2002 Fall Grants.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Fenwick stated that in light of the time, he was going to waive the oral report (See Appendix I for written report). He did, however, ask that Senators look at the appended report from Ernst & Young (pg. 56). He wanted to make just two points about that. One, it was not Arthur Anderson. He had hoped that Vice President Ray would be here to explain. This was the one item about the state of Ohio notifying colleges and universities of potential workers' comp. liability.

President Proenza then noted that both Vice President Nettling and Vice President Mallo were present. With permission, VP Mallo then addressed the body. He stated that currently all state universities paid a premium with regard to worker's compensation for the claims they experienced over the course of a year. But the State Auditor was proposing to book the liabilities on the state books and to apportion those to all the state universities. So basically it would affect the bottom line of our balance sheet.

Senator Fenwick then asked to what extent.

Vice President Mallo replied that we were still in negotiations with the State Auditor and Attorney General. We thought that if we were able to do it as a footnote as opposed to the bottom line, it would have negligible effect. Senator Fenwick then asked when we would know. To which Vice President Mallo replied that discussions were going on this week on this very issue. Senator Fenwick stated that other than that, PBC would probably have preliminary reports from two subcommittees on ROI next month.

OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL - See (Appendix J) for minutes of May 17 and Oct. 4, 2002.

VI. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Gerlach stated he had some urgent new business to bring to the floor. He wanted to move this subject to the consideration of the University Well-Being Committee and our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council for their consideration and possible action. This report had come out of the Ohio Retired Teachers' Association, and should alarm us all. It was reported in their Fall 2002 newsletter. House Bill 173 sponsored by Representative Calbert established the Ohio Technology Fund. HB173 if passed, would take \$60 million from each of four retirement systems, which included the State Teachers' Retirement, the public employees, and the Bureau of Workmen's Compensation to fund venture capital investments in high technology startup businesses in the state of Ohio. Some legislators still thought that the retirement benefits were paid by state taxes and could be shifted around like the state budget. They needed to be enlightened that this was our retirement fund, funded by our contributions and was not related to state taxes. It alarmed him that anyone would raid our retirement funds on the presumption that they were borrowing from them and would return the money with interest when this kind of scheme suggested all could be lost. Why they should take it from these funds in the first place was beyond him. He thought it was simply a subject that he would move that our



Well-Being Committee and our representative to the Ohio Faculty Council take under action.

This motion was seconded by Senator Gunn. No further discussion forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body voted its approval of the motion.

**VII. ADJOURNMENT** - The Chair then called for a motion to adjourn. This was made and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

*Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin*



APPENDIX A**Final Draft****To be presented to Faculty Senate - May 2002**3359-20-031 Salaries (full-time faculty).

- (A) Although the university has no definite salary schedule, the president announces at the November meeting of the faculty senate the maximum, minimum, median, and average salaries paid to regular teaching professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors, all figures being based on ~~a nine-months'~~ AN ACADEMIC YEAR pay schedule. Generally, faculty members are on the ~~nine-months'~~ ACADEMIC YEAR schedule, and administrative officers are on the twelve-months' schedule.
- (B) Although salary adjustments may be considered at any necessary time, the deans, after conferences with their department chairs, normally review and recommend changes in salaries in the spring so that the president's recommendations may be presented to the board during the spring semester and salary changes can go into effect at the beginning of the academic year.
- (C) DEPARTMENT CHAIRS, SCHOOL DIRECTORS, OR DEANS IN COLLEGES WITHOUT DEPARTMENTS, SHALL CONDUCT AN ANNUAL EVALUATION OF EACH FACULTY MEMBER AS REQUIRED BY 3359-20-02-B.
- (D) SALARY ADJUSTMENTS SHALL BE BASED ON MERIT.
  - 1. ANNUAL EVALUATIONS SHALL SERVE AS THE BASIS FOR DETERMINING MERIT.
  - 2. ACADEMIC UNITS MAY USE INFORMATION FROM MORE THAN ONE YEAR OF ANNUAL EVALUATIONS IN DETERMINING SALARY ADJUSTMENTS.
- (E) DEPARTMENT CHAIRS OR SCHOOL DIRECTORS AND DEANS SHALL RECOMMEND FACULTY SALARY ADJUSTMENTS BASED UPON MERIT PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA AS REQUIRED BY SECTION (I) OF THIS RULE.
- (F) FOR THE PURPOSES OF ESTABLISHING PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATION AND MERIT, AN ACADEMIC UNIT IS DEFINED AS FOLLOWS:
  - 1. A DEPARTMENT OR SCHOOL WHERE FACULTY HOLD A PRIMARY APPOINTMENT.



2. A COLLEGE WHERE FACULTY HOLD A PRIMARY APPOINTMENT.
  3. FACULTY IN COLLEGES WITH DEPARTMENTS OR SCHOOLS MAY CHOOSE TO ACT AS A FACULTY OF THE WHOLE AND ESTABLISH PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA THAT GOVERN THE COLLEGE AS A WHOLE.
- (G) "ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER," IN THE MOST RECENT EDITION, SHALL BE ACCEPTED AS THE AUTHORITY ON ALL QUESTIONS OF PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE NOT DETERMINED BY THE UNIVERSITY RULES AS DEFINED IN THE OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE. IN ANY CONFLICT BETWEEN THE OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE AND "ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER," THE OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE TAKES PRECEDENCE.
- (H) EACH ACADEMIC UNIT SHALL ESTABLISH PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR ANNUAL EVALUATIONS.
1. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE ESTABLISHED IN WRITING BY THE ACADEMIC UNIT FACULTY IN CONSULTATION WITH THE DEAN.
    - a. THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE APPROVED BY AT LEAST A SIMPLE MAJORITY OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY. AN ABSTENTION, WHILE ALLOWED, SHALL BE CONSIDERED AS A NEGATIVE VOTE.
      - i. THE DEAN SHALL NOT VOTE AS A MEMBER OF THE REGULAR FACULTY.
      - ii. ANY OTHER INDIVIDUALS, BEYOND THE LEVEL OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT, DIRECTLY INVOLVED WITH THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA ARE INELIGIBLE AND SHALL NOT VOTE.
      - iii. IN EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES, INDIVIDUAL UNIT'S GUIDELINES MAY ALLOW FOR ABSENTEE BALLOTS FOR FACULTY WHO HAVE BEEN PARTICIPANTS IN THE DELIBERATIONS.
    - b. THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE DEAN.



- c. THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
  - 2. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL INCLUDE A PROCESS FOR AMENDMENT
  - 3. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE ACCESSIBLE TO ALL FACULTY MEMBERS. A COPY OF THE PROCEDURES SHALL BE AVAILABLE IN THE DEPARTMENT, THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
  - 4. A WRITTEN COPY OF THE COMPLETED ANNUAL EVALUATION SHALL BE PROVIDED TO THE FACULTY MEMBER IN A TIMELY MANNER.
  - 5. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES SHALL INCLUDE AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE FACULTY MEMBER TO MEET WITH THE INITIAL EVALUATOR(S) PRIOR TO THE FORWARDING OF THE EVALUATION BEYOND THE ACADEMIC UNIT.
  - 6. ANNUAL EVALUATION PROCEDURES SHALL INCLUDE AN APPEALS PROCESS.
  - 7. THE ANNUAL EVALUATION SHALL COVER THE TIME PERIOD DEFINED BY THE CALENDAR YEAR.
  - 8. ANNUAL EVALUATION CRITERIA SHALL ADDRESS ALL COMPONENTS OF THE FACULTY MEMBER'S RESPONSIBILITY AND SHALL BE SUITED TO THE DISTINCTIVE MISSION AND ROLE OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT.
  - 9. IN THE CASE OF CONFLICT, THE UNIVERSITY RULES AND REGULATIONS AS CONTAINED IN THE OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SUPERCEDE ALL OTHER GUIDELINES.
- (I) EACH ACADEMIC UNIT SHALL ESTABLISH PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR THE PURPOSES OF RECOMMENDING SALARY ADJUSTMENTS BASED ON MERIT.
- 1. MERIT PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE ESTABLISHED IN WRITING BY THE ACADEMIC UNIT FACULTY IN CONSULTATION WITH THE DEAN.
    - a. MERIT PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE



APPROVED BY AT LEAST A SIMPLE MAJORITY VOTE OF THE ELIGIBLE FACULTY. AN ABSTENTION, WHILE ALLOWED, SHALL BE CONSIDERED AS A NEGATIVE VOTE.

- i. THE DEAN SHALL NOT VOTE AS A MEMBER OF THE REGULAR FACULTY.
    - ii. ANY OTHER INDIVIDUALS, BEYOND THE LEVEL OF THE ACADEMIC UNIT, DIRECTLY INVOLVED WITH THE APPROVAL PROCESS FOR THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA ARE INELIGIBLE AND SHALL NOT VOTE.
    - iii. IN EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES, INDIVIDUAL UNIT'S GUIDELINES MAY ALLOW FOR ABSENTEE BALLOTS FOR FACULTY WHO HAVE BEEN PARTICIPANTS IN THE DELIBERATIONS.
  - b. THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE DEAN.
  - c. THESE PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
2. MERIT PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL INCLUDE A PROCESS FOR AMENDMENT.
  3. MERIT PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA SHALL BE ACCESSIBLE TO ALL FACULTY MEMBERS. A COPY OF THE PROCEDURES SHALL BE AVAILABLE IN THE DEPARTMENT, THE SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
  4. MERIT PROCEDURES SHALL REQUIRE THAT EACH RECOMMENDING PERSON OR BODY PROVIDE TO THE FACULTY MEMBER A WRITTEN EXPLANATION OF THE MERIT AWARD RECOMMENDATION.
  5. MERIT PROCEDURES SHALL INCLUDE AN APPEALS PROCESS.
  6. IN THE CASE OF CONFLICT, THE UNIVERSITY RULES AND REGULATIONS AS CONTAINED IN THE OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SUPERCEDE ALL OTHER GUIDELINES.



3359-20-031 Salaries (full-time faculty).

- (A) Although the university has no definite salary schedule, the president announces at the November meeting of the faculty senate the maximum, minimum, median, and average salaries paid to regular teaching professors, associate professors, assistant professors, and instructors, all figures being based on an academic year pay schedule. Generally, faculty members are on academic year schedule, and administrative officers are on the twelve-months' schedule.
- (B) Although salary adjustments may be considered at any necessary time, the deans, after conferences with their department chairs, normally review and recommend changes in salaries in the spring so that the president's recommendations may be presented to the board during the spring semester and salary changes can go into effect at the beginning of the academic year.
- (C) Department chairs, school directors, or deans in colleges without departments, shall conduct an annual evaluation of each faculty member as required by 3359-20-02-B.
- (D) Salary adjustments shall be based at least in part on merit.
  - 1. Annual evaluations shall serve as the basis for determining merit.
  - 2. Academic units may use information from more than one year of annual evaluations in determining salary adjustments.
- (E) Department chairs or school directors and deans shall recommend faculty salary adjustments based upon merit procedures and criteria as required by section (I) of this rule.
- (F) For the purposes of establishing procedures and criteria for annual evaluation and merit, an academic unit is defined as follows:
  - 1. A department or school where faculty hold a primary appointment.
  - 2. A college where faculty hold a primary appointment.
  - 3. Faculty in colleges with departments or schools may choose to act as a faculty of the whole and establish procedures and criteria that govern that college as a whole.
- (G) "Robert's Rules of Order," in the most recent edition, shall be accepted as the authority on all questions of parliamentary procedure not determined by the university rules as defined in the Ohio Administrative Code. In any conflict between the Ohio Administrative Code and "Robert's Rules of Order," the Ohio



Administrative Code takes precedence.

(H) Each academic unit shall establish procedures and criteria for annual evaluations.

1. Annual evaluation procedures and criteria shall be established in writing by the academic unit faculty in consultation with the dean.
  - a. These procedures and criteria shall be approved by at least a simple majority of the eligible faculty.
    - i. The dean shall not vote as a member of the regular faculty.
    - ii. Any other individuals, beyond the level of the academic unit, directly involved with the approval process for these procedures and criteria are ineligible and shall not vote.
    - iii. In extenuating circumstances, individual unit's guidelines may allow for absentee ballots for faculty who have been participants in the deliberations.
  - b. These procedures and criteria shall be approved by the dean.
  - c. These procedures and criteria shall be approved by the senior vice president and provost.
2. Annual evaluation procedures and criteria shall include a process for amendment.
3. Annual evaluation procedures and criteria shall be accessible to all faculty members. A copy of the procedures shall be available in the department, the school, the college, and the office of the senior vice president and provost.
4. A written copy of the completed annual evaluation shall be provided to the faculty member in a timely manner.
5. Annual evaluation procedures shall include an opportunity for the faculty member to meet with the initial evaluation(s) prior to the forwarding of the evaluation beyond the academic unit.
6. Annual evaluation procedures shall include an appeals process.
7. The annual evaluation shall cover the period defined by the calendar year.
8. Annual evaluation criteria shall address all components of the faculty member's responsibility and shall be suited to the distinctive mission and



role of the academic unit.

9. In the case of conflict, the university rules and regulations as contained in the Ohio Administrative Code supercede all other guidelines.

(I) Each academic unit shall establish procedures and criteria for the purposes of recommending salary adjustments based on merit.

1. Merit procedures and criteria shall be established in writing by the academic unit faculty in consultation with the dean.
  - a. Merit procedures and criteria shall be approved by at least a simple majority of the eligible faculty.
    - i. The dean shall not vote as a member of the regular faculty.
    - ii. Any other individuals, beyond the level of the academic unit, directly involved in the approval process of these procedures and criteria are ineligible and shall not vote.
    - iii. In extenuating circumstances, individual unit's guidelines may allow for absentee ballots for faculty who have been participants in the deliberations.
  - b. These procedures and criteria shall be approved by the dean.
  - c. These procedures and criteria shall be approved by the senior vice president and provost.
2. Merit procedures and criteria shall include a process for amendment.
3. Merit procedures and criteria shall be accessible to all faculty members. A copy of the procedures shall be available in the department, the school, The college, and the office of the senior vice president and provost.
4. Merit procedures shall require that the department chair, school director, or dean in colleges without department provide to the faculty member a written explanation of the merit award recommendation.
5. Merit procedures shall include an appeals process.
6. In the case of conflict, the university rules and regulations as contained in the Ohio Administrative Code shall supercede all other guidelines.



APPENDIX B**REPORT OF UNIVERSITY WELLBEING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 7<sup>TH</sup>, 2002**

The University Wellbeing Committee met twice in October on 10<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>. The chair also met with PBC on October 24<sup>th</sup>.

The Committee received a report from Desnay Lohrum from Human Resources. She reported on the present open enrollment, noting that retiree dependents under 65 had the option of choosing the PPO or the Kaiser HMO. Summa's quotes were too expensive to allow that option.

She also reported on her initial discussions with Steve Livovich of Watson Wyatt. HR needs an effective tracking system for costs and why they occur. It involves identification of claims by status, diagnosis etc. and will help with attempts to develop an appropriate Wellness program.

The Committee agreed that it was necessary: Mr. Livovich will be putting in a cost estimate for this work, plus making a forecast on the likely contract increase in costs. (see attached Senate recommendations)

In the meantime, members of Wellbeing shared their knowledge of the likely increases for the next contract. MedLife in mid-contract for dental is reporting claims 15% above those estimated. Summa, which had only agreed to a one year contract, increased its costs by 15%, the maximum their contract allowed. Other outside information reinforces the 15% annual increase, which translates into possibly a 30% increase for a full year for our new contract. This is only a guess at this stage, Steve Livovich has not made a UA specific estimate as yet.

The Committee is also working on the Senate recommendation to investigate the possibilities for an in-house wellness program. Rachelle Kappler of Zip-fit explained their program on directed exercise. She is willing to be on the ad-hoc committee to examine the issues. Dr. Irene Glanville has also agreed to serve. Other appropriate members are being sought by Wellbeing & EC.

The Chair of the Committee e-mailed the Chair of PBC to ask PBC to recommend how much of any increase they would agree to be absorbed by the university: would it be the whole amount or would Wellbeing need to work on premiums and a possible reduced benefit plan. (see Senate recommendations). It is PBC that can decide the overall tradeoffs necessary in the budget. The chair then met with PBC and shared this information, plus the senate recommendations. A dialogue has therefore started with PBC.

The next meeting of Wellbeing is Tuesday, November 19<sup>th</sup> at 3:13 pm in the Faculty Senate Conference room

Respectfully submitted



Elizabeth Erickson

Chair, University Wellbeing Committee



## **6. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SENATE REGARDING HEALTH CARE**

The Well-Being Committee was given the responsibility to evaluate health care costs and benefits, in light of the major increase in health care costs in the 2002-2003 budget. The Committee recommends the following measures to PBC and the Senate to reduce costs, recognizing that they have limited effects, especially in the short-term:

### **1) Changes in Retiree dependent plans**

The Committee recognizes that UA needs "to provide a comprehensive health plan" to retiree dependents. However, we consider that retiree dependents should have the equivalent benefits and costs as present employees, rather than TI with zero contributions. In light of that principle we recommend:

- a) For dependents <65: for January 2003, TI, PPO and Summa and Kaiser HMO's should be made available. For January 2004, retiree dependents with TI should pay the same contribution for the plan as present employees.
- b) For dependents >65: for January 2003, TI and Medicare Plus from Summa and Kaiser should be made available.
- c) VP Nettling should explore the possibility of providing retiree dependent coverage with the appropriate Ohio state retirement schemes, with payments made by UA which are less than the present cost to UA.

### **2) Wellness and Disease management program**

A Wellness and Disease Management program is one of the few methods that can reduce costs effectively, although it will take time. The Committee recommends that an ad-hoc group representing appropriate departments and units be formed to develop an effective Wellness program for UA. They should investigate the possibilities of using resources at UA for some aspects of the program as well as evaluating vendors to be paid by UA. The Committee considers this could be a real opportunity to become an effective Wellness presence on campus. They note that the new recreation center offers additional possibilities.

### **3) PBC budgeting for health care cost increases**

Given the national problem of health care cost increases in the double digits, the Committee recommends that PBC take into account likely major health care cost increases in planning for its future budgets. We ask that PBC stay in contact with the Well-Being Committee on these issues.

### **4) Contributions by employees**

If PBC should determine that cost sharing of health insurance increases by employees is necessary, the Well-Being Committee recommends:

- a) There should be a cap on the percentage of total medical costs to be paid by employees, the percentage to be determined by the Well-Being Committee when such cost sharing is recommended.
- b) Any contributions should only be initiated after UA reaches a median annual salary for Ohio universities and should then be phased in concurrent with steps towards achieving the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile in salaries.
- c) There should be cost sharing options, by premiums, by reduced benefits; that is, we recommend that there should be at least one limited but free plan (e.g. an EPO).
- d) There should be some simplification in plans, with some probable reduction in numbers.



- e) TI should not be maintained if the numbers in the program drop below a minimum (the number to be specified by Well-Being before 2004).
- f) Plan premiums should be proportional to salary, with time allocated to planning this implementation.
- g) Plans should be costed for E, E plus one unit and E+ two or more units, rather than the present system.
- h) We ask that PBC stay in contact with the Well-Being Committee on these issues.

**5. Monitoring issues**

The Committee recommends that the UA health consultant report at least every 4 months to the Well-Being Committee, Human Resources and the Vice President for Business and Finance on likely health cost increases and health insurance issues. The Well-Being Committee should report this information immediately to PBC and the Senate.

**6. Long-term issues for study**

The Well-Being Committee should be directed to continue to monitor some longer-term issues including IUC initiatives for catastrophic coverage & health savings plans and the ongoing experience with defined contributions.

Respectfully submitted,

University Well-Being Committee:

Wieslaw Binienda  
Steven Bunn  
Kyonsuku Min Cakmak  
Russ Davis  
Susan Direnzo  
DeDe Duell  
Elizabeth Erickson, Chair  
Marlene Huff  
Suzanne MacDonald  
Rick Maringer  
Barbara Osyk



APPENDIX C**Report to Faculty Senate from Graduate Council November 7, 2002****I. At their last meeting, Graduate Council voted to approve curriculum proposals from:**

1. Education
2. Engineering
3. Nursing

**II. At their last meeting, Graduate Council voted to approve Revised Graduate Faculty Membership Criteria from:**

1. Geology
2. Philosophy
3. Physics
4. Psychology
5. Public Administration & Urban Studies
6. Theoretical and Applied Mathematics
7. Counseling
8. Educational Foundations and Leadership

**III. At their last meeting, Dr. Newkome continued the discussion of the numerous issues associated with the State imposed 85% funding cap for Ph.D. students. Dr. Newkome emphasized that the University needs to align its courses to allow for appropriate state subvention for masters- and doctoral-level courses. Also, the Graduate School will curtail stipend and tuition remission for all graduate students who are ineligible for state subvention. Accordingly, below are the revised rules covering graduate student tuition remission and stipends. These rules will go into effect Spring semester, 2003:**

1. No scholarships for tuition remission will be awarded after the 14<sup>th</sup> day of any semester or session.
2. Students in their first or second year of support will receive up to 15 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and over the combined summer sessions.
3. Students in their third year or greater of support will receive up to 9 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and up to 6 graduate credit hours remitted over the combined summer sessions.
4. Under no circumstances will the Graduate School provide stipends or tuition remission to a student who has acquired:
  - 174 or greater graduate credit hours, or
  - 140 or greater graduate credit hours and has a graduate degree from another institution



The text below is taken from the minutes of the last Graduate Council meeting. Dr. Newkome has reviewed, edited, and approved them, according to the GC secretary, and is aware that a report would be made to the Senate.

Dr. Newkome continued, from the last Council meeting, the discussion of the numerous issues associated with the State imposed 85% funding cap for Ph.D. students. Specifically, he reviewed the documents that he had prepared for a meeting with the Vice Presidents & College Deans. That document is appended to these minutes. Dr. Newkome emphasized that the University needs to align its courses to allow for appropriate state subvention for master's and doctoral-level courses. Also, the Graduate School will curtail stipend & tuition remission for all graduate students that are ineligible for state subvention. Accordingly, below are the revised rules covering graduate student tuition remission and stipends. These rules will go into effect Spring semester, 2003, and will assist in maximizing the appropriate state subvention received for graduate students.

1. No scholarships for tuition remission will be awarded after the 14<sup>th</sup> day of any semester or session.
2. Students in their first or second year of support will receive up to 15 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and over the combined summer sessions.
3. Students in their third year or greater of support will receive up to 9 graduate credit hours of tuition remission during each semester of the award and up to 6 graduate credit hours remitted over the combined summer sessions.
4. Under no circumstances will the Graduate School provide stipends or tuition remission for a student who has acquired:
  - a) 174 or greater graduate credit hours, or
  - b) 140 or greater graduate credit hours and has a graduate degree from another institution.

There was extensive discussion about these rules. Dr. Newkome emphasized that understanding and managing the parameters that makeup this 85% funding cap will be an ongoing endeavor.



APPENDIX D1.**BYPASSED CREDIT Policy**

Certain courses designated in this bulletin by each department enable a AN ELIGIBLE student to earn "bypassed" credit. AN ELIGIBLE student who completes such a course with a grade of "C" or better ~~is entitled to~~ MAY APPLY FOR AND RECEIVE BYPASS credit for designated prerequisite courses which carry the same departmental code numbers. A STUDENT WHO COMPLETES SUCH A COURSE WITH A "C-" OR LOWER WILL NOT BE ELIGIBLE TO APPLY FOR OR RECEIVE BYPASS CREDIT. IF THE PREREQUISITE COURSE IS REQUIRED FOR GRADUATION AND THE BYPASS ATTEMPT IS UNSUCCESSFUL, THEN THE STUDENT MUST TAKE THE PREREQUISITE COURSE. Credit for such bypassed prerequisites shall be included in the total credits earned but shall not count in the quality point ration, class standing or hours required for graduation with honors. Bypassed credit is not awarded on the basis of completing a course either credit-by-examination or credit/noncredit, OR BY COMPLETING A COURSE AS REPEAT FOR CHANGE OF GRADE.



APPENDIX D2.

APCC recommends the attached proposed calendar for 2003-2004 and the preliminary calendar for 2004-2005 be approved.

APCC recommends that the executive committee of Faculty Senate appoint a task force, which will include at least two members of APCC, to investigate issues related to the calendar that resulted from the creation of the fifteen-week summer session. Examples, in no particular order, of such issues include housing, registration, breaks between semesters, and exam week. It is further recommended that the task force gather information from both inside and outside the university. Finally, APCC recommends that the task force forward an interim report to APCC by April 25, 2003 and a final report by October 3, 2003.



	PROPOSED 2003-2004	PRELIMINARY 2004-2005
FALL SEMESTER		(week between summer and fall)
Day and Evening Classes Begin	Mon., August 25	Mon., August 30
Labor Day *	Mon., September 1	Mon., September 6
Veteran's Day	Tues., November 11	Thurs., November 11
Thanksgiving break **	Thurs-Sat, November 27-29	Thurs.-Sat., November 25-27
Classes resume	Mon., December 1	Mon., November 29
Final Instruction Day	Sat., December 6	Sat., December 11
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., December 8-13	Mon.-Sat., December 13-18
Commencement	Sat., December 13	Sat., December 18
Fall Semester Grades Due		Tues., December 21
Spring Intercession (Winter Recess)	Sat.-Sat., December 15-January 10	Sat.-Sat., December 25-January 15
SPRING SEMESTER		
Day and Evening Classes Begin	Mon., January 12	Tues., January 18
Martin Luther King Day *	Mon., January 19	Mon., January 17
President's Day observance *	Tues., February 17	Tues., February 22
Spring Recess	Mon.-Sat., March 22-27	Mon.-Sat., March 28-April 2
Classes Resume	Mon., March 29	Mon., April 4
Final Instruction Day	Sat., May 1	Sat., May 7
Final Examination Period	Mon.-Sat., May 3-8	Mon.-Sat., May 9-14
Commencement	Sat.-Sun., May 8-9	Sat.-Sun., May 14-15
Law School Commencement	Sun., May 16	Sun., May 22
SUMMER SESSION I		
Day and Evening Classes Begin for first 5-week session	Mon., May 10	Mon., May 16
Day and Evening Classes Begin for first 10-week session	Mon., May 10	Mon., May 16
Memorial Day *	Mon., May 31	Mon., May 30
Final Instruction Day for first 5-week session	Sat., June 12	Sat., June 18
SUMMER SESSION II		
Day and Evening Classes Begin for second 5-week session	Mon., June 14	Mon., June 20
Day and Evening Classes Begin for second 10-week session	Mon., June 14	Mon., June 20
Independence Day *	Sun., July 4	Mon., July 4
Independence Day observed	Mon., July 5	
Final Instruction Day for first 10-week session	Sat., July 17	Sat., July 23
Final Instruction Day for second 5-week session	Sat., July 17	Sat., July 23
SUMMER SESSION III		
Day and Evening Classes Begin for third 5-week session	Mon., July 19	Mon., July 25
Final instruction Day for second 10-week session	Sat., August 21	Sat., August 27
Final Instruction Day for third 5-week session	Sat., August 21	Sat., August 27
Commencement	Sat., August 21	Sat., August 27



APPENDIX E3359-20-052 Curricular Changes

## A. Curricular change process for curriculum other than distributed learning proposals

- (1) Each college shall have its own procedure for proposing curricular changes. For the purpose of this document, a "course" is defined as any university offered curriculum regardless of mode of delivery (e.g. web-based, synchronous distance learning, etc.). The following curricular changes require university-wide approval.
  - (a) addition of courses
  - (b) deletion of courses
  - (c) changes in course or program names
  - (d) changes in course or program numbers
  - (e) changes in course descriptions
  - (f) changes in course prerequisites
  - (g) addition of new degrees, minors, or certificate programs
  - (h) changes in degrees, minors, or certificate programs
  - (i) proposals that would change any university-wide requirements.
- (2) Curricular proposals shall originate within an academic unit (e.g. department, college, or school). The academic unit shall review the proposal and either approve or reject it. For the purposes of initiating interdisciplinary proposals, which involve two or more academic units, one academic unit shall be identified as the originating unit.
  - (a) For the purposes of this document, an "academic unit" is defined as any group having a separate identity that participates in the offering of curricula.
- (3) Program changes may require Ohio Board of Regents approval. It is the responsibility of the originating unit to determine if approval is required.
  - (a) The Ohio board of regents requires "advance notice" of an institution's intent to initiate new degrees or new degree programs. Before this required "preliminary prospectus" is submitted to the chancellor, it shall be input into the curriculum proposal system and reviewed by the curriculum review committee and the senior vice president and provost. Proposed master and doctoral level programs shall also be reviewed by the dean of the graduate school.
    - (i) The curriculum review committee shall meet within fourteen days of th



date when the proposal is released for university wide review.

- (ii) To allow for university wide representation and participation, the curriculum review committee may appoint additional members for the review process.
  - (iii) The curriculum review committee shall forward to the senior vice president and provost a recommendation of support, or non-support including rationale.
- (b) The Ohio board of regents requires "formal application" for new degrees or new degree programs. Before this "formal application" is submitted to the chancellor, it shall be input into the curriculum proposal system and reviewed by the curriculum review committee and the senior vice president and provost. The proposal shall be assigned a new proposal number in the curriculum proposal system and shall reference the preliminary proposal by its original proposal number. Proposed master and doctoral level programs shall also be reviewed by the dean of the graduate school.
- (i) The curriculum review committee may appoint additional members for this review process to allow for university wide representation.
  - (ii) This review shall be completed within fourteen days of the date when the proposal is released for university wide review.
  - (iii) The curriculum review committee shall forward to the senior vice president and provost a recommendation of support, or non-support including rationale.
  - (iv) The "formal application" shall be sent from the office of the senior vice president and provost. The submitting college shall be notified of the date of the submission.
- (4) Proposals can be submitted at any time into the Curricular Review System (CRS).
- (a) For changes to appear in the undergraduate or graduate university bulletin of the following academic year, a proposal must be submitted by a college for university review by the end of the twelfth week of the fall semester.
  - (b) The review process shall be suspended for all periods when classes are not in session, and reactivated with the resumption of classes.
  - (c) Proposals shall not be reviewed during the summer sessions.
- (5) After a proposal is approved by the academic unit, the appropriate college review committee shall review the proposal and either approve or reject it.



- (6) A college-approved proposal shall then be released by authorized personnel of the college for institutional review and approval. The proposal shall be available on the university web server for a period of two calendar weeks from the date of release.
- (a) Various institutional reviews and approvals may be required and shall be given before the proposal can be submitted for university-wide review. The reviewing bodies may include but are not limited to library, graduate school, institutional research, distributed learning review committee, and the curriculum review committee (CRC). Details of these review procedures are available in each academic unit.
  - (b) If institutional review cannot be completed within the two calendar week period, the originating unit and the office of the senior vice president and provost shall be notified indicating reasons for the delay and the approximate completion date.
  - (c) When all approvals are obtained, the proposal shall be released for university-wide review. The proposal shall be available on the university web server for a period of two calendar weeks from the date of release. Proposals released for university-wide review shall be posted in a weekly curriculum digest.
  - (d) Reviewing bodies or any faculty member wishing to make an objection or to comment on a proposal shall do so within the web environment. The system will email the objection or comment to the office of the senior vice president and provost, to the CRC, and to the initiating college for response.
    - (i) CRC shall determine the appropriateness of any objections. Objections that are considered appropriate include but are not limited to:
      - (a) duplication of content
      - (b) appropriateness of the initiating unit
      - (c) questions of academic quality
        - (i) This is an appropriate objection only if initiated within the originating academic unit
        - (ii) Academic quality objections from outside of the originating academic unit will be considered as advisory only
      - (d) demonstration that the proposal adversely affects another program
- (7) Following the two calendar week period for university-wide review, the following options are available for the disposition of the proposal:



- (a) If no objections are received, the proposal shall be forwarded to the executive committee of faculty senate for approval at the next scheduled meeting.
  - (i) If the executive committee approves the proposal, it shall be immediately forwarded to the senior vice president and provost.
  - (ii) If the executive committee rejects the proposal, it shall be brought before the faculty senate at the next scheduled meeting. The reasons for the rejection shall be conveyed to the originating unit, to the CRC, and to the faculty senate.

The executive committee shall inform the faculty senate of all approved proposals at the next scheduled meeting.

- (b) If appropriate objections are received, the proposal is referred to the CRC for review. The CRC will meet at the first practical opportunity to hold a hearing on the objection. A two-thirds quorum of the CRC shall be present to conduct business.
  - (i) One or more representatives from the originating unit and the person(s) filing the objection(s) shall be invited to present his/her respective positions at the hearing and be subject to questions from the CRC.
  - (ii) The chair of CRC or his/her designee shall inform the originating unit and the person(s) filing the objection(s) of the time and place of the hearing. CRC reserves the right to limit the number of participants at the hearing.
  - (iii) Upon the close of the hearing, and in closed session, the CRC shall reach a decision by consensus. CRC shall forward its findings and recommendations to the faculty senate to be addressed at the next scheduled meeting.
    - (a) Possible recommendations to faculty senate include but are not limited to:
      - (i) recommend approval of the proposal
      - (ii) recommend changes/modifications to the proposal
      - (iii) recommend rejection of the proposal
      - (iv) no recommendation
  - (iv) Faculty senate shall approve or reject the proposal.



- (a) Proposals rejected by the faculty senate shall be returned to the originating unit.
    - (b) Proposals approved by the faculty senate are forwarded to the senior vice president and provost.
  - (c) The senior vice president and provost or his/her designee shall approve or reject the proposals within one calendar week of receipt.
    - (i) The senior vice president and provost shall forward approved proposals requiring board of trustees approval to the board of trustees for consideration at its next meeting.
    - (ii) If the proposal is not approved by the senior vice president and provost, the reasons for the rejection shall be conveyed to the originating unit and to the faculty senate.
  - (8) When a proposal has been approved by the board of trustees or its designee, the proposal becomes record and shall be implemented on its effective date.
- B. Curricular change process for distributed learning proposals including changes in mode of delivery.**
- (1) All asynchronous courses shall utilize a standardized interface to facilitate uniformity for the transfer of learning.
    - (a) Course content is determined solely within the purview of the instructor of record.
    - (b) All courses that change the mode of delivery to either asynchronous or distance shall be subject to an assessment of student outcomes for the first two course offering sessions. Synchronous courses are also subject to assessment of student outcomes.
  - (2) Process for existing courses to be offered through distributed learning
    - (a) The departmental unit shall approve, in concept, the change of delivery.
    - (b) The dean of the college shall approve the change in delivery.
    - (c) For tracking purposes, the college designee shall enter the course into the CPS as a mode of delivery change, only.
    - (d) The instructor of record develops the course.
    - (e) The course, with representative examples of all delivery



mechanisms and the front page, is sent to the distributed learning review committee (DLRC) which will evaluate the following.

- (i) Does the university have the technology to support the course?
- (ii) Does the university have the electronic resources available to support the course?
- (iii) Is the interface standardized?
- (iv) If approved by DLRC, the course is forwarded to the senior vice president and provost for approval.

(3) Process for new distributed learning courses

- (a) The course is treated as any new classroom course and is entered into the curriculum review process described in 3359-20-052-A-2 through 8 above.
- (b) After university-wide approval is obtained, the instructor of record develops the course.
- (c) The course, with representative examples of all delivery mechanisms and the front page, is sent to the distributed learning review committee (DLRC) which will evaluate the following.
  - (i) Does the university have the technology to support the course?
  - (ii) Does the university have the electronic resources available to support the course?
  - (iii) Is the interface standardized?
  - (iv) If approved by DLRC, the course is forwarded to the senior vice president and provost for approval.



**REPORT OF THE CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE OF THE FACULTY SENATE****November 7, 2002**

The Campus Facilities Planning Committee met October 24, 2002.

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:20 p.m.

The minutes of the September 19, 2002 meeting were approved.

Minutes of September 19, 2002 CFPC meeting were distributed. Minutes were approved as printed.

**Presentation by Ted Curtis, Vice President Capital Planning & Facilities Management:** Mr. Curtis presented an update on campus construction and renovation projects. He distributed material showing color photos of recently completed and ongoing projects and a booklet of Landscape for Learning activity and reported on the progress and completion dates for major construction (e.g. Student Center Phase I, Recreation Center, North Parking Garage). He indicated that the University was undertaking a Parking Maintenance Program that would include all parking structures. Discussion also included Buchtel Field expansion, Route 8 project, and Shrank Hall, Leigh Hall, and Whitby Hall renovations. The University is also involved in the planning phase of projects in Medina County and Holmes County. In response to a question, Mr. Curtis indicated that the new Student Center would include a faculty/staff/guest dining area.

**Campus Moves & Space Assignment:** Mr. James Haskell, Assistant Director Campus Planning & Facilities Management, followed with extensive discussion of campus moves that have occurred or are forthcoming. He documented reuse of space in Olin, Carroll, Ayer Halls and Polsky building following the opening of the College of Arts and Sciences Building during Summer 2002. Ayer and Carroll Halls will house units being displaced when Gardner Student Center is demolished for Phase II of the Student Center project. He also discussed relocations for Whitby Hall (primarily Chemical Engineering) during its renovation. He documented moves from Leigh Hall (primarily to Polsky Building) due to the renovation. These include Academic Achievement Programs, EEO, University Neighborhood Organization, and Women's Studies. The Committee endorsed these moves.

**Resolution:** The Faculty Senate endorses the reassignment of space in Olin, Carroll, Ayer Halls and Polsky building which resulted from the opening of the College of Arts and Sciences Building during Summer 2002. Ayer and Carroll Halls will temporarily house units being displaced when Gardner Student Center is demolished for Phase II of the Student Center project. In addition, relocations for Whitby Hall (primarily Chemical Engineering) during its renovation and moves from Leigh Hall (primarily to Polsky Building) due to the renovation are also endorsed. Full document on file with the Committee.

**Request for Incubator Space:** The Committee received a request for space allocation for a University incubator facility for faculty and community start-up companies through The University of Akron Research Foundation. The University has purchased the former Superior Auto Body Service Building that abuts the former Goodwill Building (now SAS building) on South College Street. It is anticipated that the 17,000 square foot structure could be used to house 7-10 new companies. Discussion took place regarding adequate space and potential noise conflicts with offices in the current SAS building (and proposed permanent location for Human Resources). A motion to endorse the space allocation was approved by the committee.

**Resolution:** The Faculty Senate supports the assignment of space for the creation of a university incubator facility for faculty and community start-up companies (Superior Auto Body Service Building).



**Request for Service/Storage Space (Student Administrative Services Building):** The Physical Facilities Operation Center requested the Committee for use of space in SAS building for custodial storage. A motion was made and approved by the Committee to endorse the space allocation for PFOC with Jim Haskell to work out the details.

**Resolution: The Faculty Senate supports the assignment of service/storage space in the Student Administrative Services Building.**

**Space for Benefits Administration:** The Chair reported to the Committee that the Counseling and Testing Center in Shrank Hall, North, does not need temporary space in the Polsky Building during planned renovations (as was previously assumed at the September meeting). The Committee determined that Polsky 327 A-F, 325 F could be temporarily assigned for use by Benefits Administration. A motion to endorse the space allocation was approved by the Committee.

**Resolution: The Faculty Senate supports the temporary assignment of Polsky 327 A-F and 325 F for use by Benefits Administration.**

The committee adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Harvey L. Sterns, Chair



APPENDIX G

## REPORT OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE November 7, 2002

The Library Committee met on November 1, 2002.

The Library Committee wishes to confirm reports that our library no longer buys books. As the attached list entitled expenditures shows, this year's materials allocation will go almost entirely to the purchase of serials. The allocation for books should cover a few monograph series. At the current rate of serials inflation, even if we continue to buy only serials and no books, there will be virtually no serials within five years.

This is already obviously an enormous danger to the academic integrity of undergraduate as well as graduate programs. The current situation is so far out of sync with our plans to be the premier research university in northern Ohio as to demand our immediate attention.

Attached are data not only for our library over the past ten years but also data from other Ohio institutions for the year 2000. The sole criterion for choosing these universities is that they had reported full data, enabling a better comparison. It is useful to note that while we aspire to surpass Kent as a research institution, we lag behind Kent in building our library. More telling, the long-term goal for UA to be the Cincinnati of northern Ohio indicates that we will need to spend much more on the library. More on salaries, more on serials, more on books. A library is crucial to the academic infrastructure of a research university.

Although the Library Committee discussed an array of short-term "fixes," because of this year's budget crisis, we focused on the longer-term solution. As a result,

**The Library Committee strongly recommends that the Faculty Senate charge the Planning and Budget Committee to ensure sufficient funding to raise the library within the next decade to the status of a research library as defined by the Association of Research Libraries.**

An ARL library spends at least 12 million on its library. We spend about half that. Case Western, Kent, OU, OSU and Cincinnati are all ARL libraries. For the exact criteria, see the guidelines as listed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (<http://www.ala.org/acrl/guides/univer.html>).

In short, the Library Committee believes that the library must be treated as a fundamental part of attaining status as a premier research university. It is as important as competitive salaries, adequate physical plant, and strong academic programs. Without a strong library, we will not be a strong university.

The Committee also discussed proposals to ask the Senate to recommend to the administration that the Library be moved from the domain of the Vice President of Information Services to that of the Senior Vice President and Provost. Those discussions are ongoing.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Harp, chair



The University of Akron  
University Libraries

**EXPENDITURES**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Materials Allocation</b>	<b>Serial Expenses</b>	<b>Binding</b>	<b>Books Allocation</b>
92-93	\$ 2,241,542	\$ 1,128,512	\$ 75,000	1,038,030
93-94	2,241,542	1,224,546	75,000	941,996
94-95	2,241,542	1,278,572	75,000	887,970
95-96	2,443,542	1,407,952	100,000	935,590
96-97	2,443,542	1,599,725	100,000	743,817
97-98	2,443,542	1,690,727	100,000	652,815
98-99	2,443,542	1,749,357	100,000	594,185
99-00	2,443,542	1,873,109	100,000	470,433
00-01	2,443,542	1,926,908	100,000	416,634
01-02	2,500,000	1,985,495	120,000	394,505
02-03	2,221,000	2,184,515	-	36,485



**Table A**  
**EXPENDITURES ON MONOGRAPHS / 2000**

1	U Cincinnati - Main	\$ 1,525,067
2	Miami U	1,295,699
3	Kent State U	675,991
4	Wright State U	675,516
5	U of Akron	649,935
6	Case Western Reserve U	\$ 640,985

**Table B**  
**EXPENDITURES ON SERIALS / 2000**

1	Case Western Reserve U	\$ 3,970,890
2	U Cincinnati - Main	3,341,077
3	Kent State U	2,486,491
4	Wright State U	2,148,604
5	U of Akron	1,873,109
6	Miami U	\$ 1,633,167

**Table C**  
**TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR LIBRARY MATERIALS / 2000**

1	U Cincinnati - Main	\$ 5,198,345
2	Case Western Reserve U	4,723,693
3	Kent State U	3,963,547
4	Miami U	3,100,153
5	Wright State U	2,955,387
6	U of Akron	\$ 2,523,044

**Table D**  
**TOTAL SALARIES & WAGES / 2000**

1	U Cincinnati - Main	\$ 5,763,967
2	Case Western Reserve U	5,176,232
3	Kent State U	3,833,368
4	Miami U	3,576,540
5	U of Akron	2,887,900
6	Wright State U	\$ 2,663,339



**Table E**  
**TOTAL LIBRARY EXPENDITURES / 2000**

1	U Cincinnati - Main	\$ 12,391,325
2	Case Western Reserve U	11,415,956
3	Kent State U	8,737,176
4	Miami U	7,291,405
5	Wright State U	6,421,943
6	U of Akron	\$ 6,305,201

**Table F**  
**VOLUMES IN LIBRARY / 2000**

1	Miami U	2,357,616
2	U Cincinnati - Main	2,108,782
3	Case Western Reserve U	2,033,085
4	Kent State U	1,501,497
5	U of Akron	1,122,187
6	Wright State U	762,452

**Table G**  
**VOLUMES ADDED / 2000**

1	U Cincinnati - Main	53,469
2	Kent State U	48,123
3	Miami U	44,708
4	U of Akron	28,804
5	Case Western Reserve U	21,179
6	Wright State U	21,508



APPENDIX H

Report from the Faculty Research Committee  
November 1, 2002  
Elizabeth S. Kinion EdD, MSN, CNP

The committee met on November 11, 2002 from 9:00a.m. until 11:15 a.m. We reviewed Nine proposals from faculty were reviewed and four proposals were recommended for funding.

The NEH guidelines state that a university can only submit two proposals. A subcommittee of three faculty with backgrounds in humanities reviewed proposals being submitted to NEH and recommended submission of two proposals from The University of Akron.

The Research Committee task force chaired by Dr. Mark Tausig will continue to meet with Dr. Newkome on a regular basis.

This is taken from the Office of General Council Version of the Faculty Senate By-laws link on the faculty senate home page.

**(9) FACULTY Research RESEARCH committee (faculty projects).**

**(a) ADVISES THE FACULTY SENATE ON ALL UNIVERSITY ACTIVITIES RELATING TO FUNDED (BOTH INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL) RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.**

**(a) (b) Reviews research proposals submitted by faculty members and grants university funds in support of those proposals deemed worthy.**

**(b) (c) Recommends the budgeting of sums of the university's support of faculty research proposals to be funded by this committee.**

**(e) (d) Establishes policies for funding proposals and guidelines for expenditures of those funded.**



**2002 Fall Grants  
Awarded 11/01/02**

**Internal Grants Awarded by:  
The University of Akron's Faculty Research Grant Committee**

<u>ACCT. #</u>	<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
2-07504	1541	Dr. Lindgren L. Chyi Geology	All Weather Radon Monitoring System for Earthquake Prediction.	3,962.70
2-07505	1542	Dr. Mark D. Foster Polymer Science	Nanomechanical Properties at the Surface of a Polymer Blend.	4,000.00
2-07506	1543	Dr. Richard Londraville Biology	Fish Proteomics.	4,000.00
2-07507	1544	Dr. John A. Peck Geology	The Environmental Magnetic Record of Ecosystem and Land Use Change from Summit Lake, Akron, Ohio.	4,000.00

**TOTAL FUNDED: \$15,962.70**



APPENDIX I

**PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE**

**Report to the Faculty Senate  
November 7, 2002**

**Meetings of October 3 Through October 31.** The Committee heard numerous reports on various aspects of the budget. These included reports by Vice President Ray on the review of the FY02-03 Budget, and overview of the ROI by Phil Brown, quality measures by Tom Angelo and health care costs by Liz Erickson.

The committee anticipated receiving preliminary budget models. However, it was reported by Vice President Ray at the October 31 meeting that, because of political strategizing surrounding the November 5 election, the state budget situation was too uncertain to provide even preliminary budget models. He anticipated that a clearer picture of the budget regarding higher education would emerge within 2-3 weeks after the election.

Vice President Ray also shared a memo from Ernst and Young to the University's Board of Trustees that the completed audited financial statements for FY01-02 would be presented to the Board at its December 4, 2002 meeting. (See Attached memo.)

The committee also discussed whether it should request all unit heads to present their budget priorities and justifications to PBC, and what the guidelines for such presentations should be. That discussion was to be carried over to the November 7 meeting.

Preliminary reports from the PBC Subcommittees on ROI Assessment and Review and ROI Quality Measures were also to be discussed on November 7. The final reports are to be presented to the Senate on December 5, 2002.

Respectfully submitted,

Rudy Fenwick  
Co-Chair  
<fenwick@uakron.edu>



October 24, 2002

■ Ernst & Young LLP  
1300 Huntington Building  
925 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1405

■ Phone (216) 861-5000  
www.ey.com

Board of Trustees  
The University of Akron

Dear Members of the Board of Trustees:

We were engaged to perform an audit of the University of Akron's financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2002, which were to be presented in draft format at the October 30, 2002 Board of Trustees meeting. On October 23, 2002, we met with finance management and reviewed the status of the financial statement audit. Considering the following open items, management with our concurrence, have determined it would be more appropriate to present complete audited financial statements at the December 4, 2002 Board of Trustees meeting:

- The University is required to adopt and prepare its financial statements in accordance with the new GASB Statement No. 34 Basic Financial Statements-and Management's Discussion and Analysis-for State and Local Governments and GASB Statement No. 35 Basic Financial Statements-and Management's Discussion and Analysis-for Public Colleges and Universities for fiscal 2002. These statements require the University to present their financial statements on an entity wide basis, include expanded footnotes and management's discussion and analysis. The adoption of these statements has required significant effort, is ongoing but incomplete.
- Completion of several generally accepted accounting principles checklists;
- The State of Ohio has notified all Ohio colleges and universities of a potential fiscal 2002 worker's compensation liability; however, no evidential matter to record this liability has been provided to the University; and
- Due to the delay in the completion of the 2002 audit, the University's General Counsel will need to provide us with an update to the University's litigation matters.

The University's financial and internal audit departments are down several key managers who have not been replaced. However, management is developing a plan to ensure that the above items are addressed and completed in order for us to complete our fieldwork to meet the deadlines of the December 4, 2002 Board of Trustees meeting. We look forward to meeting with you and would be happy to address any questions you have regarding this timing change.

Very truly yours,

  
Robert S. Monitello  
Partner



APPENDIX J

Minutes  
Ohio Faculty Council  
May 17, 2002

- I. Chancellor Chu joined us at the start of our meeting. His comments included:
  - Budget concerns include trying to close the biennium budget gap. He was quite concerned about what the new fiscal year might bring.
  - The Governor is campaigning on a 3<sup>rd</sup> Frontier issue which is basically the Ohio Plan. He suggested three major things that higher ed must do: provide a better education for more Ohioans; recognize this is a knowledge economy; and seriously invest in research and development.
  - He indicated he felt we must find a way to change the focus from teaching to learning.
  - We must consider other models of funding.
- II. General Education Conference  
This conference is being cosponsored by OFC and the Articulation/Transfer Committee. It will be held June 10 and 11. Members were asked to carry information to their campuses and encourage participation.
- III. Meeting Dates  
It was decided we would schedule an OFC meeting each month next year and cancel if we do not have agenda items to discuss.
- IV. It was decided, after a brief discussion, that perhaps grade inflation is not a topic we want to approach at this time. It might be worthwhile to discuss the philosophy of grades. It was agreed that inflation studies probably don't accomplish anything.
- V. Rob Sheehan joined us to talk about the upcoming Performance Report progress. As always, he was very informative. He shared a number of interesting statistics that have surfaced in preparing the report. He promised to get us copies of the high school performance report when it is ready.
- VI. Legislative visits  
Jim Evans, Bowling Green, reported on organized visit with state legislators. He advocated we plan similar visits on our campuses. In the discussion about the merit of such visits, it was suggested we invite legislators to visit with OFC and perhaps invite the Governor to a meeting as well. It was suggested perhaps the Ohio Faculty Senate (2 year faculty group) and the OFC could plan a joint meeting and invite the Governor to talk with both groups. We will need to be very well organized for such a meeting to be helpful. We'll discuss in the fall.
- VII. The meeting was adjourned at 3 p.m. Have a good summer!



Minutes  
Ohio Faculty Council  
October 4, 2002

- I. Lunch and informal conversation,
- II. Members introduces themselves.
- III. Chancellor Chu joined us for a welcome and briefing. He addressed the following:
  - Budget forecast 2001 to 2004 is an increase of 28,000 students for public campuses
  - A budget was proposed by the Regents at the September meeting with lots of input from the Funding Commission. It included a 10% increase this year and an additional 10% increase from 2004 to 2005. Chu indicated he did not expect to get that much. The Governor will propose his budget in January.
  - He reported on the work of the Funding Commission. He indicated the big wild cards within the budget process are what happens after the elections and what happens in the DeRolf decision. The Budget Director is not telling OBR to expect big cuts.
  - The Capital budget will come out after the November elections. The Legislature have taken part of the capital budget to refund money spent to handle the deficit. Higher Ed has been the biggest recipient of capital budget, so some hit is expected in the Higher Ed money.
  - Staff changes: Rob Sheehan has moved to the University of Toledo as Vice Provost of Assessment and Strategic Planning.
  - There are three new Regents: Jerry Gordon and Pauley Crum have rotated off of the OBR. Ed Rigaud (from Cincinnati), Bruce Beeghly (from Youngstown) and Donna Albarado (from Newark) are the new Regents. Chu reported that all have been very involved in the Funding Commission.
  - Compact 2010 was discussed. This is the long term plan for Ohio. Our challenge in Higher Ed will be to determine what we need to do when we get some of the funding to show payoffs, meaningfulness and impact of higher ed. He asked our engagement in this discussion
  - Rod reported he is unsure what impact the Supreme Court decision about vouchers in Cleveland will have.
  - 3<sup>rd</sup> Frontier - Rod reported there are a number of investment funds available. Initial criteria required partnership in research. This collaboration is important and is a regulatory way to help build additional quality for the state.
  - Rod noted that open admission is not required by state schools. Schools have control of their admission requirements. He advised that if faculty are not satisfied with the admission policy of their schools, they should change them.
  - Chancellor Chu indicated a concern that the Federal Funding Act for Higher Education will be reauthorized next year and legislators are already critical of degree completion rates in higher ed. He is concerned that IPED data cannot track transfers and thus may not give accurate information. He indicated that 60 to 65% of students take courses in more than 1 institution. The Chancellor asks members of OFC to be aware of the issue and to be aware that arguing data is not going to sway public opinion. We need to get our information in order, consider the situation, and bring serious discourse on our campuses. He warned us that you cannot rationalize with a legislator. He suggests we are better to focus on specific programs such as retention programs, amount of institutional help in provided to students to complete. Value added might be a valid argument.
  - We need to canvas our home school faculties to get better thoughts and arguments to share with Chancellor Chu. Stories of our students' successes are helpful. Faculty need to make a commitment to work on the issue and to reach more students.
  - Reciprocity tuition agreements are moving forward with Kentucky and West Virginia. The Pennsylvania agreement is going very slow.
- IV. The list of proposed meeting dates for this year was discussed. It was decided we need to adjust the January 10 date to January 17 to accommodate schools that are not back in session as early. At the November 8 meeting, the list will be formalized. Members will be asked to note any additional problem dates for that meeting.



- V. Selection of the Executive Committee for the 2002-2003 year was postponed until the November 8 meeting. The group is to select a Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary at that time.
- VI. Information about the General Education Conference (June 10 and 11, 2002) was distributed. This included the satisfaction survey and several pertinent handouts from the conference. We need to decide if we want to sponsor a second conference next Spring. If so, we need to start thinking about a theme and how involved we want to be as a group.
- VII. The Transfer/Articulation Policy Revision Committee was briefly discussed. At our November meeting, we will discuss how involved we want to be with this process. (Note: Dick Arndt has been invited to come and talk with us about the work of this committee)
- VIII. We need to establish goals for this year. Discussion will continue at the November 8 meeting.
- IX. The meeting adjourned at 3:10.