

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

5-6-1999

Faculty Senate Chronicle May 6, 1999

Heather M. Loughney

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

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

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 6, 1999	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 6, 1999	17
A. Provost Search Committee Bylaw Amendment	17
B. Report of <i>Faculty Rights & Responsibilities Committee</i>	21
C. Report of <i>Academic Policies & Calendar Committee</i> , including Commencement dates through 2006	22
D. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	28
E. Report of <i>Athletics Committee</i>	29
F. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i>	30
G. Report of <i>Planning & Budgeting Committee</i>	32
H. Report of <i>University Libraries Committee</i>	55
I. Report of <i>General Education Advisory Committee</i>	56
J. Proposed changes for UA Press Director	57

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Dr. Gary Oller (+1910).
FacultySenate@UAkron.Edu

MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MAY 6, 1999

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chair Barbara Heinzerling at 3:03 p.m. on Thursday, May 6, 1999, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-eight of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Deckler, Isayev, Rich, Richert, Smith, and Smolen were absent with notice. Senators Baldwin, Batur, Bird, C.Buchanan, J.Buchanan, Fisher, Ozanich, Reed, and Wright were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED THE LIST OF SUMMER 99 COMMENCEMENT CANDIDATES**
- * PASSED THREE PROPOSALS FROM APCC REGARDING DATES FOR COMMENCEMENT, THE LAST DAY TO REGISTER AND THE CURRICULUM REVIEW PROCESS AS DESCRIBED IN THE FACULTY MANUAL**
- * PASSED AN AMENDED VERSION OF THE PBC FINAL REPORT**
- * PASSED A MOTION FROM APCC TO ALLOW 6 BYPASSED CREDITS FOR A MINOR**
- * PASSED CHANGES TO THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS REGARDING THE RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE**
- * PASSED CHANGES TO THE UNIVERSITY BYLAWS REGARDING THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON PRESS**
- * POSTPONED VOTING ON A MOTION REGARDING PART-TIME FACULTY PAY RAISES UNTIL THE SEPTEMBER MEETING**
- * APPROVED A MOTION TO CARRY OVER ANY UNFINISHED BUSINESS TO NEXT YEAR'S SENATE**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chair asked for approval of the agenda. This was moved by Senator Peggy Richards and seconded by Senator Judith Fitzgerald. The body then voted its approval.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE APRIL 1, 1999 - Secretary Gary Oller said that he had no corrections. Senator Richards moved that the minutes be accepted, and this was seconded by Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh. The Senate then approved the minutes.

III. CHAIR'S REMARKS - The Chair welcomed Dr. John Bee, who had agreed to serve as the parliamentarian for today's meeting. (Don R. Gerlach, the regular parliamentarian, was away.) This was certainly not a new position for Dr. Bee, and she appreciated his giving up his time in this last week of school when we all were so busy.

As the 1998-99 school year was coming to a close, the Chair personally wanted to thank the members for serving as Senators as well as for the diligence with which they had served on the body and its committees. She thanked those who were completing their terms of office for the stewardship which they had given the University and congratulated them on a fine job done. She wished all those who would be returning in September an enjoyable summer and hoped that they would return refreshed, renewed, and ready to go. She also congratulated those members present, who had earlier today received chairs for 30 years service to the University. They were Senator Elizabeth Erickson, Senator Judith Fitzgerald, and Dr. John Bee. She asked for a round of applause for the three who looked so young that they must have been juveniles when they had started here. The body acknowledged the colleagues with applause.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chair noted that at this exceptionally beautiful time of the year, there was a particular poignancy to the next order of business, which was to note the loss of four of our colleagues from The University of Akron family. The first was Dr. Charles Poston, who had passed away on January 11 at the age of 83. He received a Ph.D. in Finance from the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill in 1959 and in that same year had joined the faculty of The University of Akron as an Associate Professor of Finance. During his career here, Dr. Poston had been head of the Department of General Business, head of the Department of Finance, and Director of Institutional Research and Academic Personnel. Prior to and after retiring, he had also served on the University accreditation team for the North Central Association. He had also continued to teach in the capacity of Professor Emeritus of Finance.

The second colleague was Dr. Robert Deitchman, a long-time crusader and advocate for equal rights, who died on April 19. He graduated from the City College of New York in 1962 and had received his masters and doctorate degree from the University of Tennessee in psychology in 1966 and 1968 respectively. In 1992 Dr. Deitchman had returned to college as a student and received his masters degree in science and social administration from Case Western University. He began to teach here at the University as an Assistant Professor of Psychology, and in 1981 became an Assistant Professor of Social Work. He retired in 1994 as an Associate Professor of Social Work but continued to teach part-time in the school.

The third colleague was Dr. Robert Dubick, one of our own Senators, who had died on April 30. He had served as an administrator and faculty member at The University of Akron since 1985, and in recent years had become an expert on alcohol and drug abuse on college campuses. As associate provost and dean of student services, a post he held here for 8 years, Dr. Dubick had seen over time what alcohol and drugs were doing to deteriorate the quality of student life, and he had wanted to do something about it. He had served as a consultant to colleges and universities that wanted to implement programs to reduce alcohol and drug abuse among students. In recent years, he had been an associate professor of higher education administration in the College of Education.

The last colleague was Mr. E.J. (Bud) Houston, Jr., who died on May 3. He had received his B.S. degree from Purdue University and his MA in Speech and Communication from The University of Akron. Mr. Houston had been acting Associate Provost and Dean of Continuing Education, Public Services and Outreach at the University, retiring in 1994 with 22 years of service. Since retiring, he had been associated with Primerica Financial Services.

The Chair asked the body to rise for a moment of silence for the four colleagues, and the Senate did so.

The last special announcement was that the body needed to approve the list of Summer 1999 commencement candidates. There was a list of those students here as well as in the Senate office. She asked for a motion to approve that list, and any member who had not as yet seen the list was welcome to abstain. Senator Dolli Markovich moved approval and Senator Richards seconded the motion. The Senate then approved the list.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - President Luis Proenza made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Madame Chair, and colleagues - good afternoon. There are a number of pieces of information that I need to share with you this afternoon, but let me begin by setting the context for a portion of those remarks.

As you know, last week the Board of Trustees acted on some recommendations to raise tuition by 6%, which includes a number of modest increases and fee structures. The reason for this deals with the biennial structure of the legislature here, which places us in a somewhat unusual situation of not yet knowing what our budget is going to be and having to act in anticipation of some possible conditions, and yet hoping for some more positive conditions. At the moment, as Senator Norfolk was pointing out, if you've been reading the papers, you know that the House of the Ohio Legislature has made some recommendations of the budget and that it will now move to the Senate for their debate, recommendations, and ultimately to a conference in process that will lead us to the final budget.

As we are currently situated, the following would be the situation by and large. For the first biennium, we would receive a 0.1% or .1 of 1% increase in the operating budget. We would have some modest increases in challenge access, modest increases in research challenge, and projected for the second biennium is the slightly more positive picture for the operating budget, an increase of 2.3%. Now I'm sure not to compute for you what 0.1% of our operating budget is, but it isn't very much. Therefore, I had with the help of our staff, recommended to the Trustees that they examine a number of possible scenarios, many of which were exactly those that were examined by our Planning & Budgeting Committee. Based on that, they felt it appropriate to put forward the tuition increase and modest fee increase.

I need to comment on that a little bit, because there is a bit of misunderstanding about some elements of it. The reason for the misunderstanding is that in a separate action, the Trustees authorized the administration to seek bonding in the amount of no more than \$135 million to be ultimately repaid by certain fee increases for facilities. So the first message that you need to

understand is that what the Trustees authorized for that action was not yet the fee increases to bear those bond repayment schedules. They authorized the issuance of the bonds, and as Hank Nettling is here, if you have some questions for Hank, that will come forward. But an important message for you to understand, therefore, is that as far as facilities is concerned, the payment schedule for fee increases with the facilities enhancement of about \$55 per semester from our students will not begin until the Fall of 2000. So no one is going to be charged for anything that hasn't already been put in place. That's an important message for you to have in mind, as I've had several students assume that the tuition increase is to pay for those facilities - not at all.

I've heard equally from many students the suggestion that if we're going to start with facilities, why can't we at least improve parking? We are going to start with that, and to that end the Trustees did approve a modest increase in parking fees for students; and for the first time, yes, ladies and gentlemen, a charge to faculty and staff. I need to comment on that a little again, so that you understand it. First of all, it is a very modest increase - \$20 per semester for faculty and staff. That is in addition to the \$120 that the University already has set aside per faculty and staff toward parking issues. This is at a time when we can no longer afford to assume those costs within the operating budget of the University. So now you're saying, you're giving me a fee increase that's going to result in a pay cut. Not at all, but I cannot recommend to the Trustees a compensation increase until I know what our operating budget is going to be. But we have, at least in the scenarios we're developing, the assurance that it will be no less than \$40 per year; in fact, quite a bit more than that, I assure you. But just so you understand that it's at least \$40. To put it another way, the way I've tried to convey to our staff and to Hank, who is needing to ultimately implement this, is that I will never recommend to the Trustees an increase in fees that will not be accompanied by increasing compensation that will exceed whatever fees are being charged. I regret that I can't tell you how much it will be exceeded by until I have a budget from the state of Ohio. I know what we could do if they don't give us anything, and that's more than \$40, but I don't yet know how much more. And lest I promise something I can't deliver, please be patient. First and foremost, are there any questions on those two issues?"

Senator Richards stated that the part-time faculty consistently only received a \$5-\$10 raise annually, and many times they had been left out of raises completely. Would the President assure her that part-time faculty would also receive at least a minimum of a \$40 pay increase?

President Proenza answered that this was a difficult question. He thought she would recognize that he might not know exactly what the answer to that would be. Recognizing the difficulties with both faculty and staff, he had asked the parking services staff to begin looking at how we could tier parking fees across different categories of faculty, staff, and students. Equally important was to recognize the possibility that we ought to look at different charges for different places to park. He thought that the combination of compensation increases and the application of an appropriate parking structure (which we had not had) should make it, if not a total wash for people who had a small part-time assignment, certainly more appropriate than the \$350 that people at Cleveland State paid per year. He regretted having to hedge, but he did not know exactly.

Senator Jack Braun said that on the light side, the President was guaranteeing that we all would be getting a \$40 salary increase this year. The President responded that it would be at least that much. He believed that this would apply to everyone here, if he was not hurrying too far in his mathematics at the moment.

On the serious side, Senator Braun wanted to know what was going to guarantee that the fee would not be increased every year from now on. We started at \$20, but it would then go up \$40, \$60, \$80 - just like rent for an apartment.

The President replied that this was a very good question, since the University was already paying \$120 for you and it had significant needs. As he told the body before, we were committed to improving the campus in all of its aspects lest we lose our competitive advantage and lest we therefore not be able to even pay your salary. The first thing necessary to do was improve the parking situation. This was because as soon as we started the construction program, some of the current lots would be lost. It was quite reasonable to anticipate that parking fees would continue to rise until some reasonable fraction of those fees were being paid individually. But they would not occur without continuing accruals in compensation increases that should exceed those.

Senator Markovich said that she would appreciate it if the President would comment for the record on the fact that the parking revenues that would be generated by this increase would not be going toward the Mercer study. She thought that there was a misperception by some of the faculty that it was to fund the Mercer study, and it was not in fact for that purpose. President Proenza responded with the following comments:

"No, the parking fees that we've set aside and we've charged students and will begin now to charge to faculty and staff will always go to bear parking costs, parking improvements, parking management, etc. If at any point we find that we're collecting more than we need, we'll reduce fees and adjust them as every other place does under those circumstances. But they are not going to fund any aspect of Mercer, salary compensation, and so forth.

That raises another very good question and that is, that we also recommended to the Trustees as part and parcel of the recommendation for a 6% increase, that we do take some money, develop now from the increase in tuition and begin setting that aside for three purposes. First and dearest to all of our hearts I'm sure, is the continued and serious application of resources whenever they become available, to improve the salary condition of this institution. I'll share some data with you on that in a moment with appropriate caveats, but that will be a priority.

Number 2, that we set some funds aside to redress those equity issues that we know will come about when we apply the Mercer study data that's almost completed. I know you're impatient about that, but we're recommending that they go into effect on a retroactive to July 1 basis, and the reason it will be impossible for us to say today that we do it by July 1 is that evidently the law requires that we make certain announcements and allow certain opportunity for dialogue before those adjustments are made. So there's a 60-day waiting period evidently that has to be met, and Mr. Mallo may be able to inform us if there is further concern about it.

And lastly, of course, we have some modest number of funds that enable us to pursue the Carnegie Teaching Academy initiative and enable us to continue to make available the kinds of funds that our Provost's office has made for the enhancement of our research mission, our two principal advancement goals. So we'll have some pool of money available for compensation increases, separate pool for Mercer increases, and separate pool for these initiatives, none of which correctly identified by Senator Markovich derived from parking revenue increases. So all of those would go for program-related activities.

Now, in that context it's important for me to share a little bit of information on the latest AAUP salary survey so that you know we still have some room to go and yet we may have made some enhancement. I say some, because some of the data is now going to get readjusted given, for example, the new contract that was put in place at Kent State recently. These data antecede that, so I'm not sure exactly what that contract calls for and you'll have to look at that data.

But as we speak now, we have gone forward in instructors, and we're currently number one in the state among public institutions at an average pay of \$38,400, range from \$31,000-\$38,400, and we're at the top of that scale. So entry-level instructor positions at the top institutions are the urban institutions that will avail themselves, professionals in our community which require a somewhat higher pay.

In asst. professors, we've risen to number five in the state. The average for Akron at asst. professors is currently at \$44,600 but that's about a year-old data. The range was from \$37,100 at the lowest end to \$48,700. And \$48,700 by the way, is Ohio State; the next nearest is the University of Cincinnati at \$45,800, so we're not far below. For example, the average at Cincinnati is \$44,600, compared to \$45,800, and we are above Kent State, which in assoc. professors in this survey is at 11th place.

Moving from asst. to assoc. professors, The University of Akron now ranks 8th in the state. Kent State is listed in this survey at 10th. Our average for assoc. professors is \$52,900; the range is now for associates from \$42,300 to \$58,100. Again, Ohio State is at the top at \$58,100; Cincinnati is at \$56,100; we're at \$52,900; Kent is below us at \$52,000, so about \$900 less on the average. Again, those figures may need to be adjusted, both by the contract they approve and whatever we are able to do at this budget cycle coming up.

Finally, full professors - again, we do better than some, but not as well as either assoc. or asst. professors. We rank 9th in the state of Ohio at \$68,900, with the range being \$48,100 to \$84,900. We'll provide you that data, and the AAUP survey is available on the internet, which is the data for Ohio public institutions. We've looked at private institutions as well, and it might just interest you to note that obviously Case Western is like Ohio State, an outlier at the very top. The other key institutions of substantial size - Oberlin, Dayton, John Carroll, Kenyon and Xavier have the range for full professors between \$64,000 and \$74,000 for assoc. professors; between \$49,000 and \$57,000 for asst. professors between \$40,000 at the bottom end and \$45,000, excluding Case. That gets skewed by the medical salaries. Instructors are quite comparable at the bottom end - you are \$34,300 at the bottom and \$41,500 at the top in private institutions. Any questions?"

Senator Virginia Gunn asked what the range was for Assistant Professors at The University of Akron. President Proenza answered that he did not have that information. The range for all public universities at the assistant professor levels was from \$37,000 at Central State University to \$48,700 at Ohio State. Our average was \$44,600. Senator Gunn thought that our range was lower than that. The President responded with the following remarks:

"The range starts lower and moves well above that. I know we just started an asst. professor at well over \$48,700. Any other questions? Let me end that portion of my remarks, and I apologize for the amount of time, but these are important. Again, with just a request that you try to help us communicate these issues among your faculty colleagues as well as within the student group, and

remember that no student fees are currently going for any facilities other than parking, and only parking fees are going to parking. We're setting aside money for compensation increases that should exceed comfortably, certainly for full-time people, any fee increases which you will see. But you have to understand and help understand on the part of your colleagues the fact that we cannot be the only institution that is in an urban setting charging absolutely no fees.

Just a couple of other things - the financing plan I mentioned - the Trustees approved the issuance of bonds, and Mr. Nettling will be beginning the process. They similarly approved the renovation in a part-time way, and by part-time you'll hear the following: the 3rd and 5th floors of Polsky. The reason for that is that as we begin to demolish some facilities - Simmons, for example, our psychology dept. is going to need someplace to go. So we're taking an unusual and very innovative approach of using some very fine systems from steelcase to make first-quality space available at Polsky which can be reconfigured and even moved, if necessary, to other space. The people that would be affected have reviewed that and are quite enthusiastic about it, so the purpose of staying in Polsky's for the foreseeable future is to allow the chess game that has to take place as one facility comes off-line, people have to move somewhere, etc. And we'll be immediately moving forward with some parking deck renovations and plans for some new parking decks as well. We've already talked about the tuition and fee increases.

Mercer study - very briefly, I think we're coming very close to recommendation. About 100 individuals are affected, and depending on the final analysis from supervisors and looking at the data of a cost to the institution of somewhere in the \$400,000 range to make those adjustments.

Three last things - as you know, we have a new venue for commencement beginning next Saturday. I hope that many, if not all of you Senators, will be in attendance. I trust you will find the exercises, once we get all of the kinks out of the way, to be a ceremony that all of us can be very proud of and that our students will remember and each one of us will remember.

Secondly, we had a visit by the Mexican Ambassador to the United States and shared information, as some of our colleagues in International Business were in attendance. Mr. Jesus F. Reyes-Heroles is a Ph.D. from MIT and has remained active as both a professor as well as a man of government service.

Lastly, I'm delighted on behalf of my colleagues in the School of Law to announce that the speaker for next year's Dean's Club dinner will be Supreme Court Judge Sandra Day O'Connor. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you very much."

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met on April 7 and had dealt with a variety of matters, including setting the agenda for today's meeting. Presidential Assistant Joseph Walton also attended that meeting to explain a problem and its possible solution regarding the Provost Search Committee. In initiating the election of the various constituencies' representatives for that committee, it had been discovered that there was a problem regarding the electorate and candidates for the two upper-level administrative members. In the bylaw describing the committee and its makeup, it referred to a different Faculty Senate bylaw, which would contain the list of upper-level administrators who would act as the electorate and from whom the two representatives would be chosen. When one looked up that Faculty Senate bylaw, one discovered that it did not exist. The problem was that the original reference had been to an old University Council bylaw which had

listed the administrators who were members of the University Council. Since there weren't any upper-level administrators in the Faculty Senate, obviously that bylaw no longer existed. But when the Faculty Manual had been updated, all reference to University Council had just been replaced by "Faculty Senate"; hence, the reference in the Provost Search Committee bylaw. Therefore, there was no bylaw that listed the eligible administrators.

To solve the problem, Legal Affairs proposed amending the Provost Search Committee bylaw by incorporating the original list of administrators excluding the President and Provost and making allowances for title changes and so forth from the no longer extant University Council bylaw. This made no change in the committee or the process - just a correction of an oversight. In order to expedite this and have Board approval as soon as possible, Dr. Walton was asking the Executive Committee on behalf of the Senate to give its okay to the amending language, and the Executive Committee did so. If anyone was interested, Secretary Oller had the details available. (See Appendix A.)

The Committee had also met with President Proenza and Dr. Walton this past Tuesday to discuss matters of mutual interest.

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - (See Appendix B.)

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Sheryl Stevenson, the Chair, referred the body to her written report (Appendix C). There were three items from the Committee for the body. The first had to do with the use of EJ Thomas Hall for graduation. Since they scheduled events up to five years in advance, we had to approve a calendar for commencement for the next five years. Those dates were listed in the written report, and the Committee was recommending their approval.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the calendar dates for commencements for the next five years.

Senator Stevenson said that the second item was something that had been requested by the President's office. She reminded the members that faculty had been asked to put in their syllabi that the last day to add a course would be a certain day, and this policy needed now to be added to the schedule of classes and needed to be somewhere where students could read it. If students did not register by a certain day each semester, we did not get subvention for them. That certain day was the official census date set by the Ohio Board of Regents. After some investigation in order to figure out this language, the date was the 15th calendar day, whether it was summer I or II or fall or spring, although these really weren't equivalent times. The Committee was recommending the policy written in boldface in section two of the written report.

In response to a question regarding where this policy would be posted, Senator Stevenson said that she understood it would be in the schedule of classes. Interim Associate Provost Jean Blosser added that there was a place in the University Bulletin where it talked about adding classes, and the policy would be placed there as well.

The Senate then voted on the policy and gave its approval.

Senator Stevenson then presented the third item. The Committee had received an inquiry last fall concerning the curriculum review process on an unrelated and minor matter. When it had looked at that process as it was described in the Faculty Manual, it had discovered that the description had never been updated since the former Academic Policies Curriculum and Calendar Committee had been split and Curriculum Review had become a separate committee. Nor did the description reflect the current web-based review of curriculum proposals. The Committee realized that this needed an entire overhaul. The written report contained the language of the old policy currently in the Manual and the totally revised description to replace it. The revision had been the result of at least four months of pretty hard work with Jean Blosser, Nancy Stokes and Gary Oller working long and hard to come up with an accurate description of the current process that would clarify, for instance, how changes in delivery of the course and so forth would fit into our curriculum review process. This final draft was just finished on Wednesday after suggestions from the Graduate School and others were incorporated into it, and it replaced the one which had been sent to members of the Senate earlier.

Associate Provost Blosser added that the earlier draft which Senators had received did not quite allow a clear enough explanation of what really happened after the college released the proposal and it was reviewed by various bodies on campus, including the Graduate School, the Library, Institutional Research, and the Distance Learning Steering Committee if it had a web-based component. So what we had to do was step back and take a look to allow enough time that any changes or suggestions that had come from those bodies could be put into place by the time the proposal came open for university-wide review. Then the person would be reviewing an accurate, final document and not something that was still going back and forth with comments and recommendations. This was called institutional review, which was in point 5. The college released the proposal and it would go to those bodies. Then it could be reviewed with recommendations passed, and then it would be open for university-wide review. This would streamline the process essentially. Once it was released from the college and everything went well, it could be 8 weeks, which would enable us to still bring it to the Senate.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate approved the new language describing the curriculum review process in the Faculty Manual (3359-20-052).

President Proenza wanted to return to the first item of the APCC report - the calendar for graduations. He thought that a friendly amendment needed to be made. Because of the new venue, there would be two dates for each of the commencements. He recommended that the body work with Tom Vukovich to be sure that the additional dates be added when the calendar was printed.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Blosser, the Chair, stated that she had distributed a report of the curriculum proposals (Appendix D). Every proposal that had gone in had now been reviewed and come out. If you had been watching closely, you would see that some on this list had been approved by this body before, but this morning an editorial thing had been done to make sure that everything had been caught. There might be some programs that would go before the Board of Trustees at the June meeting. Simultaneously, they were working on the Bulletin so at this point they were going to act as though these would be accepted and would say pending Board approval by those programs. It was a few minors and certificates, but she was confident that we would get it all done.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - (See Appendix E.)

(As Senator Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee began her report (Appendix F), the tape mechanism apparently malfunctioned, and approximately one hour of the meeting was lost. A major point which she raised in her report was the Committee's dissatisfaction that the Capital Budget Plan had not been presented in a timely fashion for discussion by the Planning and Budgeting Committee and presentation to the Senate before going to the Board. President Proenza thanked Senator Erickson for the thoroughness of her report. Senator Rebecca Gibson, the Chair of the Student Affairs Committee, then gave a report for that committee.

Senator Jesse Marquette then presented the final report (Appendix G) of the Planning and Budgeting Committee for discussion, which focused mainly on Appendix D (Proposed Procedure for Technology Fee Implementation) and Appendix E (Graduate Student "Stand Alone" Tuition Scholarships) of that document. Senator Ralph Turek raised concerns about the adverse effects the new policy on graduate student "stand alone" tuition scholarships might have in the College of Fine and Applied Arts. A number of Senators (Chand Midha, Wolfgang Pelz, John Edgerton, James Lynn) had problems with aspects of the proposed procedure for technology fee implementation (Appendix D). There was a concern that departments which had allocated funds for computer equipment and labs would lose a source of revenue for their maintenance and upgrades. Senator Kris Gill pointed out that only those fees set after fall 96 were being removed. **A motion was made to amend E.2. of that appendix to read as follows: "65% to be allocated by Provost based on recommendations of CCTC and IS in response to unit funding requests. THESE FUNDS MUST BE DISTRIBUTED TO ACADEMIC UNITS ONLY.** The Senate passed the amendment with one nay and one abstention. When the tape began to function again, the discussion was focused on, "A. Remove existing course fees justified by reference to computing support." Senator Midha moved the following which was seconded by Senator Markovich: **"A. Remove existing course fees established in fall 1996 and after, which were justified by reference to computing support."** The body approved the amendment.

Senator Shelley Baranowski wanted to raise a question and then talk about a different matter. She realized that this was the budget for the next academic year, but she was also looking ahead to the fact that we would be losing over 100 faculty through ERIP by the summer of 2000. Obviously, departments would like to begin hiring in the fall of this coming year. She was wondering what was in the budget here that would allow us to get started, because if we could not replace faculty, Carnegie II and the Teaching Academy were going to go down the tubes.

Senator Marquette responded that everyone had that same concern, but at this point we were not in a position to do very much about it except to say that we were aware of it. We did not even have the amount from the state retirement system yet as to what this was actually going to cost. The Committee and the administration would have to do the best they could to make up for this giant hole that was about to be created. He had done some analysis, and we were going to lose 20% of our full professors. However, right now we just did not know, and the answer was basically the same as what the Committee had given the body in terms of the state budget. When there was sufficient information on this, the problem would be dealt with.

Senator Midha had an unrelated question. He had read in the Chronicle of Higher Education that the service factor was different for the main campus than the Wayne campus. Was the Wayne

campus faculty and staff also going to be charged \$40 for the parking permit?

Senator Tim Norfolk had a semi-serious follow-up to Senator Baranowski's question. He knew that by looking at what was happening in many departments with people retiring, adding in the ERIP costs was actually going to cost us money over new hires, because new hires were being brought in at higher salaries than the retiring people had been getting. He was curious to know how that was going to function.

Provost Noel Leathers wanted to make a couple of comments. Last year we had introduced a matriculation fee for all freshmen, which was \$100. They paid this once, and then they did not pay for course changes, drops, graduation fees or diploma fees, as well as getting free transcripts. This saved a lot of nickel and dime expenses and frustrations for the average student, and everyone seemed to be happier. There had been a number of requests from departments asking for more money (\$15, \$20) for computers. Departments had gone out and created wonderful computer labs, but there were problems and complaints about the infrastructure (hookups, servers, speed, etc.). The idea was to simplify this and across the whole curriculum charge a \$5 an hr. computer technology fee (except for freshmen). Having removed some fees, they had done an estimate. If you looked at the budget numbers, it said that this year, through all the individual departmental course fees attached to computers, it was \$1,330,000. Next year's figure was \$1,080,000 - reduced by \$250,000. If you looked at the next line - technology support - it said \$1,700,000 in some of the scenarios, so you paid \$250,000 in the way we increased the income to the University for computer technology by \$1,400,000. This was something which we needed. Having checked other universities to see what they charged, they were far above where we were. This was a growing opportunity. Everybody was using more and more computers, so what we were trying to do was enhance the income for this purpose.

Obviously, when the proposal says that revenue would be allocated, it would be allocated because the demand was going to exceed whatever we had. He had talked to the budget director about how hard it would be to administer this. There would be no problem whatsoever. The money that the department would generate through the fee would come in, and he would transfer that money to their account automatically. Once it was set in place, he would not even have to look at it. As far as putting the money back into academic units, if you meant direct academic support, he could live with that. He thought it fit the intent of what many were saying here. This fee and procedure made sense to him and simplified the process and got it started. We might need more down the road, but he guaranteed that no department would receive less money than they were getting now. They would not be adversely affected by this. Their estimate had been 35% of the gross, but the other 65% was there to make sure that nobody got hurt. There was that flexibility. He was taking the time to explain this because some members had not had the chance to understand it, and he appreciated their interest and concern. The idea was to build revenue in as simple a way as we could and then use it appropriately.

In regard to Senator Baranowski's question about ERIP, he wanted to explain how STRS worked. When the people who would take ERIP retired in June 2000, we would not know what the University's financial obligation would be until we got it all back from STRS individually. They would do an individual calculation on every person - age, how many years, etc. - and they would come back and give a number saying this was what it was going to take to pay for professor x. For five years, you have to send us this much money for professor x. Therefore, it was very difficult to say we were going to have this much money carryover. All we could do was take the formula they

were using and make a close estimate and set that much money aside because we were obligated to do that. Then we had to figure out a way to solve the question which Senator Baranowski asked. It wouldn't be an easy one, but it would be an interesting challenge.

Senator Brian Mormino had a comment regarding a concern which many students had brought to his attention. He did not know whether it was appropriate at this time, but he had never had any time to bring it to the appropriate people and would try it now. On page 2 of the document it talked about support of gender equity for athletics, and on page 8 there was \$250,000 for the gender equity plan (athletics). Then at the top of page 7 it said support of athletics was about \$5 million. He knew that there was the question of gender equity and there was the cost of Division I athletics, but students did not really like that large a percentage of their student fees going to athletics in which they did not participate. They had the enjoyment of going to watch, but they would rather have the money for student activities.

Provost Leathers thanked Senator Mormino for bringing this up. The \$250,000 increase for next year's budget had been required by an agreement that was signed with the NCAA three years ago. This had to be done for three years, but this next one was the last year that we had to do this.

Senator Norfolk, Chair of the Athletics Committee, answered Senator Mormino's comment by noting that two years ago the Committee, intent on doing something about this very issue, had concluded that there were basically two choices. The first was to continue what we had been doing which had to include the \$250,000, and the second was to do away with all competitive athletics at the University. Anything else ended up costing us more. He had been surprised to see that we spent less than almost every MAC school in athletics. Admittedly, it came out of the student fees, and the students resented it. However, despite what we might pretend about where the money came from, it was really one big pot of money. Most of it was provided by students paying tuition, and the other half was provided by the state. How it was divided up was another issue.

Since there were no further comments, the Senate approved the PBC final report as amended.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE - (See Appendix H.)

GENERAL EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Blosser reported on behalf of the committee (Appendix I). The luncheon to discuss the committee, its activities and directions for the future which she had mentioned at last month's meeting had taken place. It had been very well attended (70 faculty). The Committee had also conducted some student focus groups to get students' recommendations for the general education curriculum in the future. That concluded the work of this committee this year. It had one more meeting with President Proenza next week to present some of their thoughts.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chair recognized Senator Stevenson, who presented a motion from the APCC that had been postponed from the last meeting. This was a motion to allow 6 bypassed credits towards a minor. Senator Marquette had wanted to check on the financial implications of that. The exact wording for the bulletin was: "Courses for a minor may not be

taken credit/non-credit. A MAXIMUM OF SIX BYPASSED CREDITS MAY BE USED, BUT ALL OTHER CREDITS MUST BE EARNED."

Senator Marquette said that his investigation indicated that this would not be a problem; in fact, it would primarily benefit modern languages.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted its approval.

The second item of unfinished business were recommended changes to the Senate bylaws regarding the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee. These had been made by Senator Mark Tausig, Chair of that Committee, last month and appeared in the April 1 Chronicle in Appendix G on page 31. Senator Tausig reminded the body that **the amendments renamed the committee (Research Committee) and enabled it to participate in the discussion of all internal and external research funding for the University.**

Since there was no discussion, the Senate unanimously approved the amendments.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Oller had an item of new business which he had been asked to move by former Senator George Prough. It was a proposed job description change for the University of Akron Press which had been passed by its editorial board on May 4 (**Appendix J**). He moved the changes which were seconded and asked the body to allow Dr. Prough to speak. It gave its permission.

Dr. Prough apologized for prolonging this delightful meeting, but with the retirement of the current editor of the Press, Mr. Elton Glaser, the editorial board in searching for a replacement for him had encountered a number of issues. These changes attempted to resolve those issues. There were three changes, and the editorial board thought that the first had already been passed, but it did not show up on the web version of the University Bylaws. **This was to change the title of the head of the Press from "editor" to "director."** The board thought that Elton had been functioning as director for some time. The second change would allow more options in the hiring of the director. Right now the director had to be a full-time faculty member who was therefore eligible for tenure in some department. The board was proposing **that the language be changed to include either full-time faculty or a contract professional.** What they had found when looking at the pool of candidates was that a great many viable candidates were in fact contract professionals rather than full-time faculty. **The third change would conform more to practice, which would be in points 2 and 4 to remove the President or the President's designee from the decision about selecting the director, as well as the approval of policies and procedures. They would propose instead that "President and the President's designee" be changed to "the Provost and the Provost's designee."**

Senator Pelz noted that the editorial board was apparently to be selected by the President or the President's designee, as opposed to the director, who would be appointed by the Provost. Why not have the board chosen or selected by the Provost as well?

Dr. Prough replied that it was simply a matter that this had been the case, and the board had

figured that there was a need to continue the separation of a board and the working part of the entity to maintain that part of the separation.

Senator Norfolk pointed out that Elton Glaser had not been full-time director of the press and did still teach in the English Department. Therefore, if you brought in a contract professional, you had the possibility of basically creating another job on campus for a non-faculty member, which was something that he had railed about for a number of years. Dr. Prough responded that Senator Norfolk was correct. It would be another position.

Provost Leathers stated that there was a search going on for this position at the present time, and there was the restriction that the person had to be a faculty member. These amendments, if passed, would in a sense change the function of the press. It would also have the immediate consequence by the title change of raising the salary. If the salary went up, and the person was not a faculty member but a contract professional, we would indeed be creating another position. He had seen the papers of some of the candidates, and there were some very good ones which the committee was going through. If they wanted to make an amendment, perhaps it might be better to say that the title "director" should be determined with some kind of leeway. Dr. Prough said that the board believed that the title change from editor to director had already been made. The Provost guessed his other question was whether you wanted this person to be a faculty member who would be acceptable to an academic department and be eligible for tenure, which was the way the situation had been for Mr. Glaser.

Dr. Prough reminded the Provost that the motion had the wording "either/or," so the board was not suggesting that the person had to be a contract professional.

Senator Mary Konkel wondered whether there had been any discussion with any library folks about this. She was not clear on who was part of the editorial board.

Dr. Prough answered that Dean Williams was an advisor to the editorial board.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate approved the changes.

Senator Richards was sorry to raise this at this late hour, but last month she had asked the body to help protect the part-time faculty as far as designations were concerned. This month she was going to propose a motion to perhaps protect them again. She moved that **the Faculty Senate recommend that the part-time faculty pay scale be raised by a minimum of \$40 per credit hour from the bottom level to the top level.** This was seconded by Senator Filer-Tubaugh. Senator Richards stated that currently, starting lecturers 1 made \$500 per credit hour, meaning that if they taught a 3-hr. course, they made \$1,500 for that semester. If they got a 1% raise, it would not amount to \$40 a semester. In order to protect the part-time faculty, she was making this motion which would be a recommendation from the Senate. In 1985 the part-time faculty had not gotten a pay raise because they had been left out of the budget. This had been because part-time faculty were supposed to dry up and go away. That had been a direct quote from the director of Human Resources at that time. In 1990 the entire University had received a pay increase with the exception of the part-time faculty, even though Dr. Muse had announced to the Beacon and others that all of the valuable employees of The University of Akron were being rewarded. In 1996, when the raises had gone before the Board, the Board of Trustees had decided that everybody was going to get a merit pay

increase. Unfortunately, there was no mechanism in place for part-time faculty to receive a merit pay increase. Therefore, they did not get an increase. This was why she was now asking the Senate to help protect the part-time faculty who had been praised by the NCA in regard to the outstanding general studies program. They should be considered the valuable employees that they were and be rewarded appropriately.

Senator Norfolk pointed out that Senator Richards was proposing putting up the amount by \$40 per credit hour when the fee was only going to be \$20 per semester. This was a much bigger raise; you were talking around an 8% increase.

Senator Filer-Tubaugh responded that Senator Richards was not proposing a raise. If you looked at part-time faculty descriptions, there was a range within which they might be paid. When the 3-tier program had been instituted, they actually had lowered the range within which a starting part-time faculty person was paid. She had been told through one source last fall that part of their raises had not been given out because some of the people had reached the top of their pay range. She would have assumed that as pays went up percentages every year, the top would increase. It did not, so basically, what they were saying here was please tell them they would like to increase this so if they did get a pay raise with everyone else, it could go up that high.

Senator Lynn asked whether there was a reason why it was being proposed that people at the lower end of the part-time scale were getting an 8% raise and people at the top were getting a 4-1/2% raise. Also, did we know what this would cost us?

Senator Richards replied that currently lecturers 1 started at \$500 a credit hr., which meant that someone teaching music in Fine & Applied Arts made \$500 for that 1 credit hr. That should have been \$525, but when the Board had put in the pay ranges over the summer 2 years ago, they had taken an old pay scale and used it. Therefore, everybody was lower than where they were. What this would do basically was take the lowest position from \$500 to \$540 and the highest from \$850 to \$890. That did not necessarily mean that everybody would get a \$40 an hr. raise, because we still had to go by the merit situation. All they were really asking for here was that the cap be changed. The low end had gotten hurt the worst the last time. The low end should actually currently be \$525, so the raise was not going to be 8%. That salary had never been readjusted back to where it should have been. She did not have an answer to Senator Lynn's question on what this would cost.

Senator Marquette moved that this discussion be postponed until the next meeting because the body did not have the necessary information regarding costs, and this was seconded.

Senator Richards wanted to speak against the postponement because it meant that the Senate would not vote on this until September. The part-time faculty could end up without a raise again in September. It could happen; it had happened.

Senator Marquette said that the salary raise pool included in the budget included specifically money for the part-time faculty. This was too complicated an issue to make a decision like this now. We really did not have any idea what those changes were going to be or what they would cost.

President Proenza added as a point of information that he had just been informed by Vice

President Nettling that if the \$40 fee was payroll deducted and was pretaxed, the net pay would change by less than \$40.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted to postpone this issue until the September meeting.

Senator Michael Cheung moved that any unfinished business or continuing business in committees of this Senate become the business automatically of the next Senate. This was seconded by Senator Norfolk and approved by the body.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Oller wanted a sense of the body whether or not the Executive Committee should call it into session in June or July when a final version of the budget did become available. Senator Cheung answered that it was the Executive Committee's call.

Senator Richards wanted to make her annual thank-you's. The Executive Committee had done an outstanding job once again this year. Dr. Heinzerling had stepped in and picked up the ball and carried it well. As always, she wanted to thank Secretary Quillin for the outstanding job that she did, keeping us on track and reminding us of not only when meetings were, but of other duties that we had to attend to and helping Dr. Oller out in his most arduous job. She also wanted to thank Dr. Oller for not taking a leave of absence this year so that she did not have to take over his heavy duties preparing the minutes. She thanked Dr. Bee today for taking Dr. Gerlach's place, and that Dr. Gerlach had for five years been the Senate's parliamentarian and had done an excellent job for us. He always took this month off to go back home to Nebraska, so we did not get to say it personally, but thank you to Dr. Gerlach also.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - There was a motion to adjourn which was seconded. The body gave its approval, and the meeting ended at 5:20 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin

Proposed New Language

3359-20-02 (B)(2)(b)(i)

A FIFTEEN MEMBER search committee shall consist of: regular members of the faculty, one elected by the faculty of each degree-granting college and university libraries; plus two representatives elected by and from ~~those administrators listed in paragraphs (A) and (B) rule of 3359-10-02 the Administrative Code (the university of Akron bylaws of the faculty senate),~~ THE FOLLOWING ADMINISTRATORS: THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, THE ACADEMIC DEANS (ARTS AND SCIENCES, ENGINEERING, EDUCATION, BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, FINE AND APPLIED ARTS, NURSING, LAW, POLYMER SCIENCE AND POLYMER ENGINEERING, COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE AND WAYNE COLLEGE), THE DEAN OF CONTINUING EDUCATION AND EVENING DIVISION, THE DEAN OF UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES, THE DEAN OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, ~~THE ASSOCIATE PROVOST FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS,~~ *STUD* PLUS THREE OTHER ADMINISTRATORS DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT TO COMPLETE THE GROUP, ~~FROM WHICH TWO ARE ELECTED;~~ and two students selected by associated student government. Members of the committee representing the collegiate faculties must be regular members of the faculty as defined in paragraph (A)(1) of rule 3359-20-03 of the Administrative Code and must be elected by their respective collegiate faculties. No committee member shall be a candidate for the position.

Note: The former rule listed the following as administrators:

- The President, The Senior Vice President and Provost, and The Dean of Graduate School
- The Academic Deans (Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Education, Business Administration, Fine and Applied Arts, Nursing, Law, Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, Community and Technical College and Wayne College), the Dean of the Evening College and Summer Sessions, the Dean of University Libraries, the Associate Provost for Continuing Education, Public Services and Outreach, the Dean of the University College and the Associate Provost and Dean of Student Services,
- Plus three other administrators whom the President wishes to appoint.

*Current**Language*3359-20-02 Organization of the university.

(A) The board of trustees (from the bylaws and regulations of the board of trustees as amended).

- (1) Number of members; appointments; vacancies. See paragraph (A) of rule 3359-1-01 of the Administrative Code.
- (2) Powers. See paragraph (B) of rule 3359-1-01 of the Administrative Code.
- (3) The board shall formulate university policy; but under its general supervision, it shall leave the execution of these policies to the president and the administrative and faculty agents as provided in the bylaws and regulations.
- (4) The names of those currently serving on the board are listed in the annual general bulletin of the university of Akron.

(B) The officers of academic administration.

(1) The president of the university.

(a) The president of the university is elected by the board to hold office at its discretion. The president is the executive head of all university colleges and departments, and is responsible for the general supervision of all the university's interests.

(b) Within general policies of the board, the president leads in fostering and promoting education, instruction, research, scholarly activity, and public service as the primary aims of the university. The president is a member of and presides at all meetings of the university faculty and the long-range planning committee, and is an ex-officio member of the long-range planning committee, the budget and planning coordination committee, and of each faculty and divisional group, and it is the president's right and duty to preside at every meeting thereof, should the president choose to do so. The president is responsible for carrying out all measures officially agreed upon by the board for the administration of the university. The president attends all meetings of the board and addresses to them matters of institutional importance, is the official medium of communication between the university and the board and its committees, and possesses the exclusive right to transmit proposals from the faculty and staff - either as a group or as individuals - to the board.

(c) The president nominates all administrative officers, faculty, and staff to the board for appointment. The president appoints such other administrative officers, with the approval of the board, as necessary, to carry out the operations of the university and may delegate to them certain functions with the authority necessary for their proper discharge. The final authority and responsibility for the administration of the university, however, rests with the president.

(d) The president recommends such changes and additions to the colleges and departments, as necessary, for the operation of the university. The president appoints all committees of the university faculty unless membership has been designated by rule, oversees preparation of the annual

budget, and advises the board in all financial matters. The president submits an annual report to the board on the activities, plans, current and future needs of the university, and other relevant data. The president has ultimate authority in all matters of student discipline in accordance with the policies and rules of the faculty senate and the board, presides at commencements and other public academic occasions, and confers such degrees, certificates, and honors as are granted by the institution.

(2) The senior vice president and provost.

(a) The senior vice president and provost is appointed by the board upon recommendation of the president and holds office at the discretion of the president. The senior vice president and provost is responsible to the president for the supervision and administration of the academic functions of the university, in accordance with the policies and rules established by the president and the faculty senate.

(b) The provost is selected as follows:

(i) A search committee shall consist of regular members of the faculty, one elected by the faculty of each degree-granting college and university libraries, plus two representatives elected by and from those administrators listed in paragraphs (A) and (B) rule of 3359-10-02 the Administrative Code (the university of Akron bylaws of the faculty senate), and two students selected by associated student government. members of the committee representing the collegiate faculties must be regular members of the faculty as defined in paragraph (A)(1) of rule 3359-20-03 of the Administrative Code and must be elected by their respective collegiate faculties. No committee member shall be a candidate for the position.

(ii) This committee shall select its own chair and establish its own rules and procedures. The committee shall receive from the administration salary range and requirements for the position before commencing the search.

(iii) The search committee shall carry out an extensive search soliciting nominations from the members of the university community and appropriate sources outside the university.

(iv) The search committee shall recommend a list of three candidates to the president.

(v) The president may select one candidate from this list for approval by the board. If no candidate on the list is acceptable or available, the president shall request that the search committee submit another list of three candidates.

(c) The senior vice president and provost shall be a member and presiding officer of the budget and planning coordination committee, the long-range planning committee, and is an ex-officio member of each faculty and department or divisional group. The senior vice president and provost coordinates the academic offerings of the various colleges, departments, and divisions, the academic research activities of the institution, assists in selecting and appointing faculty and staff, recommends promotion, tenure, salary, and dismissal of faculty members, and assists in preparing the annual

*Old University Council
Language re:
Administrative Group
(A) & (B)*

BYLAWS OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Executive Committee will include the report on the agenda of Council meetings.

- (D) All legislation introduced in the University Council shall be designated as such and if passed shall be forwarded to the President. Within 45 days of receipt of the legislation, the President shall: (a) forward the legislation to the Board of Trustees, or (b) put the legislation into effect if the President deems it unnecessary to send the matter to the Board, or (c) disapprove and return the legislation to Council with explanation for the President's rejection.
- (E) Legislation sent to the Board of Trustees becomes effective 90 calendar days after receipt by the President unless the Board of Trustees disapproves, or notifies Council that it requires additional time. In the latter event, it shall designate a date by which it shall finish its deliberations. Such postponed legislation becomes effective upon such designated date unless previously disapproved by the Board of Trustees.
- (F) The President of the University shall notify Council of the disposition of its legislation within 45 days of its passage indicating whether the legislation has been approved, referred to the Board of Trustees, or returned to Council for reconsideration or amendment.

3359-10-03 Composition of the Council

The University Council shall consist of the following:

- (A) The President, the Senior Vice President and Provost, the Dean of Graduate School.
- (B) The Academic Deans (Arts and Sciences, Engineering, Education, Business Administration, Fine and Applied Arts, Nursing, Law, Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, Community and Technical College and Wayne College), the Dean of the Evening College and Summer Sessions, the Dean of University Libraries, the Associate Provost for Continuing Education, Public Services and Outreach, the Dean of the University College and the Associate Provost and Dean of Student Services, plus three other administrators whom the President wishes to appoint.
- (C) Elected members from the degree-granting college faculties including Wayne College (Graduate School excepted) elected according to the formula in 3359-10-04 (E). Additional members to be elected as increased numbers warrant, as indicated in 3359-10-04 (E). The librarians holding faculty rank shall be considered the equivalent of a degree-granting college faculty for the purpose of elective membership.

APPENDIX B

**Report of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Spring 1999**

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 98-3. The Committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 98-4. The Committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has submitted its recommendation to the Provost.

A grievance was received by the Committee. The time limit for the filing of a complaint had been exceeded. No file number was assigned, and the grievant was notified.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-1. The Committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has assisted in resolution of the complaint by conciliation.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-2. The Committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-3. The Committee is in the process of consideration.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-4. The Committee completed its consideration of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-5. The Committee completed its consideration of the grievance and has rejected the complaint.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-6. The Committee has completed its consideration of the grievance and has assisted in resolution of the complaint by conciliation.

A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 99-7. With the agreement of the grievant, the Committee has postponed consideration of the complaint until fall semester 1999.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy L. Stokes, Chair

APPENDIX CALL SEMESTER

1998-2000

Commencement Sat., December 18

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 13
*Sun., May 14

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 21

SUMMER SESSION 2

Commencement Sat., August 19

PRELIMINARY 2000-01

FALL SEMESTER

Commencement Sat., December 16

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 12
*Sun., May 13

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 20

SUMMER SESSION 2

Commencement Sat., August 18

PRELIMINARY 2001-2002

FALL SEMESTER

Commencement Sat., December 15

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 11
Sun., May 12

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 19

SUMMER SESSION 2

Commencement Sat., August 17

PRELIMINARY 2002-2003

FALL SEMESTER

Commencement Sat., December 21

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 10
Sun., May 11

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 18

SUMMER SESSION 2

Commencement Sat., August 16

PRELIMINARY 2003-2004

FALL SEMESTER

Commencement Sat., December 20

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 15
Sun., May 16

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 23

SUMMER SESSION 2

Commencement Sat., August 21

PRELIMINARY 2004-2005

FALL SEMESTER

Commencement Sat., December 18

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 14
Sun., May 15

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 22

SUMMER SESSION 2

Commencement Sat., August 20

PRELIMINARY 2005-2006

FALL SEMESTER

Commencement Sat., December 17

SPRING SEMESTERCommencement Sat., May 14
Sun., May 15

Commencement/Law School Sun., May 22

Report of the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee

May 6, 1999

APCC met as a group only once this month, on April 21, but at that lengthy meeting, and with additional work by subcommittees and many e-mail exchanges, we completed three recommendations to bring to the May 6 Senate meeting.

1. Since the University plans to hold graduation ceremonies at E. J. Thomas Hall, and since that facility has requested that we reserve five years in advance, APCC was asked to furnish a calendar with the dates for graduation for the next five years. We developed this calendar based on the current calendar, so the dates for the next five years are equivalent dates to those which the Senate has .. previously approved. This calendar is available in a handout.
2. The Provost's Office asked APCC to develop an official policy for the last day to add a course. One reason why the University needs to state and implement this policy is financial: the University does not get subvention for students who are allowed to register after the "census date" set by the Ohio Board of Regents for reporting official enrollments. After many communications with the Registrar's Office and Dick Stratton, an authority on this issue, we have developed the following recommendation for a new policy, to appear in the Schedule of Classes:

Policy on the Last Day to Add a Course

For most courses at The University of Akron, students must register by the 15th calendar day of the term and must be included on the official class list, which is issued on that day. Those students who have not registered and paid by this deadline may not attend classes or receive credit for the course.

This deadline applies to all regular 15-week courses offered in the Fall and Spring semesters, as well as to regular courses in Summer I and II. For all other courses, such as those in intersessions or those which are flexibly scheduled, students must register by the date when 20% of the course has been completed.

3. The APCC's last recommendation for the May 6 meeting—a revision to the "Curricular Changes" section of the Faculty Manual—was circulated earlier this week, by e-mail and campus mail. This document is one that APCC has researched and worked on since the end of last semester. Nancy Stokes has particularly earned our gratitude for the hard, sustained work she put into this proposal, with much help from Jean Blosser and Gary Oller. As explained in the brief paragraph that introduced the circulated version, this document updates the Faculty Manual, which needs to describe and clarify the curriculum review process implemented a number of years ago, with Web-based review of curricular proposals. In the past few days, APCC received suggestions for revisions to our circulated recommendation. We have incorporated most of those suggestions in a revised recommendation, which we have brought as a handout today.

FINAL DRAFT: 5 MAY 1999
3359-20-052 Curricular Changes

A. Curricular Change Process

1. Each college will have its own procedure for proposing the following:
 - a. addition or deletion of courses
 - b. changes in course or program names and/or course numbers
 - c. changes in course descriptions or prerequisites
 - d. changes in mode of delivery
 - e. addition of new or changes in degree, minors or certificate programs
 - f. proposals that would change any universitywide requirements.

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.).

2. Curricular proposals must originate within an academic unit (e.g. department, college, or school). The academic unit will review the proposal and either approve or disapprove it. For the purposes of initiating interdisciplinary proposals which involve two or more academic units, one unit must be identified as the originating unit.
3. The appropriate collegiate body will then review the proposal and either approve or disapprove it.
4. Proposals can be submitted at any time into the Curricular Review System (CRS). For changes, to be implemented by the fall semester 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. Proposals submitted after the twelfth week of the spring semester will not be reviewed until the reviewing bodies outside of the college are reconvened in September.
5. A college-approved proposal will then be released by authorized personnel of the college for institutional review and approval for a period of four weeks from the date of release on the university Web server. If institutional review cannot be completed within the four-week period, the originating unit and the office of the Provost will be notified indicating reasons for the delay and the approximate completion date.
 - a. Various institutional reviews and approvals may be required and must be given before the proposal can be submitted for universitywide review. The reviewing bodies may include but are not limited to Library, Graduate School, Institutional Research, Distance Learning Steering Committee, and the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC). Details of these review procedures are available in each academic unit.

- b. When all approvals are obtained, the proposal is released for universitywide review for a period of four weeks from the date of release on the university Web server.
 - c. If any of the reviewing bodies or any faculty member wishes to make an objection or to comment on a proposal, they may do so within this Web environment, and the objection and/or comment will be e-mailed to the office of the Provost, to the CRC, and to the initiating College for response.
- 6. Following the four-week period for universitywide review, the following options are available for the disposition of the proposal:
 - a. If no objections are received, the proposal could be approved by the Provost without going to the CRC. Proposals approved by the Provost will become record unless Faculty Senate acts otherwise at its next meeting. If the proposal is not approved by the Provost, the Provost will communicate the reason to the initiating college and to the CRC.
 - b. If there are unresolved objections, the proposal must be reviewed by the CRC. When the CRC has deliberated on a proposal, the following can happen:
 - 1. If the CRC passes the proposal with two or fewer negative votes and, if approved by the Provost, the proposal will become record unless Faculty Senate specifically acts otherwise at its next meeting.
 - 2. If the CRC passes the proposal with three or more negative votes, the proposal will be put on the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting.
 - 3. If the proposal does not receive a majority of votes of the CRC, the proposal will not be brought before Faculty Senate for action.
 - 4. Proposals may be adopted by the Faculty Senate, either through no action taken on a proposal on which action was not necessary or by a majority positive vote on a proposal on its agenda.
 - 5. Proposals for degree program name changes, new degree programs, minors, or certificate programs which are approved by the Faculty Senate shall be recommended to the Board of Trustees and, if approved, to the Ohio Board of Regents.
- 7. When a proposal has been approved by all parties, the proposal is now record and will be implemented on its effective date.

3359-20-052

3359-20-052 Curricular Changes**(A) Curricular Change Process**

- (1) The procedure for adding or deleting courses, for changing course names and/or code numbers, and for changing course descriptions or prerequisites will include the following steps:
 - (a) The department will review and approve or disapprove.
 - (b) The appropriate collegiate body will review and approve or disapprove.
 - (c) The dean of the college will certify, in writing, to the Provost that the faculty, equipment, library, and other resources will be available for the proposed change.
 - (d) The proposed change, unless legislatively exempted by the Faculty Senate, will be circulated to all collegiate deans' offices, and complete sets will be sent to the Provost's Office, Bierce Library and the Science and Technology Library. One set of the long form proposal will be made available to each of the members of the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee. Abbreviated listings of all proposals will go to all deans, all Faculty Senate members (excluding the deans to avoid duplication), all department chairs and division chairs, and all members of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee who are not on Faculty Senate. Review will be made by appropriate department faculty committees so that potential interdepartmental and intercollegiate course duplication or other problems will be reported in writing to the Provost within three weeks from the date of circulation.
 - (e) For graduate courses, the Dean of the Graduate School will also conduct an appropriate review and recommends approval or disapproval to the Provost.
 - (f) While the proposed change is circulating, the Provost will take it under advisement, and help to make changes which seem necessary. Unresolved conflicts will be submitted to the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee which submits a recommendation to the Faculty Senate for its consideration and action.
 - (g) Within one week following the end of the circulation period, assuming no conflict exists, the Provost either approves or disapproves. If the proposal is returned to the dean and department chair for further study, it may be recirculated as a new proposal.
- (2) Proposals for new or changed degree programs, proposals that would change any University-wide requirements or proposals for any other changes not specifically covered by the above procedure will be submitted for approval through the following procedure:
 - (a) The department will review and approve or disapprove.
 - (b) The appropriate colleges will approve or disapprove.
 - (c) The proposed change, unless legislatively exempted by the Faculty Senate, will be circulated to all Faculty Senate members, deans, and department

chairs. Review will be made by the appropriate departmental faculty committees so that potential interdepartmental and intercollegiate course duplications or problems are eliminated.

- (d) The dean of the college will advise the Provost as to faculty, equipment, library, and other resources (if any) needed for the proposed change. The Provost will then notify the dean as to whether or not additional resources can be provided.
- (e) If changes in graduate programs are being proposed, they will be reviewed and approved by the Graduate Council.
- (f) All of these changes will be reviewed by the Curriculum Subcommittee of the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee and recommendations will be prepared for the full committee.
- (g) The Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee will consider the Curriculum Subcommittee recommendation and prepare recommendations for the Faculty Senate.
- (h) Faculty Senate will act on those items which are recommended for Senate action.
- (i) New degree programs which are approved by the Faculty Senate shall be recommended to the Board and, if approved, to the Ohio Board of Regents.

APPENDIX D

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost

Akron, OH 44325-4703

(330) 972-7593 Office

(330) 972-8699 Fax

Date: May 6, 1999
 To: Faculty Senate
 From: Dr. Jean Blosser, Interim Associate Provost *J. Blosser*
 Re: Curriculum Proposals

The proposals listed below have matured without objection and have been approved by the Provost. Unless Faculty Senate acts otherwise at its meeting May 6, 1999 these proposals become record.

PROPOSALS (COURSE CHANGES) APPROVED BY PROVOST

Arts & Science	Engineering	Polymer Science
AS-99-03	EN-99-10	PS-99-02
AS-99-11		PS-99-03
AS-99-35	Fine & Applied Arts	PS-99-04
AS-99-48	FAA-99-19	PS-99-10
AS-99-60		
AS-99-70	Nursing	University College
AS-99-82	NU-99-01	UC-99-01
AS-99-108	NU-99-06	
	NU-99-07	

PROPOSALS (PROGRAM CHANGES AND NEW PROGRAMS) APPROVED BY PROVOST**Arts & Science**

AS-99-01	Program Change	Courses added for core requirements for the program
AS-99-32	Program Change	Change in admission requirements (PAUS)
AS-99-33	Program Change	Addition of core requirements (PAUS)
AS-99-34	Program Change	Addition of Electives for certificate program
AS-99-97	Program Change	General changes in the program
AS-99-98	Program Change	The new guidelines for the admission
AS-99-100	Program Change	Elective added for the Certificate program
AS-99-101	Program Change	Elimination of comprehensive exam for the Master's (Thesis option)

Community & Technical

CT-99-15	Program Change	Replaces the technical elective for the spring semester of the senior year with the required CNC Programming II course.
CT-99-40	Program Change	Two certificate option deletions, additional clinical hours added to current program, change in current program required hours, change in current program required courses.

Engineering

EN-99-02	New Program	As an alternative to obtaining two completely separate degrees in business and in engineering with some duplication, this program permits students to obtain both degrees with a minimum of duplication.
----------	-------------	--

APPENDIX E

May 6, 1999

TO: University of Akron Faculty Senate

FROM: David Jamison, Faculty Athletics Representative

RE: Second Semester Report to the Senate

As Faculty Athletics Representative, during 1998-99 academic year, I carried out the following activities:

Regular/Required

Participated in NCAA Rules Education Program

Administered Coaches' Recruiting Test to all coaches and athletics personnel, certified to the Mid-American Conference (MAC) the results of those tests

In cooperation with the Registrar and the Athletics Department, certified all Squad Lists for each intercollegiate sport, monitoring both initial and continuing eligibility for student-athletes

Participated in MAC meetings: Faculty Athletics Representatives (FAR) Group, Joint Committee of Athletics Directors, Senior Administrators, and FAR's

Served ex officio on the University Athletics Committee

Additional

Served as the sole MAC representative (and one of 3 FAR's) on 34 Member NCAA Championships/Competition Cabinet (my term continues through Summer 2000)
(this Cabinet oversees administration of all 83 NCAA Championships, adopts rules which govern playing and practice seasons for student-athletes, governs pre-and post-season competition, and medical safeguards for student-athletes)

Served on the Football Bowl Certification and the Playing and Practice Seasons Subcommittees and chaired the Strategic Planning Subcommittee of the Championships/Competition Cabinet

Chaired the MAC Infractions Committee (which meets 4 times each year to consider reported rules violations in any of the 13 member institutions' athletics programs)

Served on a Campus Site Visit Review Team to Purdue University in connection with Purdue's application for NCAA Certification of its athletics program; authored the portion of the team report dealing with academic integrity

Served as the University of Akron's representative on the search committee for Commissioner of the MAC

Chaired the search committee in the search for a Director of Advising for Student Athletes in the University College; participated in the search committee in the search for the position of Senior Administrator in the Athletics Department

Represented the Athletics Department in a student financial aid hearing

APPENDIX F**REPORT OF CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE TO FACULTY SENATE, MAY 6TH, 1999**

CFPC has met twice since the last Senate meeting, on April 15th and April 29th.

At the meeting of April 15th, the Committee reviewed the Program for the new Arts and Sciences building. They noted with appreciation that the present program had been revised to include 7,100 sq ft of new classroom space. Reductions in classroom space are of significant concern.

There was also discussion regarding the cost and funding issues raised by the Campus Capital Plan. CFPC had recommended that PBC review these capital budget issues and a resolution had been passed at the February Senate meeting. Mr. Nettling, the Interim Vice President for Finance had only introduced the physical plan (with no costs) at the April 1st meeting of the Senate. Members of the Committee voiced their opinion that, with Board action expected at the end of the month, this did not leave sufficient time for PBC review. The Committee passed the following motion unanimously:-

That the Committee expressed its dissatisfaction that the Capital Budget Plan was not presented in a timely fashion for discussion by the Planning and Budget Committee and presentation to the Senate, before going to the Board.

There was considerable discussion at the meeting of April 15th and April 29th concerning the priorities in the Campus Capital Plan. The Committee is on record as enthusiastically supporting the concept of campus capital improvements. However, one general issue and four specific issues were raised by the Committee.

The general issue was that of overall building priorities. The Committee had put academic buildings in their highest priority category, while the present plan had support facilities (Student Center and Recreation Center) using the largest percentage of the funds. Given the draft Master Academic Plan stressed Carnegie Research and Academy goals, the Committee was concerned that the message being given by the building plan could be considered at odds with the stress on academic goals.

The four specific issues were

1. no definite timeline listed for a Permanent Hazardous Waste facility
2. lack of inclusion of the Guzzetta Hall addition
3. lack of inclusion of asbestos removal in Auburn Science Center towers
4. the cost, including maintenance, of the proposed Recreation Center

The Committee chair sent an e-mail to President Proenza pointing out our concerns regarding Hazardous Waste. The new Interim Facility to be built, plus the modifications of Knight Hall would deal with short-term safety issues. However, the move towards Research II was likely to generate a greater quantity of chemical wastes in the future. Also a permanent facility would allow bulk purchases of chemicals and significant sorting and re-cycling of chemicals. The President has told us that he is aware of the need and they are working to make the priority clearer. The Committee notes that the issue needs to be stressed so that the "Interim" Facility does not over time become the "Permanent" facility.

Members of the Committee noted the safety issues raised by the present Ballet Facility. There had been problems with heating and in any emergency the city not the University had to be contacted as no cable existed to the facility.

Other Committee members pointed out that asbestos removal had been scheduled for Auburn Sciences for a considerable time and that it kept on being postponed. It was an administrative and safety issue.

Finally the Committee had concerns related to the Recreation Building. They noted that the cost had increased since the proposals presented in the Fall (from \$15-23 million). They were concerned that the building reflect the real needs of commuter students, rather than a residential campus. As they understood it, students wanted weight rooms, exercise equipment and walking and swimming access, rather than space for intra-murals or more exotic exercise pursuits. They were also concerned about whether the cost of maintenance had been considered. The annual maintenance and salary cost at Toledo was \$2 million. The option of the inclusion of a Wellness Center was interesting, especially if it involved a sharing of costs.

There was also discussion of the increase in student fees noted in the Beacon Journal. This increase would probably almost double present fees. It was noted that present fees are lower than the state average of \$375. The Committee considered that this issue should be examined by PBC.

The Committee will be meeting on Wednesday, May 12th with Sasaki & Associates to review their final version of the Campus Guide Plan. We shall provide a report to the Senate after that meeting. The plan should be available for discussion by the University at large after this Sasaki visit..

The Committee wishes to thank the ex-officio members of the Committee for their co-operation this year with the Committee and their willingness to share information. These members are Ted Curtis, Ramaesh Vakamudi, Phil Bartlett, Richard Giglioni, Jean Blosser, Tom Bennett and Kathy Ruther. We also wish to thank Laurie Madden, Coralyce Calderone, and Francois.Song.

Respectfully submitted



Elizabeth Erickson
CFPC Chair

APPENDIX G

**The University of Akron
Planning and Budgeting Committee Final Report
April 26, 1999.**

Planning Initiatives and Progress - 1996-1999

Given the tumult occasioned by having three presidents, three provosts, three chief financial officers in addition to the transition from two to one planning committee during the past five years, it is sometimes difficult to remember that our planning and budgeting process has managed to provide relatively consistent direction for the University thanks to the efforts of dozens of individuals across campus. This section provides a brief reprise of the salient initiatives either arising from or coordinated by the planning and budgeting process during the last several years.

Research

Beginning in 1996, the Long-Range Planning Committee(LRPC) urged an effort to refocus on research support, including the re-establishment of funding for equipment matching, and the reallocation of the indirect cost recovery to its earlier formula, restoring cuts that were imposed on the colleges, departments and research support functions. Discussions during the period 1997 and 1998 led to the adoption, in the 1998-99 plan, of the University Research Council recommendation that the University seek Carnegie Research II status as an explicit goal. Supported by the Board of Trustees, this goal also served as a major focus in the recruitment efforts for our new president.

Adoption of the Research II goal provided focus to many of the planning efforts of the institution, including the establishment of a \$1,500,000 research fund intended to support the initiative. In large part, this fund addresses the equipment matching problem identified earlier. By April of 1999, the research fund had already been committed to provide more than \$1,080,000 to activities such as start-up funds for new faculty, equipment matching funds, seed grants and other initiatives. This effort has provided support for the activities of researchers from 10 departments across three colleges, and will spread as our research efforts increase.

Teaching

During the decade of the 1990's, there was a continuous effort to improve the quality of our general education program. This included efforts to reform the curriculum of the general studies offerings, which resulted in the adoption of major changes in 1994. In support of that effort the Long-Range Planning Committee urged a major reallocation of resources from administrative support activities to funding for full-time faculty assigned to general studies instruction. This effort assisted in deploying the curriculum changes and began what is now a continuing effort to reduce our reliance on part-time faculty. Since the inception of this program, 17 faculty have been hired and/or redirected their efforts to support the general studies program. The strength of our institutional commitment to this effort is measured by the fact that the original \$750,000 dollar reallocation, which made possible full-time positions for general studies, was supplemented by Arts and Sciences college funds to increase the impact. In addition 15 Visiting Instructor positions have been funded to further to reduce our reliance on part-time faculty.

When the Planning and Budgeting committee adopted the Carnegie Research II initiative, a phrase added to the goal statement indicated that we would "continue to improve undergraduate education" as the research initiative proceeded. This effort was to be supported by the development of a teaching and learning center recommended by the Council of Deans. That initiative has been transformed into the creation of a Faculty

Development Center as part of a new University goal. This goal, recommended by the Council of Deans, and endorsed by the Planning and Budgeting Committee, states that the University, in parallel to its Research II effort, will also seek Carnegie Teaching Academy status. An extensive effort in on behalf of that initiative is already underway.

Students

The Scholars for Excellence Program is now firmly established and remains a continuing effort toward our long term goal of recruiting a higher quality and more diverse student body. This major initiative has resulted in substantial endowment fund gifts and the recruitment of 41 valedictorians and 10 salutatorians to our student body from 1997 through 1998. Among recent applicants who have accepted our offer is a student with a 35 ACT score.

In the 1997-98 planning cycle, the PBC adopted enrollment targets of 23,575 students by 2006. This manageable goal culminated an extended discussion concerning the costs of trading quantity for quality incurred by attempts to increase revenue through increased enrollment. Stabilizing our long term planning requires that we continue to pursue realistic enrollment goals for the institution.

Substitution of a single-payment Matriculation Fee for a wide variety of miscellaneous fees has simplified the lives of our students. This also reduced the pressure on a variety of support offices and should allow us to continue improving the "campus climate of service" to students.

PBC continues to support the gender equity initiative of our athletics program through a three-year commitment of funds to improve the availability of sports for women athletes per an agreement with NCAA. This commitment is clearly reflected in the priorities of the current plan.

Personnel

In the 1997-98 planning cycle PBC recommended adoption of the goal of raising the average faculty salary above the median for Ohio AAUP Category 1 institutions by the year 2006. This goal is based 1) on the long-standing fact that our faculty salaries are low, 2) support of both the Research II and now Carnegie Teaching Academy goals will require vigorous competition for highly qualified faculty, and 3) the fourth Early Retirement Incentive Program window will disproportionately deplete the ranks of senior faculty.

Funding was provided in the 1997-98 plan to hire professional assistance to conduct a major reclassification study of our staff and contract professional organization. This effort, now colloquially referred to as the "Mercer Study," should rationalize our non-faculty classification system and improve our competitive position for support personnel. Initial funding for this effort was the top priority of the 1997-98 PBC recommendation. This long overdue effort has been based on broad campus participation and enjoys strong support in the Planning and Budgeting committee priority list for 1999-2000.

Information and Assessment

At the urging of the former LRPC, and PBC, additional resources have been assigned to the institutional research function of the University in order to provide accurate data on which to base planning and assessment. This focus is also an integral part of the North Central Association recommendation that our planning process be based on objective, publicly available information. In 1996, the Institutional Research office was reassigned to the Institute for Policy Studies and additional staff and resources made available.

One of the first tasks of the new office was to regularize the data collection efforts mandated by the Student Assessment Task Force, as part of our response to the student assessment initiative of the North Central Association. This assessment effort has resulted in surveys and performance measures for our current and former students, including regular administration of an Alumni Survey, Student Satisfaction Inventory, Institutional Profile Survey, writing portfolios and incoming freshman profiles.

The results of these assessment data collection efforts as well as numerous other data sources are now widely available to campus decision makers and the Planning and Budgeting Committee to improve both institutional planning and accountability. University Fact Books, Integrated Post Secondary Data Series responses and numerous reports are now available to the University community on the World Wide Web, and a large scale data warehouse is accessible to campus decision makers using high speed query tools.

Technology

Responding to the opportunities and challenges presented by rapid technological change the University has invested millions of dollars in new software, hardware and connectivity. These initiatives include the installation of the PeopleSoft administrative software and the conversion of our legacy systems to deal with the Year 2000 problem, the development of the New Media Center and distance learning initiatives including the Medina project, wiring many of our classrooms for multi-media instruction, and the spread of class offerings as Web based programs.

In its third year, the New Media Center within University Libraries has become a front door for faculty support for using instructional technology. Together with Audio Visual Services, personnel from these areas have helped in web based and synchronous distance learning efforts, the expansion of technology enhanced classrooms to one-third of all general purpose classrooms, the continuation of the laptop competition, seminars and one-to-one faculty development opportunities. The University of Akron Distance Learning System now extends throughout Medina County with rooms in Summit and Wayne Counties. Classes are taught to students in Cuyahoga County and elsewhere on a daily basis. A strong research and development component of the distance learning system has emerged as our reputation has grown nationally.

We continue to refine and improve our web presence; on-line application and admission are now common place, a next strategic step will be an e-commerce solution so tuition, fees, books, t-shirts and more may be purchased on-line, providing further convenience to the student. Other notable examples are the electronic reserve system, the electronic journal and database collection, and the support software for electronic courseware delivery sponsored by the University Libraries. As a member of UCAID, the University of Akron has pursued and won a high performance connections grant from the National Science Foundation and the path to the Internet will increase by over 100 fold during Spring 1999.

Planning Process

Under the shared governance structure adopted with the creation of the Faculty Senate, the planning and budgeting functions were originally divided between a Long Range Planning Committee and a Budget and Planning Coordination Committee. This structure was quickly found to be unwieldy, and the two committees were combined into the current Planning and Budgeting Committee.

In an effort to standardize and simplify the overall process, the Planning and Budgeting Committee adopted a strategy of standardized electronic forms and spreadsheets which are now disseminated and collected over the campus network. Additional changes will be forthcoming to insure better collection of planning and reporting material, with the aim of insuring regular progress toward the planned objectives.

An additional step in this process was adopted for the most recent planning cycle: Colleges and Vice-Presidential units are now required to provide benchmark reports to the Provost, in December and May, on the progress of their units.

Continuing Issues

Although we have continued to progress on a variety of fronts, PBC has also struggled with issues for which there has been no satisfactory resolution thus far, and to which significant attention should be directed:

- Conversion of technology infrastructure funding to a capital funding basis - the underlying physical infrastructure of the campus network is probably best understood as a capital investment and, at least arguably, should not be funded from current operations.
- Our continuing budget for advertising and recruiting is lower than most of our competitors. Although we actually spend significant amounts on advertising, this is accomplished by mid-year budget adjustments from one-time savings and does not permit consistent and long-term planning for image development.
- The chronic "deficit" in Physical Facilities Operations resulting from the use of the "charge-back" system to ration service use is not an appropriate way to fund maintenance and renovations. The use of the academic renovation funding last year was of some help, but the entire system needs to be re-thought.
- The proliferation of departmental "computer laboratories" is creating a series of problems: 1) general purpose classrooms are taken off line to provide space, 2) dedication for the use of particular departments limits the availability of expensive resources, 3) maintenance, staffing and usage monitoring are handled on an *ad hoc* basis, and 4) there is no clear plan for replacement of obsolete equipment.

The 1999-2000 Plan and Budget Recommendations

Over-Arching Goals:

- The University of Akron will continue to pursue Carnegie Research II classification by 2006 and improve undergraduate education, hence,
- The University of Akron will pursue attainment of Carnegie Teaching Academy status.

Activities to Achieve These Goals:

- Promulgate the final version of the Master Academic Plan.
- Create a Physical Plant that supports the academic mission by 2006, this will include the integration of the Campus Facilities Guide Plan and the Master Academic Plan.
- Continue effort to increase faculty salaries to above the median of Ohio Category 1 schools by 2006.
- Institute Mercer study personnel reclassification recommendations.
- Continue to provide support funding for research initiatives in pursuit of Research II status.
- Initiate Campus Conversations and ancillary activities for Carnegie Teaching Academy (Appendix A.).
- Continue to pursue an enrolment target of 23,575 students by 2006. An effective enrollment management process will be developed and implemented.
- Continue development of Scholarships for Excellence Program.

- Transform summer session funding to a net revenue basis as per plan, assume no net revenue change for Summer, 1999 (Appendix B).
- Commence revision of status of Community and Technical College as per plan (Appendix C).
- Continue to support the development of technology on campus by restructuring the fee system for support of campus technology (Appendix D).
- Reduce stand alone Graduate student fee waivers as per plan (Appendix E).
- Provide out-of-state surcharge waivers for high ability students (Appendix F).
- Maintain health care costs at current levels via Well-Being Committee recommendations.

Unit Initiatives Encouraged by Provost

- College of Arts & Sciences – Development of Center for Health and Social Policy; continued pursuit of interdisciplinary research collaborations; develop collaborative teaching relations with College of Education for response to changes in state certification requirements in Secondary education; continued improvement of General Education program via conversion of *visiting* full-time personnel to *permanent* funding.
- College of Business Administration – continued development of School of International Business; development of distance learning activities at the graduate level.
- Community & Technical College – see C&T initiative list.
- College of Education – Outreach improvement activities including participation in Central-Hower partnership and Medina county distance learning activities; develop collaborative teaching relations with College of Arts & Sciences for response to state certification requirements in Secondary education
- College of Engineering – Improve student services through a variety of programs such as Minority outreach and recruitment and Women in Engineering, etc.
- College of Fine and Applied Arts – reorganize personnel assignments to foster additional research activity; improved technology for instructional delivery; expanding support for external funding; revise academic programs to respond to changing needs of students and changing philosophies of professional preparation.
- College of Law – Improvement of student body quality via the application of tuition waivers, implementation of the Goodyear Chair in Intellectual Property, rejuvenate Constitutional Law Center.
- College of Nursing – reorganization of personnel assignments to support priorities in the advancement of research and scholarly activities.
- College of Polymer Science – additional personnel in support of increased research activity.
- University College – continued improvement of student advising activities including better coordination with collegiate advisors and improved articulation to promote retention and transfer to majors.
- Associate Provost for Student Affairs – develop and implement an enrollment management plan.
- Evening Division and Outreach – Develop programs and support other academic units in providing increased access for evening and weekend students.

FY 1999-2000 Budget Development

Revenue Assumptions

Because of the uncertainties surrounding State of Ohio budget support, and different possible levels of tuition increase, the budget provides four revenue and expenditure scenarios. In two of the scenarios state support is effectively flat, (an increase of only .1%), based on the enrollment driven formula. In two other scenarios state support increases 2% as in the “guarantee” based funding in effect at the beginning of the last biennium. Each of those alternatives is coupled with either a 4 or 6% general tuition increase. The committee recommends the 6% tuition increase.

Expenditure Priorities

Proposed expenditures for initiatives are listed in priority order in the spreadsheet on Page 7. Our expectation is that as many of these initiatives as possible will be funded via a combination of new money (e.g. increased endowment revenues, enrollment increases) and such re-allocations as the Provost deems plausible.

The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
CONTINUING BUDGETED OBLIGATIONS
— Planning and Budget Committee Discussion —

Assumptions:	FY99 Revised	Proposed scenarios				Comments:
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Student Credit Hours - flat	516,898	516,900	516,900	516,900	516,900	
Tuition & Fees-C&T	N/A	3%	3%	3%	3%	
Tuition & Fees - General	N/A	4%	4%	6%	6%	
Tuition & Fees - Summer	N/A	3%	3%	3%	3%	
Subsidy - Instructional	N/A	0.1%	2%	0.1%	2%	
Subsidy - Challenges	N/A	Exec. Bud.	Exec. Bud.	Exec. Bud.	Exec. Bud.	
REVENUE						
Tuition & Fees	\$79,888,030	\$83,048,000	\$83,048,000	\$84,280,200	\$84,280,200	
Non-resident Surcharge	6,075,000	6,318,000	6,318,000	6,438,500	6,439,500	
Support to Athletics	(5,763,030)	(5,763,030)	(5,763,030)	(5,763,030)	(5,763,030)	
Net Tuition & Fees	\$80,200,000	\$83,602,970	\$83,602,970	\$84,955,670	\$84,956,670	
Course Fees	\$1,330,000	\$1,080,000	\$1,080,000	\$1,080,000	\$1,080,000	
Technology Fee (Estimated)	N/A	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	1,700,000	
Continuing Education (Non-Credit)	400,000	530,000	530,000	530,000	530,000	As submitted by the Division of Continuing Education
Misc (incl Matriculation)	2,600,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	2,100,000	
Total Misc Revenue	\$4,330,000	\$5,410,000	\$5,410,000	\$5,410,000	\$5,410,000	
Subsidy-Instructional	\$91,123,228	\$91,250,291	\$92,945,691	\$91,250,291	\$92,945,691	
Subsidy-Other	1,677,711	3,128,690	3,128,690	3,128,690	3,128,690	Includes Challenges and IGB Support
Departmental Sales Accounts	5,584,238	5,208,068	5,208,068	5,208,068	5,208,068	As submitted by units
Investment/IDC/Other	8,440,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	8,440,000	See Attachment 1 for detail
Total Revenue	\$191,355,173	\$194,880,797	\$194,880,797	\$195,043,757	\$195,043,757	
EXPENDITURES						
Full-time Compensation	\$77,989,045	\$81,251,149	\$81,251,149	\$81,251,149	\$81,251,149	See Attachment 2 for detail
Other Personnel/ERIP	26,696,693	23,507,041	23,507,041	23,507,041	23,507,041	See Attachment 2 for detail
Dept Sales Total Personnel	1,747,875	2,023,701	2,023,701	2,023,701	2,023,701	Reflects request as submitted
Fringe Benefits	27,183,149	27,104,700	27,104,700	27,147,900	27,147,900	See Attachment 3 for detail
Fringes - Dept'l Sales	481,302	577,825	577,825	577,825	577,825	See Attachment 3 for detail; reflects request
Total Compensation	\$134,107,864	\$134,464,416	\$134,464,416	\$134,507,616	\$134,507,616	
Operating - Academic Units	15,824,837	16,133,600	16,133,600	16,133,600	16,133,600	See Attachment 4 for detail
Operating - Admin Units	4,381,000	4,310,800	4,310,800	4,310,800	4,310,800	See Attachment 4 for detail
Scholarships	15,459,495	15,923,875	15,923,875	16,233,063	16,233,063	See Attachment 5; reflects assumed T&F increase
Continuing Obligations	14,841,897	16,777,959	16,777,959	16,788,531	16,788,531	See Attachment 5 for detail
Departmental Sales/Cont. Ed	3,780,858	3,136,542	3,136,542	3,136,542	3,136,542	See Attachment 5 for detail; reflects request
Transfers out	2,859,622	3,933,605	3,933,605	3,933,605	3,933,605	See Attachment 6 for detail; increase to support campus plan
Total Nonpersonnel	\$57,247,309	\$60,216,381	\$60,216,381	\$60,536,141	\$60,536,141	
Total Funds Applied	\$191,355,173	\$194,680,797	\$194,680,797	\$195,043,757	\$195,043,757	
Net Change in Fund Balance	\$0	\$2,200,000	\$2,200,000	\$4,999,882	\$4,999,882	

May 6, 1999

Page 38

The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Proposed Budget Scenarios - Fiscal 1999-2000

— For Purposes of Discussion —

Assumptions:	Proposed Scenarios			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Student Credit Hours - flat	516,900	516,900	516,900	516,900
Tuition & Fees-C&T	3%	3%	3%	3%
Tuition & Fees	4%	4%	6%	6%
Tuition & Fees - Summer	3%	3%	3%	3%
Subsidy - Instructional	0.1%	2%	0.1%	2%
Subsidy - Challenges	Exec. Bud.	Exec. Bud.	Exec. Bud.	Exec. Bud.
Salary Pool	3.50%	5.00%	3.50%	5.00%

Funds available for discretionary items:	<u>\$2,359,222</u>	<u>\$4,054,622</u>	<u>\$3,349,962</u>	<u>\$5,045,362</u>
--	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------	--------------------

Priority Ranking of Initiatives:

Support to Athletics (gender equity plan)	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Chemical Waste, Radiation and Asbestos	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Mercer Compensation Adjustment (incl fringes)	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
Salary Raise Pool	3,300,000	4,700,000	3,300,000	4,700,000
Carnegie Teaching Academy	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Evening Division - one time/start up equipment	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Campus Security	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Library Acquisitions	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
C&T - increase responsiveness and competitiveness	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000

May 6, 1999

Page 39

Summary of Tuition and Fee Change Recommendations

1. Tuition increase of 6 % for undergraduate, graduate and law students - except C&T.

Rationale: While low tuition is an admirable goal, at some point the resulting low revenue cripples our ability to carry out our mission. Despite having one of the lowest tuition rates in the state, our enrollment continued to decline during the decade of the 1990's in comparison to schools with substantially higher tuition, indicating that tuition by itself does not establish a significant comparative advantage. As an example of our situation, if the University increases its tuition at a rate of 6% per year during the next 4 years, the total cost for a 1998 incoming freshman would be \$17,135, based on OBR full-time fee rates for 1998-99. In comparison, if Kent State raises its current tuition by only 4% per year the corresponding total would be \$20,020, and the current gap between UA and KSU tuition and fees of \$798 would still be \$638 at the end of four years.

2. Tuition increase of 3% for Community and Technical College - (2000 numbered courses).

Rationale: The Board of Regents has provided funds through the "Access Challenge" program which allows substitution of foregone revenue for two year schools that exercise fee restraint. This is in keeping with the general thrust of having two years schools serve as a major point of entry into higher education in Ohio. Coordinating C&T and Wayne tuition will also assist in supporting our general recommendation of providing a more distinct identity for our C&T college.

3. Impose uniform Instructional Technology Fee for advanced students, eliminate courses fees related to computing.

Rationale: As the costs of instructional technology continue to escalate there will be a proliferation of course fees intended to defray those costs. This fee change will standardize our fee system, avoid imposing the fee on first year undergraduates and is in keeping with the rationale of the "Matriculation" fee which eliminated myriad small charges for services.

4. Waive "Out of State" surcharge for non-Ohio U.S. citizens.

Rationale: Our out of state surcharge is so prohibitive as to discourage enrolment. To pursue the goal of recruiting a "...higher quality and more diverse student body" we must be able to offer a realistic fee structure in comparison to competing schools.

5. Reduce "non-service based" or "stand-alone tuition waivers for graduate students.

Rationale: Both the legislature and OBR are deeply concerned about reducing the expense of graduate subsidy generation by students who provide no service in return for fee waivers. Imposing a service requirement on these waivers results in excessive complications, including the requirement that taxes be paid on the amount. After extensive discussion it appears that many of the students enjoying the fee waiver would attend without it. The scheduled reduction allows an examination of the impact and is thus conservative in application.

Appendix A. Carnegie Teaching Academy

Explanation of Proposed Budget

In the Teaching Academy campus conversations, 300 faculty members and administrators have begun to discuss the organizational and infrastructure supports that will be necessary to improve student learning and elevate the status of teaching at The University of Akron. The results of their conversations will be used to identify the strategic directions and funding priorities necessary to meet the University's goal of recognition as a Carnegie Teaching Academy. We will need an organizational structure to develop and implement the strategic initiatives that are identified. So that the process of engaging the faculty and administration in joint planning can continue, we are not predetermining the specific allocations for funding. Early discussions have indicated that faculty want a center that can provide leadership for developing critical teaching skills, sharing pedagogical approaches, and conducting research on teaching effectiveness. This initiative will subsume the Council of Dean's recommendation for the establishment of a "teaching learning center." In addition, several groups suggest an organizational structure for coordinating initiatives that are currently in place at the university such as: The Student Assessment Task Force, The General Education Advisory Committee, the K-16 Council, the Diversity Council, and the Internationalization Committee.

Following is an explanation of the types of activities being proposed for the 1999-2000 academic year. The request is based on an estimate of what it would cost to fund these or similar initiatives.

REQUEST FOR 1999-2000: \$250,000

Personnel

Director to develop the Teaching Academy/Faculty Development Center concept; seek external funding support; and organize Teaching Academy activities

Clerical Staff

Faculty Development (Following are a few examples that have already emerged from the campus conversations)

New Faculty start-up program

Graduate Assistant Training (Teaching Methods)

Faculty Fellowships, awards, incentives to support development of innovative teaching approaches and research projects to evaluate teaching effectiveness, comparison of pedagogical approaches etc. (The specific types of awards must be determined, but the concept will be similar to faculty research grants in number and amount of funding)

Speaker Series (Bring prominent speakers to campus)

Support for faculty attendance to conferences and meetings relevant to Teaching Academy goals. (A process for sharing information obtained with the campus community will be built into the plan.)

Office Equipment and Communications

Appendix B. Summer Sessions Class Offering Policy

Purpose

This policy is designed to provide a rational basis for decision making that balances two core institutional priorities: 1) providing a vital and diverse summer session academic program to our students; and, 2) ensuring that sufficient revenue is generated to support the summer programming and contribute to the financial well being of the University.

REVENUE CONSEQUENCE FOR 1999-2000: No change expected in first year.

General Procedure

Departments will develop their summer session plans based on their perceptions of the appropriate course and faculty mix necessary to accomplish their academic missions and goals. Courses offered in the summer program should be of comparable quality to those offered during the fall and spring terms including elements such as faculty staffing and course design.

The following guidelines should serve as a framework for planning:

- A. Full-time faculty members who teach the course during the regular academic year should be offered the opportunity to teach the course in the summer unless there is reason related to the academic mission and goals, or unique needs of the program, to offer the course to another individual;
- B. Full-time faculty who are willing and properly prepared to teach the class should be offered the opportunity to do so;
- C. Faculty who have declined the opportunity to teach the course during the regular academic year should not be offered the opportunity to teach the course during the summer unless no other qualified faculty are available;
- D. Courses comprising degree requirements should not be offered only during the summer session unless they are critical to the sequence of program offerings
- E. Courses such as clinics, practica, lessons, or other specialized offerings may be offered during the summer if they are critical to the requirements for the degree.

Revenue Considerations

As it is necessary for the summer programs to produce substantial revenue to help support the overall offerings of the university, it is not sufficient that a program simply provide a positive cash flow. Hence, the Provost will provide to the Deans of the Colleges net revenue benchmarks for the summer session offerings of each college, based on historical performance by the College and the revenue needs of the University. These benchmarks will be determined by the Provost in consultation with the Vice-President for Business and Finance and college deans, based on data provided by the Office of Resource Analysis and Budget and the Institute for Policy Studies. The summer offerings of the college as a whole will meet or exceed the *net revenue* benchmark.

Definitions:

- a) *Net revenue* for a course is an actual dollar amount consisting of the tuition and subsidy income derived from the course enrollment less the summer contract compensation of the course instructor.
- b) *Net revenue ratio* is the revenue/expense ratio for the course based on summer compensation and subsidy factors; a net revenue ratio greater than 1 means the course produces a positive return to the University
- c) *Net revenue benchmark* is the net revenue for a college times a multiplier designed to weight net revenue to accommodate academic year university operations.
- d) *Net revenue ratio benchmark* is derived from the net revenue benchmark for the college. If the college net revenue benchmark is \$500,000 and the college direct expense is initially expected to be \$1,000,000 then the total revenue for the college offerings must be at least \$1,500,000 or a net revenue ratio benchmark of 1.5.

Maximum Load Assignments and Weeks of Effort Allowable for Summer Salary**Instruction**

Summer instructional load assignments cannot exceed nine load hours, with a maximum of 6 hours per session and 9 hours for the total summer including Intersession, Summer I and Summer II.

Faculty may earn summer income based on the individualized study formula for a maximum of four load hours for the entire summer session. This load is calculated for directing independent research, theses, or dissertations of advisees supported by the University. The four-hour maximum can be exceeded if the faculty member has generated external funding to support the students during the academic year or summer. Students should register in accordance with the College and University policies. Deans are responsible for making decisions regarding assignments over the four-hour limit to faculty that have not generated external support.

Instruction and Externally Funded Research

Faculty may be compensated for a combination of instructional load and externally funded research effort up to a maximum of 13 weeks effort equivalent. The following formula should be used for calculating the faculty's maximum combined load:

$$(\text{Month's of Funded Research Effort} \times 4.3) + (\text{Instructional load hours} \times 1.1) \leq 13$$

Faculty with external funding with full Indirect Cost Recovery (IDC), to support their full summer salary may be compensated for up to 15 weeks of effort, with approval by the Dean.

Compensation Rates and Terminology

- a) *Summer Instructional compensation rate, per load hour* = Academic Year Salary / 32
- b) *Load hours for individualized study* = (number of students x enrolled credits)/9
- c) *Small class formula*, for the purposes of this policy the term "Small Class Formula" shall be understood to mean an adjusted summer instructional compensation rate for an instructor such that the course will return a positive net revenue based on actual course enrollment.

d) *Research Compensation Rate per Week* = Academic Year Salary / 37 or 39

Note: The divisor (37 or 39) for the weekly research compensation rate will be based on the permissible number as determined by the funding agency.

Decision support

To support implementation of this policy the Institute for Policy Studies will provide to each college an electronic spreadsheet populated with the necessary information and formulas to produce net revenues for each course section in the summer sessions schedule of the college. Instructions will be provided to permit modifications of the spreadsheet to reflect course schedule changes such as adding or deleting sections, changing the instructor and accompanying salary expense or updating the course enrollment figures.

The spreadsheet provided to each college will have two pages:

- 1) A base page to which all course information changes and additions will be applied and,
- 2) An analysis page, which will begin as an exact copy of the base page, and may be recreated as a default by recopying the base page if needed.

Decision sequence

- 1) all course information will be made current on the base page,
- 2) the base page will be copied to the analysis page,
- 3) the analysis page will be sorted in descending order of course *net revenue ratios*,
- 4) courses that exceed the *net revenue ratio* benchmark for the college will be offered,
- 5) a subtotal of net revenue will be generated for those courses exceeding the *net revenue ratio* benchmark
- 6) provided that the *net revenue* benchmark for the college as a whole is met or exceeded, courses that produce a *positive net revenue* will be offered,
 - a) courses that produce a *negative net revenue* may be offered if the Dean certifies that:
 1. the course satisfies a significant need for students that cannot reasonably be accommodated with regular academic year offerings; and
 2. the summer offerings of the college as a whole will meet or exceed the *net revenue* benchmark;
or
 - b) The faculty member agrees to teach the course on the Small Class Formula, if the college benchmark would not otherwise be met.
- 7) no college may offer a summer sessions schedule which, as a whole, fails to meet the *net revenue* benchmark for the college without the express written consent of the Provost.

Appendix C. Initiative on Community and Technical College

REQUEST FOR 1999-2000: \$300,000

Background:

At the current moment the Community and Technical College of the University of Akron is non-competitive due to lack of a separate identity, an insufficiently responsive curriculum and a tuition that is out of line with local two-year schools. This initiative suggests a course of action which will allow the Community and Technical college to respond to the challenges it currently faces.

The long-term goal of the initiative is to modify the relationship between the Community and Technical College and University of Akron in order to treat the college as a branch campus of the University.

To this end we propose the following suggested actions:

- 1) Rename the Community and Technical College to, for example, Summit Technical College
- 2) Create a separate bulletin for the Community and Technical College
- 3) Separate the curriculum revision process for Community and Technical College from that of the University
- 4) Improve the course articulation process with University baccalaureate programs.
- 5) Provide signage on the Polsky building identifying Community and Technical College
- 6) Develop and fund a separate advertising campaign for Community and Technical College
- 7) Hold Community and Technical College tuition increases to $\frac{1}{2}$ of University of Akron tuition increases and file the appropriate reporting to substitute the foregone revenue with the Ohio Board of Regents under the Access Challenge program.
- 8) Over a three year period coordinate tuition of Community and Technical College and Wayne College.
- 9) Include dedication of Polsky building to Community and Technical College as part of campus facilities guide plan, as main campus need for swing space recedes.
- 10) Reallocate C&T tuition differential in support of above actions at the rate of \$5 per credit hour in 1999-2000 \$(300,000), \$10 per credit hour in 2000-2001.
- 11) A formal plan and timetable to implement this initiative will be developed by the Dean of the Community and Technical College, in consultation with appropriate University personnel by June 30, 1999.

**Appendix D.
Proposed Procedure for Technology Fee Implementation**

- A. Remove existing course fees justified by reference to computing support.
- B. Levy instructional technology fee of \$5 per credit hour assessed on undergraduate students with more than 24 completed or transferred credit hours (maximum of \$60 per semester).
- C. Levy instructional technology fee of \$7.50 per credit hour assessed on all graduate and professional students.
- D. The fee for engineering majors to remain \$100 per semester (i.e. the technology fee under B and C above will not be levied on 4000 numbered (Engineering) courses).
- E. Fee revenue to be deployed to support *instructional* technology upgrades and replacement of obsolete equipment.
 - 1. 35% of revenue to be returned to departments based on credit hour generation,
 - a. General Studies based revenue returned to colleges for support of General Studies programs,
 - b. revenue for departments with existing course fees for computing will be adjusted if more than 35% of the new technology fees if required in order to insure no loss of support,
 - c. base distribution to be handled by Budget Office.
 - 2. 65% to be allocated by Provost based on recommendations of CCTC and IS in response to unit funding requests.
 - 3. 100% of Engineering revenue will be returned to Engineering college, but Engineering will not be eligible for distributions under point E.2.

REVENUE CONSEQUENCE: Net increase of approximately \$1,500,000.

AMENDMENTS MADE TO THIS APPENDIX DURING SENATE MEETING:

- A. Remove existing course fees ESTABLISHED IN FALL 1996 AND AFTER, WHICH WERE justified by reference to computing support.
- E.2. 65% to be allocated by Provost based on recommendations of CCTC and IS in response to unit funding requests. THESE FUNDS MUST BE DISTRIBUTED TO ACADEMIC UNITS ONLY.

Appendix E. Graduate Student "Stand Alone" Tuition Scholarships

Based on recent OBR analysis and legislative concern with the use of stand alone tuition scholarships for graduate students, and the complexity of imposing a "service" requirement,

Revisions to the current policy are as follows:

- The number of graduate credits available for Stand-Alone Tuition Scholarships will be reduced by twenty-five per cent in 1999-2000 from the 1998-99 level.
- The number of graduate credits available for Stand-Alone Tuition Scholarships will be reduced again so that we achieve a fifty per cent reduction of the 1998-99 level by academic year 2000-2001.
- Recipients of "Stand Alone" Tuition Scholarships may hold them for one academic year only. (Students holding such Scholarships in 1998-99 may hold them for a second year in 1999-2000. However, no one will be eligible to hold such a Scholarship for a second year effective with 2000-2001.)
- Graduate credits for recipients should be awarded primarily in the fall semester and the spring semester with a minimum registration of nine graduate credits for each semester. Graduate credits, if awarded in the summer session at all, should be distributed at a minimum.
- A different contract form will be used for "Stand-Alone" Tuition Scholarships effective with 1999-2000.
- A review of the continued viability of the "Stand-Alone" Tuition Scholarship as a component of the UA Graduate Financial Assistance will be conducted in 2000-2001.

REVENUE CONSEQUENCE: Expectation is that properly targeted reductions will result in no change in credit hour production.

Appendix F. Out-of-State Surcharge Waivers

We propose the use of out-of-state surcharge fee waivers as a tool to recruit high ability students to UA from outside the state. Currently the BS/MD Program and School of Dance are the only two UA academic units that regularly enroll students from outside Ohio. Intercollegiate athletics has also been successful in recruiting outside of Ohio. High ability out-of-state students can contribute to the atmosphere of our academic community and aid in pursuing the goal of recruiting a higher quality and more diverse student body.

The two proposed scholarships include:

Legacy Scholars - Open to children of UA alumni living outside of the state of Ohio (US citizen or permanent resident).

Resident Scholars - High ability, new United States high school graduates from outside of Ohio - Must reside on-campus each year (freshman-senior year) in order to receive scholarship.

Other criteria for award of the fee-waiver scholarships will be developed by the Enrollment Services Planning Implementation Network (ESPIN) committee and reported back to PBC.

This scholarship program would assist the University in achieving three objectives:

- a) To increase the number of academically and artistically talented students in residence.
- b) To recruit and retain a combined total of 200 Legacy and Resident Scholars by the year 2006.
- c) To recruit 7% of new freshman for fall 2006 from outside the State of Ohio.

REVENUE CONSEQUENCE: None expected. Few of our undergraduate students are out-of-state but U.S. citizens, hence the out-of-state surcharge revenue from such students is not material.

**Appendix G.
Budget Detail Attachments**

**Attachment 1
The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Miscellaneous Income Summary**

<u>Miscellaneous Income</u>	<u>FY99 Revised Budget</u>	<u>FY00 Proposed Budget</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Investment Income	\$4,800,000	\$4,800,000	\$0
Income from Endowments	300,000	300,000	0
Indirect Cost	3,290,000	3,290,000	0
Miscellaneous	50,000	50,000	0
Total Miscellaneous Income	<u>\$8,440,000</u>	<u>\$8,440,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>

Draft

Attachment 2
The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Compensation Summary

	FY99 Revised Budget	FY99-00 Proposed Budget *	Difference	
			\$	%
Full-time Compensation				
Full-time Faculty	\$41,255,210	\$41,961,283 +	706,073	1.71%
Administration	10,360,800	10,548,857 +	188,057	1.82%
Full-time Staff	21,039,314	21,643,473 +	604,159	2.87%
Vacant Positions	5,343,721	6,395,130	1,051,409	19.68%
Time Release Positions	Inc. Above	537,455 +	537,455	ERR
Stipends - Regular	Inc. Above	164,951	164,951	ERR
Total Full-time Positions	77,999,045	81,251,149	3,252,104	4.17%
Other Personnel				
Departmental Sales: Total	\$1,747,675	\$2,023,701	276,026	15.79%
Full-time	1,031,035	1,259,187	228,152	22.13%
PT faculty	386,685	283,012	(103,673)	-26.81%
Summer Session	100,572	74,671	(25,901)	-25.75%
PT staff	159,483	350,691	191,208	119.89%
Overtime	19,900	9,500	(10,400)	-52.26%
GA stipends	50,000	46,640	(3,360)	-6.72%
Part-time faculty	4,553,180	4,553,180 +	0	0.00%
Summer Session Faculty	5,902,817	5,865,000	(37,817)	-0.64%
Part-time Staff	937,525	937,525 +	0	0.00%
Overtime	405,465	405,465 +	0	0.00%
GA Stipends: Graduate School	6,550,597	6,550,597	0	0.00%
GA Stipends: College Supplements	175,607	175,607	0	0.00%
	6,726,204	6,726,204	0	0.00%
ERIP Dollars:				
Salary Savings to pay Liability	6,617,063	3,519,667	(3,097,396)	-46.81%
Window 3 Dollars Available for Ret	1,554,439	1,500,000	(54,439)	-3.50%
Mercer Compensation Study Adjustment	0	0	0	ERR
Total Other Personnel	\$28,444,368	\$25,530,742	(\$2,913,626)	-10.24%
Total	\$106,443,413	\$106,781,891	\$338,478	0.32%

* Assume Scenario 1 for discussion purposes.

+ Used in raise pool calculation - $(\$80,587,238 \times .035 \times 1.17)$

Note: The FY99 Revised Budget accounts for permanent changes made to the original departmental allocations during the mid-year re-budget process. The Proposed Allocations incorporate additional permanent changes and reorganizational adjustments.

Attachment 3
The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Fringe Benefit Summary

Fringe Benefits	FY99 Revised Budget	Fiscal 1999-2000 Proposed Scenarios			
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Retirement Systems	\$13,106,080	\$13,230,000	\$13,230,000	\$13,230,000	\$13,230,000
Workers Comp	336,881	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Medicare	617,952	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Unemployment Comp	64,403	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Group Insurance	9,302,383	9,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000	9,400,000
Parking Permits	444,499	670,000	670,000	670,000	670,000
Fee Remissions	2,154,969	2,181,800	2,181,800	2,225,000	2,225,000
ERIP W-3 (Fringe Savings)	677,493	287,800	287,800	287,800	287,800
ERIP W-1&2	478,489	295,100	295,100	295,100	295,100
Subtotal	<u>\$27,183,149</u>	<u>\$27,104,700</u>	<u>\$27,104,700</u>	<u>\$27,147,900</u>	<u>\$27,147,900</u>
Departmental Sales	\$481,302	\$577,825	\$577,825	\$577,825	\$577,825
Total Fringe Benefits	<u>\$27,664,451</u>	<u>\$27,682,525</u>	<u>\$27,682,525</u>	<u>\$27,725,725</u>	<u>\$27,725,725</u>

Attachment
The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Unit Operating Budget Summary

Academic Units:	FY99 Revised Budget	Proposed FY00 Unit Allocation	Difference	Explanations:
Senior VP & Provost	\$548,397	\$624,400	\$78,003	Min Aff, Min Access/Ret, Black Clt Ctr fr President.
Human Resources	125,000	125,000	0	
Student Affairs	1,458,000	1,408,900	(49,100)	To personnel to fund FT permanent position.
Information Services	2,321,000	2,488,000	145,000	Additional support for Y2K and Distance Learning
University College	231,000	231,000	0	
Arts & Sciences	1,802,000	1,802,000	0	
Business Administration	1,544,837	1,544,800	(37)	Includes state support of IGB program.
Community & Technical	434,000	434,000	0	
Education	481,000	481,000	0	
Engineering	720,000	720,000	0	
Fine & Applied Arts	800,000	800,000	0	
Graduate School	103,603	103,600	(3)	
Law-Operating	795,018	795,100	84	
Law-Library	455,984	458,000	16	
Nursing	350,000	350,000	0	
Polymer Science & Polymer Eng.	400,000	400,000	0	
Bierce Library-Operating	1,083,458	1,098,500	35,042	Additional Funding for University Press
Bierce Library-Books & Period.	2,293,542	2,293,500	(42)	
Subtotal Academic	<u>\$15,924,637</u>	<u>\$16,133,600</u>	<u>\$208,963</u>	
Administrative Units:				
President's Unit	\$377,000	\$128,500	(\$248,500)	Minority affairs, etc to Provost & Planning to Admin Svc
Administrative Services	2,189,000	2,269,300	100,300	Planning fr President (+ 170k), fund 5 custodians (-70k)
VP Business & Finance	351,000	351,000	0	
VP & General Counsel	155,000	233,000	78,000	Additional support for Bd of Trustees and Gen Counsel
VP Public Affairs & Development	1,329,000	1,329,000	0	
Subtotal Administrative	<u>\$4,381,000</u>	<u>\$4,310,800</u>	<u>(\$70,200)</u>	
Total	<u>\$20,305,637</u>	<u>\$20,444,400</u>	<u>\$138,763</u>	

Note: The FY99 Revised Budget accounts for permanent changes made to the original departmental allocations during the mid-year re-budget process. The Proposed Allocations incorporate additional permanent changes and reorganizational adjustments.

May 6, 1999

Page 52

Attachment 5
The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Continuing Obligations Summary

Continuing Obligations	FY99 Revised Budget	FY 1999-2000	
		Proposed Scenarios 1 & 2	Proposed Scenarios 3 & 4
Scholarships - Undergraduate	\$2,293,656	\$2,481,403	\$2,527,274
Scholarships - Graduate	13,165,839	13,442,472	13,705,789
	<u>\$15,459,495</u>	<u>\$15,923,875</u>	<u>\$16,233,063</u>
College Work Study Program	\$320,000	\$290,000	\$290,000
SEOG/Perkins Loan Matching Funds	250,000	205,000	205,000
Brennan Chair Match	45,000	45,000	45,000
Student Extracurric. Activities	519,163	519,163	519,163
Commencement	115,000	265,000	265,000
Upward Bound Add'l Step Students	72,391	72,391	72,391
Matching Funds-Upward Bound	37,000	37,000	37,000
Purchased Utilities - Net	5,646,397	5,840,422	5,840,422
Course Materials & Compute Fees	1,711,630	3,161,630	3,161,630
Cost Recovery-Auxiliaries	(301,080)	(301,080)	(301,080)
Cost Recovery-Wayne College	(69,508)	(69,508)	(69,508)
Cost Recovery-NEOUCOM	(74,216)	(74,216)	(74,216)
Cost Recovery-Dept'l Sales & Svc.	(10,000)	(10,000)	(10,000)
Indirect Cost Redistribution	1,301,500	1,301,500	1,301,500
Off-Campus Credit Course Set Aside	528,603	549,747	560,319
Rentals	256,087	226,429	226,429
Legal Fees (Counsel & Settlements)	961,000	961,000	961,000
Insurance	280,000	280,000	280,000
Assessments	45,000	45,000	45,000
Campus Budget Reserve	223,449	500,000	500,000
Other-Continuing Obligations	421,000	450,000	450,000
Year 2000 Conversion	80,000	0	0
Research Initiative	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Technology Fee Reserve	983,481	983,481	983,481
	<u>\$14,841,897</u>	<u>\$16,777,959</u>	<u>\$16,788,531</u>
Depart'l Sales/Cont. Ed Operating	3,780,658	3,136,542	3,136,542
Total Continuing Obligations	<u>\$34,082,050</u>	<u>\$35,838,376</u>	<u>\$36,158,136</u>

Attachment 6
The University of Akron
Office of Resource Analysis and Budget
Transfers-out

Transfers-out	FY99 Revised Budget	FY00 Proposed Scenarios 1-4	Difference	
			\$	%
Student Center	\$220,000	\$220,000	\$0	0.0%
Rubber Bowl	204,200	204,200	0	0.0%
PAH Operations	667,427	667,427	0	0.0%
Residence Life	701,255	400,000	(301,255)	-43.0%
Perkins Loans Match	115,000	115,000	0	0.0%
Plant Funds	500,000	500,000	0	0.0%
Bonded Debt Repayment - Series 1997a	\$312,955	\$314,510	1,555	0.5%
University Club	143,482	145,196	1,714	1.2%
Corbin Commons Improvements	52,777	52,727	(50)	-0.1%
Energy Conservation Program	48,841	48,795	(46)	-0.1%
Child Care Center	67,855	67,792	(63)	-0.1%
Debt Repayment - Series 1999a	\$0	\$1,380,133	\$1,380,133	ERR
Energy Conservation		380,133		
Arts & Sciences, Knight Roof, Property Acquisition		1,000,000		
NMR Loan Repayment	24,285	24,285	0	0.0%
Real Estate Tax Agreement - City of Akron	114,500	108,050	(6,450)	-5.6%
Total	\$2,859,622	\$3,833,605	1,073,983	37.6%

APPENDIX H

TO: FACULTY SENATE

FROM: UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE
Mrs. Barbara M. Heinzerling, Acting Chair
Dr. Lynn Smolen, Chair

REPORT: ACTIVITY DURING 1998-1999 SCHOOL YEAR

DATE: May 6, 1999

The University Libraries Committee has met regularly during the 1998-1999 school year. During fall semester discussions focused on the library's acquisition of electronic journals and databases and the education of users for these resources. The University's participation in the OhioLink's consortium purchase of on-line Elsevier journals and the Jstor Retrospective on-line journals were also discussed. Another discussion was on the university libraries' new electronic reserve program.

During spring semester the Committee began to discuss the idea of Information Literacy. This topic was first discussed by the libraries' task force. Information Literacy has been defined as developing an individual's expertise in searching for, analyzing, evaluating, and managing the information needed for use in academic, personal, and professional life. Currently there are several models of promoting information literacy and a strong argument can be made for a resource-based and process approach focused on the user. During the summer of 1999 librarians from the university libraries will work with interested faculty to enhance their curriculum to include teaching the skills that students need to be successful in seeking and using information.

The Committee would also remind all faculty that the university libraries will accept donations of books and journals from all faculty. For retiring faculty this is a wonderful opportunity to make a contribution to the libraries while simultaneously reducing what they have to remove from their offices.

APPENDIX I

DATE: 6 May 1999

TO: Faculty Senate, Mrs. Barbara Heinzerling, Chair

FROM: General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC), Pamela Hollinger, Chair

SUBJECT: Interim report of our activities

Since we last reported to you on April 2, we have met four times—5 April, 19 April, 26 April, and 3 May. The minutes of those meetings, as well as reports of a number of GEAC's other activities are available on our website—<http://www.uakron.edu/geac/home.htm>.

On 12 April 1999, GEAC hosted a luncheon conversation on general education as part of the Carnegie Teaching Academy initiative. The questions which were discussed are as follows:

- What can be done to improve the quality of the undergraduate experience?
- How can we globalize the undergraduate curriculum?
- How can we engage students in active reading of texts?
- What is the impact of technology on student learning?
- Is student motivation subject to change through strategies and pedagogies we employ as teachers?
- What constitutes a well-rounded education?
- How relevant is our *General Education Program* toward achieving the goal of a well-rounded education?
- What, if anything, would you like to change in the *General Education Program*?

Judging from the comments of the more than 70 attendees, the luncheon conversation was indeed fruitful. Although not all GEAC facilitators have turned in their reports of topics covered at their tables, some reports have already been uploaded to our website under the rubric "GEAC/Assessment."

The final phase of our assessment—student focus groups—has proven to be more difficult than we had ever imagined. Getting students to participate is the major source of our frustration. To date, we had scheduled eight focus group sessions, but have only been able to conduct three focus groups involving a total of only twelve students. Although these sessions were enlightening, at the present time, we do not believe that their comments reflect the larger population of student opinion about the *General Education Program* at The University of Akron. Therefore, we will "revisit" the idea of student focus groups again during the fall semester

On 3 May, we met with Dr. Thomas Vukovich, Dr. Dick Stratton, Ms. Marjorie Keil, and Mr. Gary Traveny to discuss data on the skills and abilities of our students entering the *General Education Program*. Based on that meeting, GEAC has determined that there is a substantive and critical need to assess institutionally some of the most salient issues of higher education concerning the needs and expectations of both our faculty and our students about teaching and learning.

On 10 May, we will have our final meeting of the semester. We will be meeting with President Proenza to discuss with him the types of recommendations GEAC may be forwarding to Faculty Senate as part of its final report on assessment of the *General Education Program*.

APPENDIX J

Proposed job description changes for
University of Akron Press Director
Passed by Editorial Board, 5.4.99

Changes proposed for University Bylaws, Section 3359-20-057. Deletions indicated by line striking out, and additions indicated in all capital letters.

(E) University Press

- (1) The purpose of "The University of Akron Press" is to support intellectual inquiry through the publication of scholarly works.
- (2) The ~~Editor~~ DIRECTOR of "The University of Akron Press" shall be EITHER a full time faculty member who has a significant record of involvement with academic publication (preferably as author and/or Editor of academic publications) OR A CONTRACT PROFESSIONAL WITH A SIGNIFICANT RECORD OF INVOLVEMENT IN EDITING OR DIRECTING THE ACTIVITIES NECESSARY FOR PROPER FUNCTIONING OF THE PRESS. The ~~Editor~~ DIRECTOR shall be selected for the position by ~~the President or the President's designee. The Editor shall report to the Provost~~, AND SHALL REPORT TO THE PROVOST OR THE PROVOST'S DESIGNEE.
- (3) The Editorial Board of "The University of Akron Press" shall be composed of the ~~Editor~~ DIRECTOR and six faculty members. The terms of the faculty members shall be three years, except that the initial appointments shall be made for staggered terms so that one-third of the faculty members will rotate from the Board every year. The Editorial Board shall be selected by the President or the President's designee.
- (4) The ~~Editor~~ DIRECTOR and Editorial Board shall establish editorial and publishing guidelines for the Press and shall recommend to the ~~President or the President's designee~~ PROVOST OR THE PROVOST'S DESIGNEE such policies and procedures as are deemed useful for the Press including the creation of an Advisory Board of Scholars from the University of Akron and elsewhere.

Rationale: First, we propose that the title be changed from Editor to Director. Although this does not appear in the web-based version of the By-laws, we believe that this change has already been voted upon favorably by the Senate, and wish to ensure that the change is made. It reflects the more standard job title used among university presses.

Second, we wish to allow more permissive language in the hiring of a new director. Many directors of university presses are full-time contract professionals. Because of retirement, we are currently searching for a new director, and the old wording dramatically limits the available pool of candidates. To allow more hiring options, we wish to change the language.

Third, we propose replacing the President or his or her designee with the Provost or his or her designee in decision making regarding (a) the selection of the director and (b) policies and procedures of the Press. This more accurately reflects current practices, and relieves the President of unnecessary responsibilities.

FACULTY SENATE ATTENDANCE RECORD
1998-99

<u>NAME</u>	<u>EXCUSED ABSENCES</u>	<u>NON-EXCUSED ABSENCES</u>
Aby	1	0
Baldwin	1	2
Baranowski	2	0
Batur	4	0
Bird	1	2
Braun	0	2
C. Buchanan	1	1
J. Buchanan	1	2
Butler	0	0
Cheung	0	0
Chyi	0	0
Clark	2	1
Deckler	1	3
Dhinojwala	1	3
Dubick	0	2
Edgerton	0	0
Erickson	0	0
Filer-Tubaugh	2	0
Fisher	3	0
Fitzgerald	0	0
Foos	0	0
Gelfand	2	0
Gibson	0	0
Gill	0	2
Gilpatric	0	1
Griffin	1	0
Gunn	0	1
Hanlon	0	0
Heinzerling	0	0
Huff	0	1
Isayev	2	0
Johnston	0	1
Kennedy	1	0
Konkel	0	0
Lillie	0	0
Lynn	0	1
Markovich	0	0
Marquette	0	0
Midha	0	0
Mormino	2	0
Murray	1	1
Norfolk	0	0

SENATE ATTENDANCE

Ofobike	1	3
Oller	1	0
Ozanich	5	2
Patankar	0	0
Pelz	1	0
Redle	0	3
Reed	0	4
Reep	1	2
Rich	0	0
Richards	0	0
Richert	0	1
Ritchey	1	4
Sheffer	0	0
Smith	0	1
Smolen	1	2
Stems	0	0
Stevenson	1	0
Stewart	2	0
Stinner	0	3
Tausig	1	0
Turek	2	1
Wright	0	3