

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

4-11-1996

Faculty Senate Chronicle April 11, 1996

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 Special Faculty Senate Meeting of April 11, 1996	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of April 4, 1996	11
A. Report of <i>Budget and Planning Coordination Committee</i>	11

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

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF APRIL 11, 1996**

The special meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 11, 1996, in Room 207 of Leigh Hall.

Forty-three of the fifty-six members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Bucey, Clements, Davis, DePaul, Echols, Harrison, Hebert, John, Malhotra, Newman, Smith, Webb and Wright were absent with notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- **APPROVED A REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE REGARDING TUITION AND FEES FOR 1996-97**
- **APPROVED AND REFERRED A RESOLUTION AND MOTION REGARDING THE MERGER OF LRPC AND BPCC INTO ONE COMMITTEE TO THE REFERENCE COMMITTEE**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman stated that this meeting was a continuation of the meeting held last week. The Senate had adjourned to this date and time. There was only one item of business; namely, consideration of a recommendation from BPCC which had been amended after a joint meeting of BPCC and LRPC at the Senate's direction. The Senate's task today as part of that consideration was to make recommendations regarding the budget and possible tuition increases. He asked whether there were any other items for today's agenda.

Senator Jesse Marquette wanted to add a resolution regarding LRPC and BPCC for consideration after the body had finished its deliberations on the budget.

Since there was no other business to add, the amended agenda was approved.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman asked Senator Chand Midha, Vice Chair of BPCC, to make a report. Senator Midha reminded members that last Thursday the BPCC had recommended to the body that it approve an increase of 6% in tuition so that there could be \$1.5 million set aside for quality enhancement as well as a 3% salary raise pool. The Senate had sent that recommendation back to the Committee because it thought that the 6% tuition increase was not applicable at this time. The LRPC had originally recommended a 3% tuition increase as well as a \$3 million cut from the administrative side of the budget. When the two committees had met this past Monday, Senator Marquette presented new figures showing that the \$3 million could be cut. As shown in the second page of the handout from the Committee (**Appendix A**), he came up with a \$3,402,000 deduction in the administrative budget. The detailed breakdown showed what proportion

of that total would come from the Office of the President, Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President of Business and Finance, and Vice President for Research and Development. Brian Davis, Budget and Resource analyst, told the Committee that this could be done, and the Vice Presidents for Student Affairs and Business and Finance, who were originally reluctant, by the end of the meeting also felt it could be done. These were hard decisions to make and the Committee was not telling the units what had to be cut. However, to the best of his knowledge there would be no layoffs unless there were some part-time positions.

Senator Midha went on to say that based on this information the Committee had passed a motion that it supported the LRPC's proposal to increase tuition by 3% so long as an additional 1% increase was added to cover the cost of the metro loop bus system. That system, which both students and faculty had been able to use for free, had been in operation for the past two years. This had been accomplished through a grant which would run out next month. This expenditure amounted to approximately \$438,000 per year, of which the University paid \$100,000 with the grant taking care of the rest. With the grant coming to an end, another \$338,000 would be necessary. The additional 1% tuition increase would take care of that and would also give another \$100 - 150,000 toward the roughly \$50 million needed to cover maintenance expenses for buildings. It was a drop in the bucket, but at least it was a start. This was why the motion from the Committee now read as follows: "BPCC supports the LRPC proposal to increase tuition by 3% so long as an additional 1% increase is added to cover the cost of the metro/loop bus system and/or to defray the costs of the campus facilities deferred maintenance. BPCC also supports the LRPC proposal to reduce the administrative unit budgets by \$3 million so long as 2/3 of this reduction is from continuing dollars and 1/3 is from one-time dollars to become continuing dollars the following fiscal year."

Senator Marquette offered to discuss the information presented in the handout (**Appendix A**) regarding the assumptions for rescission. He and Brian Davis had been asked by President Ruebel to try and find \$3 million without layoffs, since this had been an assertion of the LRPC that it could only be accomplished with massive layoffs. At the moment there was about \$1.4 million available in vacant and ERIP positions that would occur on July 1, 1996. They had begun by freezing all those positions which would be swept up as a permanent reduction. ERIP positions in admissions had specifically been exempted so they should be replaced as well as any other position that admissions might need. The new Vice President for Informational Services for whom a search was now underway had also been made an exemption. The position for Vice President of Business and Finance and the Associate Vice President for Research would also have continuing money left because that money was not going to become available until July 1, 1997. Those positions would be funded out of one-time dollars for the first year as was normally the case after the ERIP positions had been taken up.

Senator Marquette went on to say that \$400,000 in vacant position money was going to be held as a reserve for the President. This was because the last time there was a position freeze on the faculty side, all of these positions were lost and there was nothing that could be done about it. This money would allow the President to replace what he deemed to be critical positions in the units. Therefore, even though we were starting with \$3,400,000, it was not going to be taken over the long run. All of the long term commitments at the University such as megaserver payments, University advertising and other things that were in carryover accounts would not be touched. None of the essential accounts like fringe benefits would be touched. The \$1.5 million for quality enhancement

which the LRPC was recommending would be held until after the Fall 14th-day phase so that there would be a cushion if there was an enrollment decline beyond what was being projected. After the 14th-day phase, assuming enrollment was close to projections, \$750,000 intended for the general studies positions would be treated as a Provost reserve and the Provost would be able to spend that money any way he wanted. This was because that \$750,000 was a permanent allocation; it was continuing money but the positions for which it was intended would be recruited next year and the money not actually spent until next year. Therefore, the money would be available for spending for specific activities but that would be treated as a one-time expenditure next year.

The third column in the chart contained one-time money for conversion, and it would be possible to plan to convert that money to continuing money by the end of the year. Finally, for example, if the Business and Finance area stuck in proportionately \$200,000 of the \$400,000 reserve and they did not use it, that is they did not get back from the President any critical positions, then that money would count against their one-time conversion. Only what was needed would have to be converted, and if nobody used the \$400,000, then there would only have to be \$600,000 in the one-time conversion. So only \$3 million, not \$3.4 million would be taken, but the \$400,000 reserve might be given back partly during the course of the year, and then another way would have to be found to get to it at the end. Finally, additional planned reductions would be developed during the 96-97 budget cycle. President Ruebel had said that we needed to squeeze things and not slap them on the head, but a plan was needed to get this down so that things were in balance over the next couple of years.

On the basis of all of this, Senator Marquette said that the money was there. The budget figures on the last page of the handout came from Brian Davis' production of the budget. This was in effect the budget. It was all there except for the 1% tuition increase for the specific things mentioned in the BPCC's motion.

In answer to a question from Senator William Taggart in order to clarify that the position freeze was not going to affect the academic side, Senator Marquette responded that nothing on the academic side had been touched. All of this came from the institutional support area. There was more which could not yet be pursued because it was not clear enough what had to be done. More time and data were necessary, but clearly this was the intent expressed more than a year ago by the Senate in terms of the institutional support positions.

Senator David Buchthal noted that President Ruebel in his comments last week had said that the cuts should be made as far removed from the students as possible. He hoped that the LRPC and BPCC would be willing to endorse that in relation to an administrator making a choice between not replacing a secretary or not replacing a placement officer or student adviser. The choice obviously should be made in favor of the student. He was reluctant to tell people to go ahead and cut because he wanted to make sure these cuts would not be punitive regarding the students.

Senator Marquette said he certainly endorsed that sentiment.

Senator Midha stated that the BPCC would endorse this sentiment as well. He wanted to note, however, that what was being recommended here would give roughly a 3% pool for salaries but no money for additional expenses. Requests had been received from the Library for an increased

budget as well as from the Graduate School. Last year, the BPCC had taken requests like these into account and allocated money for them from new money as well as for salary increases, but not this year.

Senator Richard Gigliotti asked whether the BPCC was proposing that funding the loop bus also meant funding bus riders coming in from all sectors of the region for which the current federal grant now paid. When this was affirmed, he wondered whether an analysis had been done of the need for this.

Senator Midha responded that there was some partial data, but he did not think we had utilized the \$438,000 to its full extent.

Senator Gigliotti was concerned that the cost of the loop, which was one issue, and the cost of the larger metropolitan bus system ridership had not been broken down and separated. We all had been through a lot in the past three months. Students were concerned that the University was going to lose its accreditation. Now we were going to ask them to pay more tuition in order to pay for a bus system which they probably did not use as well as to repair buildings. Was there not some other way to find this money without adding it to tuition? If it were left at 3%, it would be inflation, and symbolically it would heal some of the wounds since other schools had advertised 6% increases.

The Chairman commented that given the way the discussion was going he would entertain a motion that the body consider the BPCC's report as a committee of the whole. Senator John Green so moved and this was seconded by Senator Tim Norfolk.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate voted its approval and went into a committee of the whole.

When the Senate came out of the committee of the whole, Senator David Brink rose and reported. The committee of the whole recommended that the BPCC report be received but not endorsed. It further recommended that tuition and fees for 1996-97 be increased 3% beginning Summer Session I 1996, that the budgets of the administrative offices listed on the sheet be reduced by \$3 million per the attached table, and that the attached budget be adopted for 1996-97 (see Appendix A). Finally, it recommended that the administration take appropriate action to fund the shuttle bus service to the campus while determining its value to students and faculty.

The Chairman called for debate on adopting the report of the committee of the whole. Senator William McGucken asked for a point of clarification. All afternoon the body had been talking about tuition, but the motion which had just been read mentioned both tuition and fees. The Chairman responded that the budget had been calculated on the basis of tuition and fees. The numbers would change substantially without the inclusion of the fees. Senator Norfolk suggested that some reference be made to this in regard to the BPCC proposal which simply mentioned tuition.

Since there was no further discussion, the body voted to adopt the report of the committee of the whole.

III. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Marquette wanted to present a motion which had been extensively discussed in the LRPC as well as with President Ruebel, the Provost, and some deans. It read as follows: "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate hereby directs the Reference Committee to revise the governance structure of the University to combine the Long Range Planning Committee and the Budget and Planning Coordination Committee into a single committee named the Planning and Budgeting Committee. The suggested composition of the combined committee will be: the President, a trustee, the Provost, the Chief financial officer, three Deans elected by the Council of Deans, Faculty Senators elected on an apportionment of one per college and 5 Faculty Senators elected at large. The Reference Committee is directed to revise the governance documentation so as to combine the relevant LRPC and BPCC responsibilities and election procedures. The revision is to be completed by the May, 1996 meeting of the Senate and will take effect with election of members to the combined committee at the September meeting of the Senate."

Senator Marquette explained that the original proposal for the creation of the Senate had not included the creation of the two committees. Given the way they had been functioning over the past year in regard to coordination and operating assumptions, he had concluded that the idea of having two committees was not a good one. Combining the two into one would achieve a number of things. It would address the problem of the composition of the LRPC, since presently not all colleges had representation. Also, it would simplify and streamline the planning and budgeting process of the institution. The new Committee could break up as appropriate into subcommittees to study the various assumptions necessary for long-range planning and the budget. This seemed a better solution than mandating regular meetings of both committees all the time. The original intention of those who had worked on fashioning the Senate and governance structure had been to simply have a planning and budgeting committee. The LRPC had gotten added in the same way that the Shared Governance system had been added.

Senator C. Frank Griffin asked which of the people on the proposed committee would be new to either one of the old committees. Senator Marquette answered that he did not think there were any. The President, a dean, and a trustee were on LRPC; there were two deans and the Chief Financial Officer on BPCC. This accounted for all of the officials and the proposed number of faculty on the new committee was about the same as on the two old ones. The Reference Committee might want to modify this a bit, but basically this proposal combined the two committees and left representation pretty much the same.

Senator Buchthal pointed out that Senator Marquette had miscounted the number of members from each of the degree-granting colleges. Senator Midha added that the representation on BPCC was eleven elected members. Senator Marquette apologized and noted that this could be rectified by the Reference Committee.

Senator Peggy Richards stated that at the LRPC meeting yesterday she had brought up the fact that the Part-Time Faculty did have representation on LRPC and BPCC and under this sort of proposal they were eliminated. She had thought that part-time faculty, as well as representatives from the University Libraries, were going to be added to the list. She moved to amend the second paragraph of the proposal to read, "The suggested composition of the combined Committee will be the President, a Trustee, the Provost, the Chief Financial Officer, 3 deans elected by the Council of

Deans, one Faculty Senator elected from each college, one from University Libraries and one from the part-time faculty." This was seconded by Senator Paul Fowler.

Senator Carmen Keener saw this proposal as an opportunity to include student representation on this committee. She moved to amend the amendment to add a student Faculty Senator to the committee membership, and this was seconded by Senator Diane Vukovich.

Senator Vukovich, in the hopes of being as inclusive as possible, also wanted to add a contract professional representative. The Chairman pointed out that it was not possible to amend an amendment to an amendment.

Senator William Rich was afraid that Senator Marquette had gone awry in being too specific in his proposal and wondered whether it might not be wise to refer this to the Reference Committee to work out the specifics. Accordingly, he urged the defeat of the initial motion to amend, after which he would propose an amendment that would do what he suggested.

Senator Nicholas Ranson was confused in regard to the power which the Senate had to revise the governance structure of the University. These committees were not committees only of the Senate, and therefore the best the Senate could do was offer a recommendation to the Board of Trustees that this be done. Was he wrong about this?

The Chairman replied he was not but asked that discussion be limited to the amended amendment.

Senator Elizabeth Erickson asked for a point of clarification regarding the 5 at-large Faculty Senators in Senator Marquette's proposal. What was his purpose for including these positions? It seemed to her that the Reference Committee would need to know.

The Chairman thought that "at-large" was well defined.

Senator Virginia Gunn had some concern about major things like restructuring committees. While some members of the body might have talked about these issues two years ago, many present Senators had not been in on those original discussions. She did not think it was wise to have papers handed out halfway through a meeting and have a vote without any time to think about the issues. She was not saying that she would oppose this, but she would be more comfortable with some sort of resolution that the Reference Committee look at this issue and present something than to vote on something so specific now. The body was getting a lot of information at the last minute that obviously some people had discussed, but no one else was in on it.

Senator Joseph Padovan pointed out that there would be 21 people on this Committee, and this would be very unwieldy. He had never seen committees that large really resolve anything. What was the philosophy behind the 5 "at large" members?

The Chairman once again reminded the body that it was discussing the amendment to add student representation to the amendment to add part-time faculty and University Libraries representation. It would make better progress if it could confine itself to that issue. Since there

were no further comments, the body voted on Senator Keener's amendment and it failed with one abstention. Senator Keener called for a division of the house, and the vote was 17 to 17.

The Senate then returned to discussing Senator Richards' motion to add part-time and University Libraries representation.

Senator Marquette, in keeping with the comments of Senator Rich, wanted to offer an amendment that after the phrase "3 deans elected by the Council of Deans" the sentence simply read that the Reference Committee be directed to determine the Senate representation on the Committee and work out what was appropriate. The composition in his proposal had merely been a suggestion so perhaps it was better to refer this to the Reference Committee and let them do it.

The Chairman was not certain that Senator Marquette's motion was in order, and secondly he was not sure that the body wanted to place a policy matter before the Reference Committee. It was better for this body to give them some direction.

Senator Gunn wondered why it was assumed that the two committees could be merged. Did not each have a separate charge?

The Chairman observed that this comment and question would be relevant if that was what the Senate was presently discussing. It could return to this after it had voted on Senator Richards' amendment. Since there was no further discussion, the body voted and the motion failed.

Senator Padovan asked again about the rationale behind the "at large" representatives.

Senator Marquette responded that there were two issues here. One was to try to get some balance in terms of the college memberships. The other was to try to give opportunities to other constituencies to get elected. He knew that he was unpopular when he said this, but if the body specified every constituency that had to be represented every time, then the ability of the Committee to have some general and effective discussions would be limited. What he had offered in his proposal was a way to have representation from each of the colleges as well as from other constituencies. The LRPC was elected "at-large"; there was no specification that it had to be one from each college. He had been trying to combine two methods so that there would be something similar but with one committee. In response to Senator Padovan's earlier comment about the size of the Committee, he did not believe that it would be too large given the amount of work that it had to do. Most of the work would be in subcommittee, but then, at the end, there would be one recommendation from one committee rather than two separate ones from two committees as was now the case.

Senator Dennis Kimmell commented that it had been a frustrating year for members of the BPCC because the Committee had not done as much as it had hoped to do. Since the current proposal would combine the functions of two committees, he wanted to move the following as the end of the first sentence after "...the Planning and Budget Committee": "WITH A CLEAR DEFINITION OF THE RESPONSIBILITY AND AUTHORITY OF THAT COMMITTEE." This was seconded by Senator Norfolk.

Senator Barbara Moss wanted to reinforce the importance of having college representation on this Committee. She had been charged by her college (Education) to make a motion which had been presented to the body a few months back because it did not have representation on LRPC.

Since there was no further discussion of Senator Kimmell's motion, the body voted its approval unanimously.

Senator Rich stated that Senator Gunn had made a legitimate point earlier. For many members, this was something new to contemplate. There was a lot to recommend the idea of one committee, and he intended to support it in some version. However, he was not certain that the body had thought enough about how the Committee should be constituted. Also, it would be useful for the Reference Committee to present something which the body could then debate, accept, or amend. He moved to amend the resolution by deleting the second and third paragraphs and by substituting for the words "to revise" in line one, the words "to propose a revision of." This was seconded by Senator Norfolk.

Senator Rich went on to explain that the body really did not have the power to revise. Members of the Reference Committee had heard this discussion and had some sense of what the sentiment of the body was. It could also make use of the paragraphs which he was proposing be deleted. His purpose in making the motion was not to say that the bulk of Senator Marquette's proposal be rejected. He only wanted the Reference Committee to have a chance to take a crack at it without the Senate having definitively expressed its views on the specifics.

Senator Marquette asked that as a friendly amendment the last sentence of paragraph three be retained with slight rewording so that it would now read, "The PROPOSED revision is to be completed by the May, 1996 meeting of the Senate and will take effect with election of members to the combined committee at the September meeting of the Senate." Senator Rich was willing to accept it but the seconder, Senator Norfolk, was not because given that it was now April 11, he had real problems with a May deadline. Senator Marquette now moved it as an "unfriendly" amendment, and it was seconded by Senator Green.

Senator Ranson wondered whether any member of the Reference Committee who was here could say that this was feasible. Senator Green responded that the Committee had a meeting scheduled for April 25 to consider Senator Moss' proposal to expand the membership of LRPC. Therefore, it was already set to discuss these sorts of issues. Although one could never be absolutely certain, he had confidence that the Committee could bring this to closure.

Senator Ruth Clinefelter wanted to remind the body that the work of this Committee would be a 12-month responsibility. LRPC had met throughout the summer last year, so this was something that should be kept in mind regarding committee structure.

Senator Gary Oller had a question regarding the end of the sentence, "...and will take effect with election of members to the combined committee at the September meeting of the Senate." As Senator Ranson had pointed out, all this body could do was make a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. Was it appropriate to also specify exactly when we wanted it to take effect?

Senator Marquette saw no difficulty in making the recommendation but did not think that Board members were going to have any problem with this.

Senator Brink asked that the Reference Committee try to have the proposal in Senator's hands by April 27 so that there would be a week to consider it before the May 4 Senate meeting. Senator Green said that the Committee would do its level best.

Since there was no further discussion, the body first voted its approval of Senator Marquette's amendment, and then voted approval of the proposal as amended by Senator Rich. The final version of the approved proposal read as follows: "Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate hereby directs the Reference Committee to propose a revision of the governance structure of the University to combine the Long Range Planning Committee and the Budget and Planning Coordination Committee into a single committee named the Planning and Budgeting Committee with a clear definition of responsibility and authority of that committee. The proposed revision is to be completed by the May, 1996 meeting of the Senate and will take effect with election of members to the combined committee at the September meeting of the Senate."

The Chairman asked whether there was other new business to come before the body.

Senator R. Gigliotti said that there was a strong sense among members of the body that there was a lot of important business to work on. Whatever we were going to accomplish, we all had to be committed to, and this did not mean just faculty. It was important to have full input from all relevant constituencies. Therefore, he moved that the Reference Committee give serious consideration to including representation on the new committee from all relevant constituencies. This was seconded by Senator Fowler.

Senator Padovan wanted to caution the body that in universities there was an income side and an expenditure side. The colleges represented the income side; everything else was an expenditure. In a budgetary crisis, it was difficult to control trends when every constituency had an equal voice in the budgetary process. This had led to the controversy in higher education over the last two decades. The academic side had lost its way in terms of empowerment, and gradually a lot of extra ancillary activities had been added to our budget from which we were going to have to wean ourselves.

When the Chairman interpreted Senator Padovan's comments as being against the motion he replied that he was not against it, but there had to be a cautionary note as additional advocacy groups were added within the University. They should not countermand the economic realities of the way the University was structured in income and expenses. The Reference Committee had to make sure that balance was maintained in the constituencies involved. Colleges, faculty and the academic side had to have the lion's share of voice within the committee.

Senator Norfolk commented that he considered the students and part-time faculty to be on the plus side in terms of money.

Senator Gigliotti agreed with Senator Padovan that the academic sector had to remain paramount. His intention had been that the relevant constituencies have the opportunity to present what they thought was important and subsequently accept whatever decisions were made.

Senator Keener thought that the word "relevant" was subjective, and spoke against its use in the motion but not against the motion itself.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted its approval of Senator Gigliotti's motion.

IV. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Keener asked that there be "good of the order," and this was seconded. The body voted its approval.

Senator Keener wanted to present to the body a recipe which the Associated Student Government had for rekindling the spirit in the UA community. During the past year, she had been working on a project which she believed would show the pride which we all could take in The University of Akron. For a limited time, the ASG would be selling University of Akron coverlets. The example which she had to show had a misspelling on it (EJ Thomas Preforming instead of Performing Arts Hall), but the first production of 75 would be available in two weeks. The colors were navy blue and off-white, and the depictions displayed different constituencies as well as the architectural history of the University. She had order forms and would be willing to stay after the meeting to take orders for the blankets. What ASG hoped to do with fund raisers like this was, within a five-year period to be an organization of students for the students by not taking any money from student general fees to operate. This was definitely a long-term project. The blankets would make a wonderful graduation present or something nice to display in one's home or office, and the ASG would really appreciate the body's support.

Senator Ranson asked whether there were plans to reissue a corrective to the misspelling, because if there were, he wanted to buy four immediately since the ones with the misspelling would increase in value.

Senator Keener replied that there would be a correction in the next production, and probably within the next couple of years the design would be changed to one with a "Zippy" or an "A."

V. ADJOURNMENT - Senator Ranson moved for adjournment which was seconded by many. The body voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 4:45 p.m.



APPENDIX A

Interoffice Correspondence

April 9, 1996

TO: H. Michael Cheung, Chair
Faculty Senate

FROM: Chand Midha, Vice Chair *Chand Midha*
Budget and Planning Coordination Committee

SUBJECT: BPCC Recommendation
(April 8, 1996, BPCC Meeting)

The following motion was discussed, voted upon, and passed at the April 8, 1996, meeting of BPCC and is presented here for Faculty Senate's review and subsequent recommendation.

MOTION

BPCC supports the LRPC proposal to increase tuition by 3% so long an additional 1% increase is added to cover the cost of the metro/loop bus system and/or to defray the costs of the campus facilities deferred maintenance. BPCC also supports the LRPC proposal to reduce the administrative unit budgets by \$3 million so long as 2/3 of this reduction is from continuing dollars and 1/3 is from one-time dollars to become continuing dollars the following fiscal year.

University of Akron
1996-1997 Administrative Expenditures Recision Details

	Vacant and ERIP Positions Savings	Base Budget Reduction	One-Time Money For Conversion	Total
Office of the President	\$180,000	\$87,500	\$340,000	\$607,500
VP for Student Affairs	134,000	198,000	140,000	472,000
VP for Business & Finance	948,000	640,000	520,000	2,108,000
VP for Research & Development	143,000	71,500	0	214,500
Total	\$1,405,000	\$997,000	\$1,000,000	\$3,402,000

Assumptions for Recision

- 1) Position freeze affects all positions where money is available as of 7/1/96.
- 2) Positions specifically exempted are ERIP positions in Admissions and for VP? of Information Services
- 3) Positions for the Chief Financial Officer and the Associate VP for Research are funded since money becomes available as of 7/1/97.
- 4) \$400,000 of vacant position and ERIP freeze is to be held as Critical Position Reserve for Presidential allocation.
- 5) Long term commitments in carryover accounts, such as mega-server payments and University advertising are not available for reduction.
- 6) All central accounts are untouched.
- 7) Quality enhancement funding will be held till Fall 14th day phase as additional reserve for excess enrollment decline.
- 8) After Fall 14th day phase the \$750,000 intended for general studies positions will be treated as Provost reserve for onetime allocation with advice of BPCC. This approach is possible since positions will actually not be on line until Fall 1997.
- 9) One-time money savings for 1996-1997 are to be converted by plan to permanent reductions for 1997-1998 budget cycle.
- 10) Any contribution to the \$400,000 Critical Position Reserve not used by a unit will be counted toward the permanent reduction conversion under item 9.
- 11) Additional planned reductions will be developed during 1996-1997 budget cycle.

University of Akron
Budget Comparison - Actual 1995-1996 to Proposed 1996-1997

	1995-1996			Proposed 1996-1997		
	Original Budget Allocation	Total Carryover	Total Resources	Original Budget Allocation	Total* Carryover	Total ** Resources
<u>Academic Units</u>						
Arts and Sciences College	\$22,027,348	\$1,297,980	\$23,325,328	\$22,027,348	\$1,297,980	\$23,325,328
College of Business Administration	6,403,892	75,719	6,479,611	6,403,892	75,719	6,479,611
Community and Technical College	5,973,183	632,627	6,605,810	5,973,183	632,627	6,605,810
College of Education	6,126,135	425,160	6,551,295	6,126,135	425,160	6,551,295
College of Engineering	7,104,128	1,037,986	8,142,114	7,104,128	1,037,986	8,142,114
College of Fine and Applied Arts	10,147,439	435,334	10,582,773	10,147,439	435,334	10,582,773
Graduate School	11,854,603	225,282	12,079,885	11,854,603	225,282	12,079,885
School of Law	3,671,851	217,072	3,888,923	3,671,851	217,072	3,888,923
College of Nursing	3,404,974	357,730	3,762,704	3,404,974	357,730	3,762,704
College of Polymer Science & Eng.	4,346,413	403,334	4,749,747	4,346,413	403,334	4,749,747
University Libraries	5,218,488	190,689	5,409,177	5,218,488	190,689	5,409,177
Senior Vice President and Provost	2,900,645	683,534	3,584,179	2,900,645	683,534	3,584,179
Total - Academic Units***	\$89,179,099	\$5,982,447	\$95,161,546	\$89,179,099	\$5,982,447	\$95,161,546
<u>Administrative Units</u>						
Office of the President	3,020,594	1,628,694	4,649,288	2,779,094	1,288,694	4,067,788
for Student Affairs	6,863,043	729,102	7,592,145	6,550,043	589,102	7,139,145
for Business & Finance	22,159,137	4,724,832	26,883,969	20,709,137	4,204,832	24,913,969
for Research & Development	2,468,883	1,337,708	3,806,591	2,274,383	1,337,708	3,612,091
Total Administrative Units	\$34,511,657	\$8,420,336	\$42,931,993	\$32,312,657	\$7,420,336	\$39,732,993
Central Accounts****	\$44,518,293	\$4,623,554	\$49,141,847	\$44,335,293	\$4,623,554	\$48,958,847
Salary Pool - 3% Tuition Increase						1,500,000
Salary Pool - Reallocation						1,500,000
Quality Enhancement Pool						1,500,000
Reserve - Critical Positions						405,000
University Total	\$168,209,049	\$19,026,337	\$187,235,386	\$165,827,049	\$18,026,337	\$188,758,386

Carryover amounts to be adjusted to reflect actual years activity.

Total amounts to be adjusted to reflect actual carryover amounts.

Academic Unit amounts to be adjusted by BPCC allocations from Central Accounts Technology Fund Reserve

* Central Accounts decrease reflects Fringe Benefit savings from Administrative Unit salary decrease.