

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

9-5-1996

Faculty Senate Chronicle September 5, 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>
Academic Calendar	1
Faculty Senate Membership	2
Faculty Senate Executive Committee Members	3
Faculty Senate Committees	3
Senate Members of Other Committees	8
Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of September 5, 1996	9
Appendices to Minutes of Special Faculty Senate Meeting of September 5, 1996	22
A. Report of <i>Long Range Planning Committee</i>	22
B. Proposal to form University Curriculum Committee	34

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

FALL SEMESTER**1996-97****PRELIMINARY 1997-98**

Day and Evening
Classes Begin
Labor Day*
(Day and Evening)
Veteran's Day
(Classes Held, Staff
Holiday)
Thanksgiving Break **
Classes Resume
Final Instructional Day
Final Examination Period
Commencement
Spring Intersession

Mon., August 26
Mon., September 2
Mon., November 11
Thurs.-Sat., November 28-30
Mon., December 2
Sat., December 7
Mon.-Sat., December 9-14
Sat., December 14
Thurs.-Sat., January 2-11

Mon., August 25
Mon., September 1
Tues., November 11
Thurs.-Sat., November 27-29
Mon., December 1
Sat., December 6
Mon.-Sat., December 8-13
Sat., December 13
Fri.-Sat., January 2-10

SPRING SEMESTER

Day and Evening
Classes Begin
Martin Luther King Day*
President's Day*
Spring Break
May Day***
Final Instructional Day
Final Examination Period
Commencement
Commencement/Law School
Summer Intersession

Mon., January 13
Mon., January 20
Tues., February 18
Mon.-Sat., March 17-22
Fri., May 2
Sat., May 3
Mon.-Sat., May 5-10
Sat., May 10
Sun., May 18
Mon.-Fri., May 12-June 8

Mon., January 12
Mon., January 19
Tues., February 17
Mon.-Sat., March 16-21
Fri., May 1
Sat., May 2
Mon.-Sat., 4-9
Sat., May 9
Sun., May 17
Mon.-Fri., May 11-16

SUMMER SESSION 1

First 5 and 8 Week
Sessions Begin
Independence Day *
First 5-Week Session
Ends

Mon., June 9
Fri., July 4
Sat., July 12

Mon., June 8
Fri., July 3
Sat., July 11

SUMMER SESSION 11

Second 5-Week
Sessions Begin
8-Week Session Ends
Second 5-Week
Session Ends
Commencement

Mon., July 14
Sat., August 2
Sat., August 16
Sat., August 16

Mon., July 13
Sat., August 1
Sat., August 15
Sat., August 15

FALL SEMESTER

Day & Evening Classes

Mon. August 25

Mon., August 31

* Classes canceled

** Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 7 a.m.

*** Classes canceled from noon to 5 p.m.

acadcal..98

FACULTY SENATE MEMBERSHIP

(Update: 9/25/96)

College of Arts & Sciences (17) David Buchthal, 97 Barbara Clements, 97 Daniel Ely, 97 John Green, 97 F. Griffin, 98 D. Malhotra, 98 J. Marquette, 99 W. McGucken, 98 (2) TBA	Chand Midha, 98 T. Norfolk, 97 Gary Oller, 97 W. Pelz, 99 Diana Reep, 99, J. Stinner, 98 Mark Tausig, 99 (E. Erickson) 99 J. Buchanan 99	Community & Technical College (6) Rebecca Gibson, 99 Carol Gigliotti, 97 David Hoover, 98 Michael Jalbert, 98 Paul John, 98 James W. Taggart, 98	College of Education (5) James Hardy, 99 Edward Lasher, 98 Carole Newman, 97 (2) TBA
College of Engineering (5) Celal Batur, 99 Michael Cheung, 99 Jerry Drummond, 98 Daniel Sheffer, 97 (1) TBA	College of Fine and Applied Arts (9) John Bee, 99 A. Borowiec, 99 Kathleen Davis, 97 Christina DePaul, 98 Virginia Gunn, 99 B. Heinzerling, 99 Jean Hines, 98 Kenneth Siloac, 97 David Witt, 97	College of Business Administration (5) John Hebert, 98 Dennis Kimmell, 98 Jay Patankar, 99 George Prough, 97 David Redle, 99	University Libraries (3) Steve Aby, 99 Ruth Clinefelter, 97 J. Fitzgerald, 99
College of Nursing (4) Cheryl Buchanan, 99 Kris Gill, 99 Karen Reed, 99 K. Ross-Alaolmolki, 98	Polymer Science/Engineering (2) John Frederick, 98 A. Isayev, 99	Wayne College (2) Dan Deckler, 99 Rick Maringer, 99	Contract Professionals (2) Barbara Bucey, 97 Connie Murray, 99
Part-Time Faculty (2) Paul Fowler, 97 Peggy Richards, 98	Students (3) Derwin Hammonds, 97 Michele Scott, 97 Peter McLinden, 97 (1) TBA	School of Law (2) William Rich, 97 Ann Woodley, 99	SEAC (2) (2) TBA Dolly Markovitch Holly Mothes, 99

Note: Term expires in year listed.

Members - 69

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
1996-97

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. H. Michael Cheung, Chair
Dr. Carol Gigliotti, Vice Chair
Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary
Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter
Dr. Elizabeth Erickson
Dr. Timothy Norfolk
Mrs. Peggy Richards

SENATE COMMITTEES

* designates Senator
Boldface designates Chair
Term expires in year listed.

ACADEMIC POLICIES, CURRICULUM AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE

Dan Buie, 97, (P)
Barbara Clements, 97* (P)
Ruth Clinefelter, 97* (C)
Jose DeAbreu-Garcia, 97 (C)
Elton Glaser, 97 (C)
Derwin Hammonds, 97*
Michael Jalbert, 97* (C)
Dennis Kimmell, 97* (P)
William Lewis, 97 (P)
Carole Newman, 97* (C)
Timothy Norfolk, 97* (C)
Gary Oller, 97* (P)
Rita Saslaw, 97 (C)
Kenneth Siloac, 97* (P)
Nancy Stokes, 97 (P)
John Zarski, 97 (C)

Edward Lasher, 98* (C)
Chand Midha, 98* (P)
Peggy Richards, 98* (P)
K. Ross-Alaolmolki, 98* (C)
John Bee, 99* (P)
Paul Daum, 99 (C)
Daniel Decker 99* (C)
Carol Gigliotti, 99* (P)
David Redle, 99* (P)
Diana Reep, 99* (C)

Ex officio member, Dr. Randall
D. Moore, Interim Senior VP
and Provost

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE

Dr. Kenneth Aupperle, 97
 Dr. Steven Chuang, 97
 Dr. James Emore, 97
 Dr. Richard Gigliotti, 97
 Mr. Paul John, 98*
 Dr. James Hardy, 99*
 Ms. Ann Woodley, 99*
 A & S (TBA), 99*
 Student (TBA), 99*

Ex officio members, Mr. David
 Jamison, NCAA Faculty
 Representative

Mr. Michael Bobinski, Athletic
 Director, or designee

Dr. James Buchanan
Peter McLinden
*97**

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES COMMITTEE

Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, 97*
 Mrs. Phyllis O'Connor, 97
 Dr. Nicholas Ranson, 97
 Dr. Dorothy Dobrindt, 98
 Dr. Georgia Peeples, 98
 Mr. William Taggart, 98*
 Mr. Rick Wiggins, 98
 Ms. Christina DePaul, 99*
 Dr. Kristine Gill, 99*
 Mrs. B. Heinzerling, 99*
 Dr. Jay Patankar, 99*
 Education (TBA)

Ex officio members, Delmus
 Williams, dean of University
 Libraries, or designee

Ex officio, non-voting member,
 Mrs. Debra Keller, Director,
 Network Services

Mr. Paul Richert, Law Librarian

REFERENCE COMMITTEE

Ms. Barbara Bucey, 97*
 Mrs. Cheryl Buchanan, 97*
 Dr. John Green, 97*
 Dr. David Hoover, 98*

Mr. Daniel Mack, 98
 Mr. William Rich, 98*
 Mr. Joseph Larose, 99

PLANNING

Annex 2

CAMPUS FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Dr. David Buchthal, 97*
 Dr. Dale Coons, 97
 Mrs. Kathleen M. Davis, 97*
 Mr. Paul Fowler, 97*
 Dr. Gwendolyn Jones, 97
 Dr. Dianne Wright, 97
 Dr. Jerry Drummond, 98*
 Dr. Kenneth Dunning, 98
 Dr. John Hebert, 98*

Mr. John Kline, 98
 Dr. Harvey Sterns, 98
 Dr. Virginia Gunn, 99*
 Dr. Jean Hines, 99*
 Dr. A. Isayev, 99*
 Mr. R. Maringer, 99*
 Dr. G. Robinson, 99*
Mrs. Connie Murray
 Ex officio member, Mr. Roger
 Ryan, designee of VP for Admin.
 Support Services

STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Dr. Daniel L. Ely, 97*
 Mr. Tucker Jolly, 97
 Mr. Don Laconi, 97
 Dr. George Prough, 97*
 Ms. Michele Scott, 97*
 Mrs. Barb Bucey, 98*
 Ms. Lynne Pachnowski, 98

Ms. Tana Alexander, 99
 Mrs. Rebecca Gibson, 99*
 Education (TBA), 99*
 SEAC (TBA), 99*
Holly Knothes
 Ex officio members, Dr. Caryl
 Smith, Assoc. VP for Student
 Affairs, or designee, and Mr.
 Doug McNutt, Director of
 Student Financial Aid

COMPUTING & COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGIES COMMITTEE

Dr. J. Wayne Baker, 97
 Dr. Jesse Marquette, 97*
 Dr. David Witt, 97*
 Dr. H.M. Cheung, 98*
 Dr. John Frederick, 98*
 Dr. Joseph Padovan, 98
 Dr. Andrew Rancer, 98
 Mr. William Rich, 98*
 Mr. Ray Sibberson, 98
 Ms. Onadell Bly, 99

Dr. Frank Griffin, 99*
 Mrs. F. Kinsinger, 99
 Dr. Wolfgang Pelz, 99*
 SEAC (TBA), 99*

Interim? *Dolli Markovich*

Ex officio member, Dr. *Richard Seibert?*
 Thomas, Associate VP of
 Information Services, or
 designee

ASK GHO

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE


Dr. Roger Bain, 97
 Mr. Earl Ertman, 97
 Dr. Lazarus Macior, 97
 Dr. William McGucken, 97*
 Dr. Isadore Newman, 97
 Dr. Daniel Sheffer, 97*
 Dr. J. Clayton Fant, 98
 Dr. Victoria Schirm, 98
 Dr. Phillip Schmidt, 98
 Mr. Michael Williams, 98
 Dr. Stephen Aby, 99*
 Dr. Celal Batur, 99*
 Mr. Andrew Borowiec, 99*
 Miss J. Fitzgerald, 99*

Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman, 99
 Dr. D. Malhotra, 99*
 Dr. Karen Reed, 99*
 Dr. Jerry Stinner, 99*
 Dr. Mark Tausig, 99*

Ex officio member, Dr. C.S.
 Chen, VP, Research &
 University Development, or
 designee

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE

Dr. Victoria Schirm, 97
Dr. Thein Kyu, 97
Dr. F. Bruce Simmons, 97
Dr. Barbara Clements, 98*
Dr. Yueh Jaw-Lin, 98
Ms. Carol A. Olson, 98
Mrs. Nancy Stokes, 98

Dr. Robert Dubick, 99  2
Ms. Monica Harrison, 99
Mr. Michael Jalbert, 99*
Dr. Lucille Terry, 99

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE

Dr. Diana Chlebek, 97
Dr. Gary Hamed, 97
Dr. James Strong, 97
Dr. Richard Einsporn, 98
Mr. J. William Taggart, 98*
Mr. Thomas Andes, 98

Dr. Paul Daum, 99
Dr. Jerry Drummond, 99*
Mr. W.S. Jordan, III, 99
Dr. Suzanne Mac Donald, 99
(TBA), 99
(TBA), 99* *Jim Cosgarca 97*

SENATE MEMBERS OF OTHER COMMITTEES

**FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR,
OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS
1996-97**

Professor William D. Rich,* School of Law
Mr. Paul R. John,* Alternate Representative

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE

Dr. Jesse Marquette, 97*	Arts & Sciences
Dr. Carol Gigliotti, 97*	C & T
Dr. Edward Lasher, 97*	Education
Dr. H. Michael Cheung, 97*	Engineering
Dr. John Bee, 97*	Fine & Applied Arts
Dr. Dennis Kimmell, 97*	Business
Mrs. Ruth Clinefelter, 97*	Library
Dr. Kris Gill, 97*	Nursing
Dr. Avraam Isayev, 97*	Polymer Science/Engr.
Mr. Richard Maringer, 97*	Wayne
Mrs. Barbara Bucey, 97*	Contract Professionals
Mrs. Peggy Richards, 97*	Part-time Faculty
Mr. William Rich, 97*	Law
(TBA), 97* Peter McLinden,	Students
(TBA), 97* Holly Mothes	SEAC

~~OK 6/10~~

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON FACULTY SENATE
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1996**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, September 5, 1996, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-five of the sixty-nine members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators DePaul, Erickson, Newman, Reep, Ross-Alaolmolki and Scott were absent with notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * ELECTED A NEW VICE CHAIR, AN ALTERNATE TO THE REPRESENTATIVE TO FACCOBOR, AND SENATORIAL MEMBERSHIP ON THE NEW PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE**
- * APPROVED A SPACE ALLOCATION IN THE POLSKY BUILDING RECOMMENDED BY CFPC**
- * DEFERRED DISCUSSION OF A PROPOSAL TO CREATE A UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE UNTIL THE OCTOBER MEETING**

I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA - The Chairman stated that Senator John Hebert had a matter which he wished to add to the agenda, and this was added under new business. Since there were no additional modifications, the amended agenda was approved by the body.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 1996 - Secretary Gary H. Oller stated that he had one correction on page 5, third paragraph down beginning with "Senator Fowler" where it read "...sister institutions were doing across the Mid-Atlantic Conference..." That should read "Mid-American Conference." Since there were no other corrections, Senator Peggy Richards moved approval of the corrected minutes, and this was seconded by Senator Ruth Clinefelter. The Senate voted its approval.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman stated that since President Marion Ruebel had an engagement at 3:30 and needed to leave early, in deference to his schedule, his remarks would come next. President Ruebel then made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the revision of the agenda so I can make my 3:30 meeting. First, let me welcome all of you back to the campus for the fall semester; I truly look forward to working with the Faculty Senate this year. I'm going to speak from some prepared remarks because I have more remarks today than I usually will have each month, so please bear with me because this is not my favorite way to make a presentation; however, I'll struggle through it. I want to talk about a number of issues that I think have to be addressed - some things that have taken place and some things that have to be dealt with in this upcoming year. First, the administrative reorganization we have gone through - this was approved by the Board of Trustees over the summer. It basically followed the Senate plan that was submitted as soon as I came back to campus, and I did some fine tuning but a very small amount. I think that paramount in the reorganization is the fact that the chief purpose was that we ensure that the classroom and the academic needs of the campus come first, and without a doubt, this did come forth. I think also that yesterday at the Convocation as I read the responsibilities of the Provost, it dawned on me, Dr. Moore, that that probably is not a real good job, that you're probably going to be pretty busy. However, I truly feel that being the Chief Operating Officer of the institution as the reorganization has indicated does truly put the Provost and academics at the focal point of the institution, so I'm pleased that we did get this particular reorganization through.

Next, I want to speak to you about the Ph.D. in History and the Ph.D. in two other programs. I met with some members of the History Department, and this summer I went to Columbus to meet with the Board of Regents staff with the Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, the Graduate Dean and the Interim Head of the Department, and presented what I felt we should work out with Kent State on this Ph.D. program. We got the program back, it's back in place at The University of Akron. When I say we got it back, I think we collectively got it back; there's some work I specifically want to do with Dr. Moore in conjunction with the History Department, but the Regents had no feeling one way or the other that we take the program back. It will be without subvention to begin with; however, we can earn ourselves back into the position where we do earn subvention, but we're not talking about that many students. Critical in this proposal though, and I think a place where the University can truly come to the forefront here is the fact that the History Department had done some work with Kent State to try to come up with the collaborative model that was never recognized as far as the State was concerned. And the example I used with them was taking into account that our History Dept. has a lot of talent and I'm sure the History Dept. at Kent State has a lot of talent. We're 12 miles apart - we can take these departments of 20 people in each department, put them together and you have a department of 40 people where you really have some strength. Basically, it means this: If a Ph.D. student at Kent State wants to take a course at The University of Akron, he or she can do that without any penalty. It's no new degree program; the degrees are simply going to be interwoven. This is what the Board of Regents has been talking about for ten years, and I feel this is an opportunity that we can truly do this and they're in agreement with us.

The Polsky parking deck: I was really mad the Friday before school started, and I'm not assigning responsibility to anyone, but this was known on the campus last February and nothing was done about it. I didn't find out about it until the Friday before school started. The parking deck will be open next Monday. I'm sorry for the inconvenience; that's all I can say. I wish it wouldn't have happened.

The Faculty Manual: The Board has now approved the long-awaited revisions to the Faculty Manual. The rule changes have been filed in Columbus; you will get your hard copy of the Faculty Manual. Once again, there's no excuse for this. Changes that go in the Faculty Manual should go to the Board of Trustees every month; the rules should be filed in Columbus every month. They will be from now on. You will have your Faculty Manual before too long.

Enrollment: The rate of decline has been blunted. I'm very happy about this, because when I came back in April I was truly, truly concerned about this; I honestly was. Our enrollment has declined since 1990. Once on our main campus the enrollment was 30,000. Last year it was down to 24,000 and the outlook looked pretty bleak. However, our freshman class this year shows a 5% increase. I have a tremendous amount of respect for Greg Stewart, Russ Sibert and Paul Herold for getting the word out in the way that we did. Now I don't know whether we'll be able to maintain, to keep all the freshmen we've recruited, but at least I think we have to feel good that we're starting this year with a larger freshman class than the start of last year. And I would hope that from my office and from Dr. Moore's office and Greg Stewart's office and so on, and with the help of the faculty as I talked to you last April at the first meeting, that we could do a better job of recruiting students than what we've done in the past. And for those of you who were at the Convocation yesterday or were not at the Convocation, I announced that this year and we're going to implement this, I want to have as many full academic rides as we have full athletic rides. Now that came from a former coach, but I still believe in that - that we have to go out and get the students we know are going to stay here. So we're going to put forth some effort in this area.

Some people will take this as a victory - I don't, but we budgeted at a 4.1% increase. We came in at a 3.2% increase, and everyone congratulated themselves. I won't feel good until the decrease is gone and the increase shows +. So it's like the two statisticians that went out target shooting - one hit on the left and one hit on the right of the target, and they congratulated each other. The planning process - I look forward to working with the new single planning committee as recommended by the Faculty Senate. Now this is going to be a rather difficult assignment for this coming year because this committee will be the one in charge of the budgeting process. As I look back in the records, we're going to be plowing some new ground now when we talk about the budgeting process, so department chairs are going to have to be tuned in to planning and budgeting. Deans are going to have to be tuned in to planning and budgeting and then on to the committee and then on to the Board. Now along with this is going to be some redistribution of funds, because we have some units in which enrollment has gone down. The amount of money has stayed the same; thus, we need redistribution. We also would need redistribution if the enrollment had gone up and the funds had remained the same, so this will be new. It's going to be very important for us this year because we're truly integrating planning and budgeting, and as I mentioned to the committee yesterday, I'm very concerned about the fact that all of us have to understand how we do this. It's not an automatic process and there has to be thought that goes into it, so I anticipate that we can work very hard on this.

The North Central - the group that came to visit us last year - all of you know, recently endorsed the last visiting team's recommendation that the University continue to be fully accredited. We are back on our regular tenure comprehensive review. They did delay our review for one year at our request, so this review will be scheduled for the 1997-98 school year. I've asked Dr. Mark Auburn to chair this, to hub this up, and I have him reporting to the Provost's office each week and also to my office each week, because I want to know what's going on with this evaluation. Because

as I stressed to you last year, the idea of accreditation in higher education is very, very serious business and I'm not too sure that all the people outside the academy truly understand this. But we're going to take this very seriously and do a good job with it.

Internal searches: Whenever possible, I intend because of the reorganization through assignments and promotions, to use internal searches because it's the most efficient way to go. Now if we don't have the talent internally, then we'll search regionally and if we don't have the talent regionally, then we'll search nationally. But what I'm looking for here is a way we can downsize and still get good people into the positions. I will not downsize and put second-rate people in the positions. I know I've been criticized for internal searches because everyone thinks they're wired and so on, and that's OK, that's all right. But if I feel that I have to put someone into a position that I have to rely on who's going to give me bad information, I'll make it world-wide if I have to, not just internally. But if we see, and please take me on my word on this, if we don't get the right people internally and I've already expanded some of the searches to be regionally and I already have one search going nationally, if we don't have the talent here to do it and I don't say this derogatorily toward the faculty, but we're going to continue to search until we get the right people in the right positions.

Vice President & General Counsel: The office of General Counsel was elevated to the level of Vice President as part of the reorganization plan. While the current nature, structure and extent of delivery of legal services to Ohio's institutions of higher education vary widely from institution to institution, The University of Akron has continued to serve as a model for others moving in this direction. I support this position being raised to that of a Vice President; I also supported the salary for this position as approved by the Board. This position is in line with other administrators and with similar positions at this University. I've provided the Chair of the Senate with information and he can distribute this to you as he sees fit, but I will be happy to answer any questions that any of you have about this position.

The Vice President for Business and Finance search which is a national search, has been narrowed down to three candidates; we've had three candidates on campus. The Provost has gone to visit one campus to check on one individual; this individual is coming back to see me next week for his second visit, and if everything goes right, this will probably be the individual who's offered the position. The reports we have on the person are very, very positive, and when you hire a person to take charge of a \$250 million budget, it's not a grab-bag approach. You've got to make sure you're getting an individual there that's over and beyond, so this is what we're looking for.

Central-Hower: I'm very excited about the possibilities of what we can do with Central-Hower High School. Now we don't want to buy the building. Five years ago that was mentioned, and I practically got arrows in my back or chest or some place. But this is what I would see us doing with Central-Hower, and this is not just confined to the College of Education. I talked to the Board of Regents, I talked to the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, I talked to the Superintendent of the Akron City Schools, I talked to the Mayor and I even talked to the Beacon Journal before we made any moves on this, not to get the Beacon's approval, but to find out if this would be a sound move for the city of Akron and The University of Akron. And I can foresee this as being a lab school and not just for the College of Education; for instance, there might be a professor in the English Dept. who wants to go and teach a 10th grade English class, and I think this would be a good experience for a professor in English from time to time to do this. I think it

would be a good experience for the youngsters who go to school at Central-Hower that if we develop their chemistry program to be real good, that if a student who went to Garfield High School wanted to go to Central-Hower just to take the chemistry class, he or she could, and we could permit that, we could do that. So we could exchange students, we could exchange faculty, both from the high school and the University, and we could do it with no cost to either one of the entities. And I think this would be good for the community. And I'm not trying to show off at this point in my career, I don't need the publicity, but we would be the first school in the United States that would be doing anything like this. The thing that prompted me to do this was the time I was visiting with an executive from Goodrich and I asked him, of the people you hire regardless of what University they come from, how long does it take for you to mesh this person in completely with your company so they're 100% effective? And he said three years, and I couldn't believe it. So somewhere along the line we've got to get theory and practicality closer together. We've got an ideal chance to do it with Central-Hower being on our campus. I just think it would be a tremendous experience and I'm looking forward to it.

We're in the process of working out a program with the Medina County Schools, 10 high schools in Medina. This will involve all departments on campus, but what we want to do is get 2-way communication between these 10 high schools and all of the departments on campus so we have interactive video from our campus out to the 10 high schools in Medina County. We've had one meeting with the Medina Superintendent of Schools from Wadsworth, the Service Director from the city of Medina, two people from Ohio Edison and two other people from the city of Wadsworth who were interested in this project, and I truly think this will be up and running by the start of the second semester. So I'm excited about this, because we can have kids that sign up for the Senate Bill 1040, the Postsecondary Option Program, stay right in their classrooms, get college credit, take it from The University of Akron. We do have a leg up, because if students graduate from high school and already have 15 credits from The University of Akron, the chances of them coming to The University of Akron are pretty good. Let me say this in closing: I came back in April, I knew we had a tremendous challenge. We still have a tremendous challenge, but I honestly feel this way - that we're going in the right direction. The reason we're going in the right direction is because of you folks, the people who teach at the University. As long as the administration and the Faculty Senate can continue to communicate, and if we're not on the same page we'll get on the same page, because logical people can sit down and disagree and come to a mutual understanding that we never forget why we're here. So I'm still happy to be back on the campus and I pledge to you my 100% effort. I'll answer any questions if they're easy ones."

Senator John Green hated to bring up an unpleasant topic after so much good news, but the Senate had raised a number of questions about hiring practices that had not entirely been resolved last year. He was wondering whether President Ruebel's administration had had an opportunity to deal with some of those issues in terms of reforming procedures so these things would not happen again.

President Ruebel answered that he wished he could say everything that he knew about it now. There were things that happened last year that were wrong. They had not yet been righted, but the members of the Senate knew him well enough to know that they would be righted. Whether or not we would come up with the right answer he did not know, but we were going to come up with an answer. There was a list of things from the Executive Committee that had to be done, and they

were going to be done. The last of these was in process today, so that there would be answers at the next Senate meeting. Until these mistakes were corrected, we were not going to be right as an institution.

Senator Oller asked whether the President had the final version of the North Central Association's report after their second visit, and, if so, would this body have a chance to see it and the NCA's recommendations.

President Ruebel said there would be no problem with the Senate having a copy. When he had gone to the exit interview, the only thing which he had been interested in was the status of our accreditation. When they gave him that, he quit listening.

Senator Tim Norfolk, in relation to the President's use of the word "downsizing," wondered what he envisioned downsizing to be. Over the past ten years, we had been downsizing the overall faculty but upsizing on the administrative support side. Was he talking about reversing that?

President Ruebel replied that this was not completely true. If a college had lost 25% of its enrollment, it should have lost 25% of its faculty, and that was not happening.

Senator Norfolk agreed but pointed out that it had not grown. The institution had not grown when we had had a phenomenal growth in enrollment.

President Ruebel went on to say that this was one of the advantages of decentralizing the budget as long as one made reallocations. If you decentralized the budget without making reallocations, you did not have anything. The advantage of decentralizing was that you could downsize in accordance with what that institution showed. This had to be done carefully because there was the possibility of new programs on the horizon and the knowledge that within two years the enrollment would be going back up. It would be foolish to let experienced people go who you were going to need in two years to run those new programs. He concluded by noting that he really had not answered Senator Norfolk's question and was not really sure that he could for now. The simple solution to a complex problem was a little downsizing in accordance with what the needs of a particular unit were.

Senator William Rich wondered whether the President's remarks concerning local and regional searches were intended to apply to academic hiring in general or to administrative hiring, in particular administrative searches. If to academic hiring, was he reversing the general policy of doing national searches for those positions?

President Ruebel said that he had been thinking more of searches that were coming directly from his office and were administrative. It would be going against the grain of the EEO if we limited academic searches to just internal candidates. He agreed with Senator Rich that you would not want to as a rule limit them to local or regional searches.

Senator Hebert asked whether the President had any more information on a possible fourth ERIP window. President Ruebel answered that this would be going to the Board at its next meeting. He had asked Human Resources to run a survey as to how many people who had signed up for the third window would delay their retirement if the fourth window were an option. They had received

some responses including some from people who were inferring that we were infringing on their rights by asking them what their plans for the future were. Until Human Resources mentioned this to him, this had never entered his mind. He wanted a fourth window because it looked to him as though we were going to lose too many good people. The University could not stand that kind of brain drain at once.

The Chairman now returned to the printed agenda and his own remarks. The body had heard from the President that the Faculty Manual had finally been approved by the Board and filed in Columbus, so we really had one. He did not know how long it would take to turn the marked-up version into hard copy so that it could be distributed, but he understood that this was being discussed in Buchtel Hall. Hopefully, it would not be too long before faculty would have access to it. He also wanted to report on two items which pertained to this body that had been approved at the last Board meeting. One was the legislation which we had passed giving SEAC two Senate representatives, and the other was the elimination of the Shared Governance Council. He then introduced the newly elected members of the Senate. (For a list of all Senators, see page 2.)

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - There were none.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - see under III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Interim Provost Randy Moore said that he had four things which his office had been working on over the summer to tell the body about. The first involved technology. The University was spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to increase our use of technology so as to become more productive in the areas of teaching, research, and service as well as to provide access for students and staff. Strangely enough, although this was a stated goal, there were penalties for trying to accomplish it; specifically, charge-backs. In addition to \$15-a-gallon Kool Ade and \$1-a-piece cookies, there was a charge-back which, for example, colleges and departments received to have a line come into an office, \$10 a month for life. In a computer lab, every machine would cost \$10 per month for life. If you wired a classroom so that you could access the World Wide Web, you paid \$10 a month forever. If you were committed enough to accomplishing this goal, you would soon go broke. Charge-backs relating to access for the technology had now been abolished in order to take away the penalties involved. Also, with the help of the near-defunct BPCC, his office had distributed money so that colleges could buy hardware and software to link faculty to the network. Each college had already received \$500 per regular full-time faculty member this year. This would continue for at least the next five years. In effect, what this did was increase the operating budget for every college so that the money was there to buy the technology which needed to be employed.

Provost Moore went on to say that his office had sponsored workshops on the use of this technology at the Library. There had been triple the expected attendance at each one of these workshops. The workshops were carried out at the "media arcade" which was being set up and which had already been described in a letter from the Library. The workshops would be designed to

present the information on how to accomplish the sorts of things one might want to do in class with the technology at hand.

Another thing which was being addressed by Provost Moore's office was the problem of filthy classrooms. Several months ago this had been discussed at a meeting of the Council of Deans. They put in a proposal and with the assistance of a lot of people, most notably Vice President Beyer, a plan was made to spend \$120,000 to renovate twelve classrooms over Christmas. One reason that the classrooms looked so bad and shabby was that the money which we used to have in the budget for renovating and painting in classrooms was taken several years ago and used somewhere else. It had continued to be used somewhere else. Now surprisingly, we had classrooms which were almost embarrassing - holes in walls, chairs that collapsed when students sat in them, thus leading to lawsuits, etc. We were also going to see cleaner classrooms.

Provost Moore also stated that the Council of Deans was in the process of developing a proposal to put a bigger emphasis on providing more resources and rewards for teaching. Right now the University spent about \$200,000 - 210,000 per year on faculty research grants. In his opinion, this was not enough. However, the ER&D Center had a budget of \$6,000. If you were having difficulty with instruction and wanted to have your class videotaped, if you wanted to learn more about the use of portfolios, if you had any desire to improve your abilities as an instructor, there really was no place on campus to do these things. This was going to be implemented step-wise under the direction of the faculty. What faculty wanted would be provided, and not what some expert might think should be available.

Lastly, as the President had already mentioned, we were going to start recruiting better students by trying to have as many full academic scholarships as there were full athletic scholarships. There was quite a difference right now between those two numbers. He and the President had their work cut out for them in terms of fund raising, but it was so much easier to teach better students. It made our jobs simpler in theory, unless they were smarter than we were - a nice problem to have. These were the things which his office was concentrating on. They were about a week and a half away from completing the reorganization in his office to absorb these functions. The President had said that the Provost's position was not a good job - that was pretty accurate. He could think of some euphemisms, but the tape player was probably on. This was what his office was doing. He offered to answer questions.

Senator Norfolk asked in regard to the hardware/software money whether the Provost would be encouraging the deans not to penalize departments or units which had managed to come up with their own funds to already do this.

The Provost replied that he would be. If one department had already gone out and raised money or taken money from its operating budget to hook everybody up, it should not be penalized for having done that. The money had gone to the deans' offices though; it had not gone to departments. It would be allocated by the deans.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Executive Committee had met over the summer to make assignments to the Senate's standing committees and to set the agenda for today's meeting. It had also met twice with President Ruebel and Vice President Mallo to discuss

issues raised by the Faculty Senate resolutions to the Board of Trustees last winter and possible solutions to them. A final report would be made to the Senate on this in the near future.

LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Jesse Marquette, Vice Chair, distributed a handout (Appendix A) which he said contained the final report of this committee. It basically outlined the assumptions that we would be working with next year in terms of the planning process which would become the basis of the plan that the Senate would act on in the spring after all the colleges and so on were finished with it. As President Ruebel had already remarked, it would be a little bit different than what you had been used to in the past. The timetable in the gross sense was that department and college level planning would occur from October to December; academic planning by the Provost, Council of Deans and the Administrative Vice President of Planning would occur in January or February, coordinating the various finances. The consideration of the academic and administrative plans by the new Planning and Budgeting Committee would occur in March and April, and the preparation of the University plan and budget by the President and Trustees would occur between April and June. There was a calendar and process contained in Table 1, which everyone would have a long opportunity to peruse because it was the one we all would be using over the coming year. The core of what had been done over the last year in straightening out the planning process was that there would be a planning process, a budgeting process, and a reporting process that would essentially occur at the same time. The intention was that your annual report describing what you did with the money you got last time would now be used to justify the plan that you were filing now. When you got done writing your plan, you would be submitting not only a plan but a budget request at the same time. So we were no longer going to be planning at one time, budgeting at a different time without reference to the plan, and then writing an annual report a while later.

Senator Marquette said that the last page of the handout contained some of the instructions that were going to be needed to do the reports including a June-to-June time frame, etc. When the packets actually would go out to the departments and colleges, each unit would have the forms that were listed at the bottom of page 9 as well as a form that had their budgets for the last three years so that there would be comparative information to begin the process.

This was the process we would be using for the year. We had done a pretty good job last year under fairly difficult circumstances. It was the charge that this committee was passing on to the new committee that it should keep the pressure up in terms of trying to move more money out of the administrative side into the academic side. Exactly how that was going to be done would require some thought this semester by the committee to evaluate the impact of the \$3 million which we took last year. We can't just go around and grab money. There were a few pots we had gotten our fingers in last year; they were smaller this year, so careful thought would have to be given on how to do that. This committee had operated with that charge from the Senate - that we wanted to try to lower the amount of administrative overhead. The LRPC had worked hard to do that, and he thought that the new committee would work hard on this as well.

VI. ELECTIONS - Before beginning the elections, the Chairman requested that when Senate committees met and elected new chairs for the year, the new chairs should inform the Senate office of their positions. The first election was to elect someone to serve the second year of former

Senator David Brink's term as Faculty Senate Vice-Chair, and the Chairman opened the floor for nominations.

Senator William Taggart nominated Senator Carol Gigliotti, and this was seconded. Senator Gigliotti said that she would accept on the assumption that the Chairman's health was in good shape. He replied that it had been this morning.

Since there were no other nominations, Senator Marquette moved that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast for Senator Gigliotti. This was seconded by Senator Dave Buchthal. The Senate then voted its approval, and Senator Gigliotti was elected to the position of Vice-Chair of the Faculty Senate.

The next election was for membership on the new Planning and Budgeting Committee. The legislation that the Senate had approved last June called for one representative elected from each of the logical constituencies of the Faculty Senate. The Chairman suggested that the body take ten minutes for those constituencies to caucus and provide the Senate with a name for membership.

When the Senate came to order after the caucusing, the following results were reported: Jesse Marquette (Arts and Sciences), Carol Gigliotti (Community and Technology), Ed Lasher (Education), Mike Cheung (Engineering), John Bee (Fine and Applied Arts), Dennis Kimmell (Business), Ruth Clinefelter (Library), Kris Gill (Nursing), Avraam Isayev (Polymer Science), Rick Maringer (Wayne), Barbara Bucey (Contract Professionals), Peggy Richards (Part-time Faculty), William Rich (Law).

The Chairman noted that there was no one from the students at the meeting today, but they would have representation on this committee, as would SEAC after they chose their two Senators. This was all that was required because the election had taken place within the caucuses. He congratulated the winners and noted that he thought he heard someone mutter that it looked like a roundup of the usual suspects.

The last election which was necessary was for an alternate for the Representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. Senator Rich was currently serving as the representative and was in excellent health. The nominee did not have to be a Senator, although there would be advantages if it were.

Senator Paul John volunteered his own name in nomination and this was seconded. Senator Marquette then moved to close nominations and cast a unanimous ballot, and this was seconded by Senator Green. The body then voted its approval and Senator John was elected the alternate to FACCOBOR.

VII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - The Chairman stated that there was one item of unfinished business. This was a matter of space allocations in Polsky's which had been recommended by CFPC. The Senate had deferred a decision on this matter until this meeting. He asked Senator Jerry Drummond, the Chair of CFPC, to refresh the members' memories on the recommendation.

Senator Drummond reminded the body that the original motion from the committee was as follows: "Space for Criminal Justice Technology in Polsky Building - This program has a substantial need for space to hold existing classes and training seminars, and has requested that they be able to convert open space in the Polsky Building to classroom use. The space is presently being used as a lounge and informal study area. The Dean and Division Chair responsible for the program are in favor of the proposal and the Committee unanimously recommends the request." He went on to note that the Senate had deferred its decision because it had been contended that C&T had not discussed this among themselves. The delay was to give the C&T faculty an opportunity to discuss it.

The Chairman stated that this was now before the body and came automatically seconded as a committee report.

Senator John, who had objected when this had first come up at the May meeting, reported that C&T had had a chance to discuss this and there was no problem. He was now in favor of the motion.

Since there was no other discussion, the body voted and approved the CFPC's recommendation.

VIII. NEW BUSINESS - Senator Hebert now presented a proposal (**Appendix B**), which related to modifying the Curriculum Committee, which last year the body had recommended separating from the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee. His proposal was a draft which he wanted the Senators to think about and act upon at the October meeting. One of the things that had occurred to him was that we might want to form a University Curriculum Committee which would have two subcommittees, one that dealt with the general studies program, and the other would be the traditional curriculum review committee which we currently had. The proposal talked about what their membership and mission would be and contained a rationale on the back. He moved the proposal and this was seconded by Senator Kimmell.

The Chairman said that he understood Senator Hebert to say that he wished to defer discussion of this until the October meeting. Senator Hebert said that this was correct. The proposal was a draft, and he would appreciate any comments, additions or corrections to it.

There was a motion to postpone consideration of this proposal until the October meeting, and this was seconded.

Senator Clinefelter had a question regarding the status of the recommended split of the APCC into the two separate committees. The Chairman replied that it was his understanding that the matter was still with the President.

Senator Siloac had a question about how this new committee would relate to the current curriculum committee of the Senate.

Senator Hebert replied that in effect the new University Curriculum Committee would be made up of the current Curriculum Committee and a second subcommittee which would do what the

General Education Advisory Committee did now. This new committee and its two subcommittees would be under the Senate.

Since there was no further discussion, the body voted to defer discussion until October. The Chairman suggested that the Senators review what the body did last year when it split the APCC into two separate committees. Senator Richards asked whether we could find out what had happened to that recommendation before the next meeting. The Chairman said that this along with some other Senate matters would be tracked down.

IX. GOOD OF THE ORDER - The Chairman wanted to correct an omission he had made earlier when talking about getting the Faculty Manual approved by the Board and on to Columbus. He wanted to acknowledge the help that effort had gotten from Counselor Mike Sermersheim. He had been largely responsible for taking the work that the Reference Committee had done and combining it with what happened since the Reference Committee had completed its task. This was a considerable amount of things to put into proper order for the Board of Trustees to consider. He had put in long hours attempting to do that, and the Chairman wanted to publicly acknowledge Mr. Sermersheim and thank him for the time he had spent.

Senator Oller reminded the body that last spring it had asked the Executive Committee to create an ad hoc committee to deal with a proposed general studies major. There had been three proposals presented to APCC last year. One was a draft from C&T. The other two were actual proposals for this sort of degree - one from Arts and Sciences, the other from University College. They had been discussed in the Curriculum Committee and the full APCC, and the decision was that an ad hoc committee needed to be formed to address these proposals and try to bring them together where possible. The Senate had approved this, but the Executive Committee needed some sort of guidance regarding the charge to give this ad hoc committee. It would be unfortunate for such a committee to work for six months to a year and then present a proposal which the Senate did not like or want in the first place. He had planned on asking the body for advice, but in light of Senator Hebert's motion which in part would create a general studies subcommittee, perhaps it would be better to wait until that discussion had taken place next month. That subcommittee, if created, might be the appropriate place to deal with a general studies major.

Senator Devinder Malhotra had no problem with Senator Oller's suggestion to postpone discussion, but he thought what Senator Hebert was proposing and what would be the charge of this ad hoc committee were very different things. The ad hoc committee would not be charged with any curriculum changes. Logically, the general studies major should go to the Academic Policies Committee since it did not fall within the realm of curriculum changes.

Senator Oller commented that one issue which he had thought would be worth discussion was the whole idea of a general studies major. Did we even want to consider creating something like that? Before we began to charge a committee to design something, we had to decide whether it was something that we really wanted.

Senator Barbara Clements asked whether there was any driving impulse to create such a major at this point. Could we not let it die a graceless death? She knew that the impulse had not

originated in the College of Arts and Sciences. If there was an argument to be made for it, she was wondering where it was going to come from.

Senator Chand Midha suggested that it be assigned to BPCC. When the Chairman pointed out that there was no longer a BPCC, Senator Midha replied that this was exactly his point.

Senator Buchthal stated that there were a number of different proposals about a generalist degree. Some of our sister institutions, Miami University for one, used such a degree to allow very strong students to design their academic programs in ways similar to what we were able to do with some of our honors students. As a way of recruiting those good types of students, such a degree had merit. If the purpose of designing such a degree was to find a place for students who could not matriculate into any other program, he would not be in favor of it. He thought that there was some good that could come out of a study of our sister institutions that took advantage of this to the academic welfare of the institution and the student body.

Senator Bucey agreed with the points made by Senator Buchthal and noted that they had been the driving reason why the idea had even been approached.

Senator Norfolk added that there was another issue for our colleagues in C&T who wanted to provide a 2+2 program where many of their students could get a four-year degree after getting an associates degree. Currently we did not have such a thing in place, so there was still value in examining this.

The Chairman suggested that the members think about this until the October meeting and then perhaps we could go into a committee of the whole to draft a charge of sorts for the Executive Committee to give this ad hoc committee.

X. ADJOURNMENT - There was a motion to adjourn, which was seconded. The meeting ended at 4:19 p.m.

APPENDIX A

**FINAL REPORT OF THE LONG RANGE PLANNING COMMITTEE
September 1996**

**Section I
UNIVERSITY MISSION AND STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS**

In 1994 the University Board of Trustees formally adopted a revised mission statement and six strategic directions to guide development of an academic agenda that identifies where existing resources should be invested and where new resources can be developed. These directions, which will continue to serve as core principles for planning by the colleges, administrative units, and the soon-to-be appointed Planning and Budgeting Committee, are as follows:

Mission Statement

The University of Akron, a publicly assisted urban institution, strives to develop enlightened members of society. It offers comprehensive programs of instruction from associate through doctoral levels; pursues a vigorous agenda of research in the arts, sciences, and professions; and provides service to the community. The University pursues excellence in undergraduate and graduate education and distinction in selected areas of graduate instruction, inquiry, and creative activity.

Strategic Directions

- . Attract and retain a higher quality and more diverse student body.
- . Identify and eliminate barriers to a campus culture of service and make every effort to improve the campus environment.
- . Increase student retention and progress toward completion of their academic program.
- . Improve the quality of the undergraduate experience.
- . Cultivate scholarly and creative activities that are recognized regionally, nationally, and internationally.

- Acquire and efficiently utilize the human, informational, financial, and physical campus resources needed to fulfill the mission of The University of Akron.

The Long-Range Planning Committee (LRPC) supports these objectives and has strived to further them through our recommendations over the past two years.

Section II LRPC RECOMMENDATIONS

In this final report, the LRPC is issuing two sets of recommendations to guide continuing planning efforts: (1) an ongoing participatory planning and budgeting process and (2) parameters and assumptions to guide unit planning for the 1997-98 year.

Planning and Budgeting Process

In fulfillment of its responsibilities, the LRPC recommends a structure, documentation, flow, and calendar for an ongoing participatory planning process. This process will require involvement and actions at all levels of the University from the Board of Trustees to the faculty and staff in individual departments.

Beginning in 1996-97, input into campus-wide planning and budgeting priorities will be generated through a new permanent advisory committee, the Planning and Budgeting Committee (PBC). This new committee, approved by Faculty Senate in June 1996 and endorsed in concept by the Board of Trustees in August 1996, will consist of the President, Provost, Vice President for Business and Finance, and representatives of the trustees, deans, full- and part-time faculty, contract professionals, staff, and students. The group will be assembled in September and replaces the LRPC and the Budget and Planning Coordination Committee (BPCC).

A summary of the planning and budgeting process and timetable to be followed this year appears in Table 1. The process consists of four primary stages:

- Department and college-level planning from October-December 1996
- Academic planning by the Provost in consultation with the Deans, January -February 1997

- **Consideration of the academic and administrative unit plans** by the Planning and Budgeting Committee, March-April 1997
- **Preparation of the University plan and budget** by the President and Trustees, April-June 1997.

General instructions for unit planning and budget requests appear in the Appendix. This new process is designed to link planning and budgeting and enhance accountability through the coordinated production of (1) the unit's annual report for 1995-96 highlighting progress toward goals expressed in its 1995-96 plan, (2) five-year and one-year plans for the unit, and (3) the unit's budget request for 1997-98 including proposed adjustments to base funding and any new initiatives or programs contained in the unit plan.

Table 1
PLANNING AND BUDGET PROCESS FOR 1997-98

STAGE	OVERVIEW	RESPONSIBILITIES	TIMELINES
1	Establishment of University-wide, College, and Administrative Unit Planning Assumptions for 1997-98	Recommendations developed by LRPC LRPC reports Recommendations to Senate; forwards to President President consults with Provost (COD), Cabinet Report to Board of Trustees	6/96-8/96 9/5/96 9/25/96
2	Development of Department & College Plans, Budget Requests and Annual Reports Development of Budget Requests & Fee Proposals for Residence Hall and Dining Services Auxiliaries Identification of Resources Available & Needed for Mid-Year Budget Revisions	Recommendations developed by Departments & Units College/Academic Administrative Unit Plans due to Provost Recommendations to Board of Trustees Final 1996-97 Subsidy calculated by Ohio Board of Regents VP for Business/President identify needed budget adjustments in consultation with Plan/Budget Committee Plan/Budget Committee (PBC) recommendations to Faculty Senate President consults with Provost (COD), Cabinet Recommendations to Board of Trustees	10/96-12/96 1/2/97 1/22/97 12/15/96 1/97 2/6/97 2/26/97
3	Development of Academic Plan Recommendations Development of Auxiliary Budget Recommendations	Unified Academic Plan & Budget Priorities developed by Provost in consultation with Council of Deans (COD) Provost Recommendations to PBC Administrative VP Plans to PBC Recommendations developed by Unit for review by VP Business VP Business Recommendations to PBC	1/97-2/97 2/28/97 2/28/97 2/14/97 2/28/97

Table 1
PLANNING AND BUDGET PROCESS FOR 1997-98

STAGE	OVERVIEW	RESPONSIBILITIES	TIMELINES
4	<p>Review 1997-98 Planning Assumptions in light of changing conditions & new information (e.g. status of state budget process)</p> <p>Personnel Evaluations in Preparation for 1997-98 Salary Recommendations</p>	<p>PBC Recommendations for Revisions (as needed) to Senate Senate Action on Proposed 1997-98 Tuition Increase President consults with Provost (COD), Cabinet Approval of 1997-98 Tuition and Fees by Board of Trustees</p> <p>Individual reviews completed at department and division levels; unit framework for increase allocations developed within assumptions</p>	<p>3/14/97 4/3/97 4/97 4/26/97</p> <p>2/97-4/97</p>
5	Development of University-wide Plan & Budget	<p>PBC Coordination of University Plan and Budget PBC Recommendations distributed to Senate for review Senate Action on PBC Recommendations to President</p>	<p>3/1/97-4/14/97 4/15/97 5/5/97</p>
6	Approval & Publication of University Plan and Budget	<p>President consults with Provost (COD), Cabinet Approval of 1997-98 Plan & Budget by Board of Trustees</p>	<p>5/97-6/97 6/25/97*</p>

* Given that 1997-98 is the first year of a new biennium, it is understood that passage of the University's budget will be contingent upon approval of the State of Ohio budget.

Planning Parameters and Assumptions for 1997-98

Enrollment

Based on the best data currently available to us, the LRPC is projecting an overall 3 percent decline in student credit-hour production for 1997-98. It is anticipated that the decline will occur in credit hours for continuing undergraduate students, with graduate and law enrollment projected at equal to 1996-97 levels. For the first time in several years, modest growth is projected in the number of new freshmen (estimated at 2,800 students).

Subsidy

The Ohio General Assembly will develop the State of Ohio's next biennial budget by June 30, 1997. At this time we are assuming a 3 percent increase in instructional subsidy. This projection must be revisited as the state budget process progresses.

Tuition

We value the University's position as one of the most affordable public universities in Ohio, with undergraduate tuition and fees ranking eighth of the thirteen schools. Historically, lower-than-average fees have preserved student access and caused the institution to operate leaner and meaner than many peer institutions long before it became the mantra of the 1990s. On the other hand, low fees have meant that Akron raised and spent fewer resources per student. As we look to the near term and beyond, we continue to believe that modest increases in tuition will be necessary to support the institution's needs and aspirations to improve academic quality. At this time we anticipate that the State will continue to limit annual increases in in-state undergraduate tuition, which in the current year was capped at 6 percent. For 1996-97, the LRPC was the first to propose restraint in raising tuition in recognition of student needs and events of the year. For 1997-98, we urge the President and Board of Trustees to consider raising tuition to the maximum permitted by the State of Ohio. Given the relative position of our fees, the dollar value of any increase still will be substantially less than for other Ohio institutions.

External Support

In recent years the University has achieved new milestones in external support for research and sponsored program funding and in the number of individual gifts to the institution. That trend continued in 1995-96, with external research grants totalling \$17.1 million and an all-time high of 19,723 donations collected. We anticipate this growth will continue but

recognize that the direct impact upon 1997-98 operating dollars will be slight given external constraints on indirect cost recovery and University policies limiting the expenditure of endowment funds.

Student Financial Aid

For planning purposes no significant change is anticipated in the availability of federal student aid for 1997-98. This projection bears watching in light of the 1996 presidential election and ongoing efforts to reduce the national debt. Although the LRPC is not prepared at this time to make any specific recommendations, through our deliberations we have become increasingly concerned that the University's scholarships--particularly for the brightest undergraduates--are not competitive in the current higher education marketplace. We urge that this issue receive further study by the Planning and Budgeting Committee and recommend that, in the meantime, the institution consider offering fewer but larger awards with existing scholarship funds.

Salary

It is the view of this committee that the competitiveness of salaries must be the highest priority for new resources. In 1995-96 UA's average faculty salary ranked seventh of Ohio universities, and annual increases in recent years have been less than many of our peer institutions. While it is too soon in the process to publicly state a specific goal, we encourage the President and Board to consider funding salary increases through tuition increase revenue as well as cost savings due to redistribution. For planning purposes units will be asked to project salary costs for continuing personnel at 1996-97 levels. It is anticipated that the specific amount of the 1997-98 increase will be determined in the spring according to the recommended planning and budgeting process.

Quality Enhancements

For 1996-97 LRPC recommended \$1.5 million in academic quality enhancements funded through reallocation of non-academic dollars. Half of these dollars are dedicated to increasing full-time teaching in General Studies. Our concern regarding the over-utilization of part-time faculty in core courses continues, and we recommend that further attention be devoted to this goal. It is the intent of the committee that concentrated resources be applied wherever possible so the impact of this initiative will be felt. Based upon current part-time faculty usage, the greatest needs appear to be in English Composition, Speech/Communication, and Mathematical Sciences (in that order). We recognize that decisions on the allocation of new positions rest with the Provost and President and practical considerations such as searches may call for a phased approach. For 1997-98 it is

proposed that 50 percent of the monies reallocated from administrative support be set aside for additional campus-wide academic quality enhancements.

Balancing Priorities/Redistribution

We recommend that the redistribution of resources from non-academic to academic support, which began in 1996-97 with a \$3 million reduction in administrative expenses, be evaluated in the 1997-98 year. The impact of previous reductions should be studied before setting additional redistribution targets. Further, it is anticipated that funding for new initiatives within the academic programs (other than campus-wide quality enhancements) will come primarily from reallocation of resources among colleges.

Technology

Over the past 18 months, a great deal of attention in the LRPC and the broader campus community has focused upon technology planning. It is anticipated that the new Associate Provost for Information Support Services position will be filled in 1997 and that greater coordination and use of information technology will occur in the creation, application, storage, and dissemination of knowledge. College and administrative plans should include provisions for faculty and staff microcomputer access as appropriate to their needs, including replacement cycle dollars. In planning it should be recognized that technology fee revenues may be used for instructional, laboratory, and classroom services equipment as well as computing equipment.

Accountability

The University and all of higher education will continue to face external scrutiny and requirements in wide-ranging areas, perhaps most notably in student outcomes assessment and faculty workload. All college plans must specifically address these areas in order to maintain credibility with funding and accrediting agencies.

Incentives

The LRPC urges continuing attention to the provision of incentives for new enrollment and believes that opportunities for greater linkage of enrollment generation and revenues can be achieved.

Section III STATUS OF SPRING 1996 RECOMMENDATIONS BY LRPC

In February 1996 the LRPC made a series of recommendations pertaining to 1996-97 planning and budgeting priorities, technology planning, administrative structure, and other campus-wide issues. The LRPC report was endorsed by the Faculty Senate in March and forwarded to President Marion A. Ruebel in April. Many of the proposals have been implemented as of this writing. So the campus community does not lose sight of what has been achieved in recent months, we close the committee's final report by reporting on the status of these recommendations.

Implemented

- Revenue planning assumptions for 1996-97 including a 3 percent increase in in-state undergraduate tuition, an overall 4 percent decline in student credit hours, and a projected 3 percent increase in state instructional subsidy.
- A 3 percent salary increase for full- and part-time faculty, staff, and contract professionals for the 1996-97 year.
- A total \$3 million reduction in non-academic budgets (President, Vice President for Business and Finance, Vice President for Student Affairs, and Vice President for University Research and Development).
- Academic quality enhancements totalling \$1.5 million, which has been reserved in the 1996-97 budget pending final 14-day enrollment figures.
- The reorganization approved by the Board of Trustees in June 1996 includes several elements of the administrative structure originally recommended by the LRPC including the transfer of information support services and student affairs to the Senior Vice President and Provost.
- The merging of LRPC and BPCC into the Planning and Budget Committee, which will occur in September 1996.
- CCTC recommendations for \$127,000 in campus network upgrades, which were supported by the LRPC, were completed during the spring of 1996.
- Upon recommendation of the LRPC, the BPCC solicited proposals from the colleges for allocation of remaining technology fee revenues for various computing, instructional, laboratory, and classroom services equipment needs.

- In June 1996 the Board of Trustees approved offering the Kaiser Permanente HMO coverage for part-time faculty purchase as proposed by Senate upon recommendation of the University Well-Being Committee and LRPC.
- The LRPC recommended reallocation of resources by the Provost to reconstitute an institutional research effort capable of meeting legal reporting obligations and analytic needs of the planning and budgeting process. This initiative was begun with the merger of Institutional Research and the Survey Research Center into the Institute for Policy Studies in August 1996.

Awaiting Further Analysis/Response

Several recommendations from the LRPC's February 1996 report await further analysis and/or response from the University President. They are as follows:

- Recommendation that total head count enrollment of 23,000 at Akron and Wayne College be used for planning purposes.
- Recommendation that the number of full-time positions (administrators and staff) in non-academic divisions be reduced to 750 by the year 2000.
- Recommendation that the number of full-time General Fund faculty positions be restored to 760 and the number of academic support staff be restored to 325 by the year 2000.
- Recommendation that part-time faculty schedules, compensation, and qualifications be decentralized to the colleges. By spring 1997 each college should establish three part-time faculty instructional ranks and set minimum qualifications and compensation (not less than current minimums). It was suggested that part-time faculty be consulted in development of these policies and that the colleges be permitted to set upper limits on course loads as appropriate for their unit as long as they comply with legal restrictions concerning part-time employment.
- Recommendations for technology planning including (1) the scope of technology planning, which should encompass computing as well as other instructional, laboratory, and classroom services equipment, (2) funding some portion of public computer lab upgrades with technology fee revenues, and (3) requiring college plans to include provisions for faculty and staff microcomputer access as appropriate to their needs, including replacement cycle dollars.

- LRPC also recommended that continued examination of college plans should focus upon (1) quality enhancement efforts for undergraduate education, (2) enrollment enhancement and retention efforts, and (3) responsiveness to legal and accreditation mandates, particularly faculty workload and student outcome assessment.

Appendix
INSTRUCTIONS FOR 1997-98 PLAN AND BUDGET

1) ANNUAL REPORT 1995-96

- A. - Use June to June time frame.
- B. - Keep narrative length to five pages
- C. - Describe (using specific indicators where possible) the unit's progress toward goals expressed in its 1995-96 plans.
- D. - If changing conditions resulted in any major diversions from the unit plan, please explain.
- E. - Place publication/activity/project lists in an Appendix.

2) FIVE-YEAR/ONE-YEAR PLANS (1996-2001 / 1997-98)

- A. - Present narrative discussion of five-year plan (three-page maximum length).
 - 1. General description of unit goals/actions in priority order to support University goals and strategic directions. Include projected time lines, measures for determining progress, and anticipated need and sources for funding (e.g. existing resources, reallocation, new dollars limited to +/- 5 percent).
 - 2. Plans must include response to academic program reviews (especially if a weakness is involved).

B. - Present planned activities for the coming year that will need to be funded, noting which are multi-year commitments (two-page maximum length).

3) **BUDGET REQUESTS FOR 1997-98**

A. - Budget request forms will be prepared in a standardized format (e.g. Word or WordPerfect) and distributed to academic and administrative units for their use. Completed forms should be provided in electronic form to the next level of responsibility.

B. - The budget request summary (Form A) will include:

Column A - 1995-96 approved budget by category (including total carry-forward amount)

Column B - 1995-96 actual expenditures by category

Column C - Total requested for 1997-98 by category

BACKUP FOR COLUMN C

Column D - Existing base funding to maintain current activities/programs

Column E - Adjustments to base, positive or negative, to account for inflation or declines in resources needed. (Detail for recommendations should be provided in Form B.)

Column F - Total funding needed for new initiatives or programs (Detail for recommendation including whether source will be new money or reallocation should be provided in Form C.)

Columns D and E should be justified in the annual report narrative.

Column F is a summary of plans for new initiatives or programs (listed individually in Form C) and should be derived from the unit plan.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. Jesse Marquette, Chair

APPENDIX B

To: Executive Committee of Faculty Senate
From: John Hebert, Senator CBA
Subject: **PROPOSAL TO FORM A UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE**

I propose that the UA Faculty Senate take action to form a University Curriculum Committee, which would be a committee of the UA Faculty Senate.

The University Curriculum Committee would be charged with two primary tasks:

- a) the development/refinement of the General Studies program, and
- b) the review of curriculum (change) proposals from the various colleges that comprise the University.

The University Curriculum Committee would be divided into two subcommittees to specifically address each of these primary tasks:

- a) the General Studies subcommittee, and
- b) the Curriculum Review subcommittee.

Other issues that need to be addressed are the composition and operational procedures/rules of the committee and subcommittees.

Membership proposal:

The membership of the subcommittees of the University Curriculum Committee shall consist of at least one senator (or representative) from each of the degree granting colleges of the University.

Proposed Subcommittee Operating Procedures:

The General Studies SC shall operate under current procedures, but shall recommend/report changes to the General Studies program to the Faculty Senate for approval, which would then forward such proposals to the Provost.

The charge of the Curriculum Review SC shall be to review curriculum (change) proposals submitted by the various colleges of the University in order to:

- a) determine whether or not the proposed curriculum changes are consistent with established degree requirements of the University (including General Studies requirements), as well as other University and OBR policies, and
- b) determine whether or not the proposed title and/or contents of a new course or proposed changes to the title and/or contents of an existing course (essentially) duplicate an existing course or "infringe" upon the academic domain of an academic department in another college.

Proposals that (a) conform with University requirements and (b) do not duplicate existing course content or infringe upon the academic domain of another academic department shall be approved by the Curriculum Review Committee, recommended to the Faculty Senate for approval, and submitted to the Provost upon such approval.

Rationale:

The colleges that comprise the University have both common and individual objectives. The common objectives are reflected in the general studies program and other University requirements such as minimum GPA for graduation. College specific objectives are reflected in the curriculum, requirements and policies set forth by the faculty in the individual colleges.

It would seem reasonable then that the University faculty as a whole would determine the common objectives (as they recently did in modifying the general studies program), and that the faculty of the individual colleges would determine college specific objectives such as those reflected in their curriculum requirements.

The current curriculum review process at The University of Akron permits all University faculty (via their representatives on the University Faculty Senate) to control the determination of BOTH the common objectives/requirements of the University and the specific objectives/requirements of the individual colleges.

I (and many others) believe that the current curriculum review process is flawed. It permits faculty from one college to control the implementation of solutions designed to satisfy specific objectives/requirements of another college by declaring "null and void" changes

September 5, 1996

Page 36

that the faculty of the proposing college have approved and endorsed even when these changes are in accord with common university requirements and do not infringe on the academic domain of another department or college.

The purpose of the proposal is to implement a process in which all University faculty would determine common University curriculum objectives/requirements, and college faculty would determine the specific curriculum objectives/requirements of their respective college.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. John Hebert

ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION...ATTENTION

We are once again updating the Chronicle mailing list. Please indicate whether you want to receive a copy of this monthly publication, if you are not already on the mailing list.

Please also feel free to make comments/suggestions regarding the Chronicle.

Name: _____

Department/+4: _____

___ I am currently **not** on your mailing list; please add my name.

___ Please drop my name from your mailing list.

Please return this form to Marilyn Quillin, SHN 155 (+4910).