

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

---

2-6-2003

## Faculty Senate Chronicle February 6, 2003

Heather M. Loughney  
hl@uakron.edu

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.

---

### Recommended Citation

Loughney, Heather M.. "Faculty Senate Chronicle February 6, 2003." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 6 Feb 2003. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/339>

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



2002-2003, No. 5

February 6, 2003

69 Pages

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 6, 2003	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 6, 2003	
A. Report of <i>Graduate Council</i>	29
B. Report of <i>Academic Policies &amp; Calendar Committee</i>	
1) Incomplete Policy	30
2) Transient work at another university	31
3) Transfer credit	33
4) Dean's List Policy	36
5) Advanced Study for University Faculty	38
6) Academic Reassessment Policy	40
C. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i> - Curriculum Proposals	42
D. Report of <i>Campus Facilities Planning Committee</i> - History and Heritage of Hezleton Simmons	57
E. Report of <i>Faculty Research Committee</i> - 2003 Summer Fellowships	66
F. Report of <i>Planning and Budgeting Committee</i>	68

---

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

## MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING ON FEBRUARY 6, 2003

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was held on Thursday, February 6, 2003, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education. The meeting was called to order by Chair Dan Sheffer at 3:02 p.m.

Forty-six of the sixty-three Faculty Senators were in attendance. Senators Covrig, Garcia, Graham, Harp, Jimenez, Matney, Wyszynski, and W.Yoder were absent with notice. Senators Broadway, Crain, Dalton, Krovi, Maringer, ~~Rede~~, Stinner, Trotter, and Wallace were absent without notice.

### SENATE ACTIONS

- \* **APPROVED EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE RESOLUTION SUPPORTING RETURNING THE LIBRARY AS A UNIT REPORTING TO THE PROVOST.**
- \* **APPROVED APCC RECOMMENDED POLICY CHANGES REGARDING: INCOMPLETES; TRANSIENT WORK; TRANSFER CREDIT; DEAN'S LIST GPA; ADVANCED STUDY FOR UNIVERSITY FACULTY.**
- \* **APPROVED CRC RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PREREQUISITE STATEMENTS TO APPEAR IN BULLETIN AND ON-LINE.**
- \* **APPROVED ADDITION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY SENATE 3359-10-02(B)(6).**

**I. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA** - Chair Sheffer called for a motion to approve the agenda. Senator Wilkinson so moved; Senator Yousey seconded the motion. The Senate then approved the agenda.

**II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 2002** - Secretary Kennedy reported that there were two corrections to the minutes of December 5, 2002, that appeared on page 12. Donfred and Hezleton had been spelled incorrectly; these would be corrected. No other corrections forthcoming, the Senate then voted to approve the minutes.

**III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR** - The Chair began his remarks by welcoming all back for the spring semester. He thanked all who had sent comments to the Senate office in the past few

days regarding the NCA self-study. He knew time had been very limited for those comments to be sent. The work group putting together the self-study would review those suggestions tomorrow and would send a draft to the outside editor either Friday evening or Saturday. The draft must go to the printer on February 14.

Since last meeting two task forces had formed. One was formed by Senate directive to review and make recommendations to the APCC related to the University calendar. Members on that committee were Senators Jan Yoder, Julie Drew, Debra Johanyak, Prof. Dudley Turner, Jason Smith, the student member, and the University Registrar, Don Fox. This task force had had an initial meeting and was beginning to gather information. A second task force had been formed for studying all the decision-making entities on campus. That particular task force had already met twice. The task force was sponsored by President Proenza, the Provost, and the chair of Faculty Senate. The chair of the task force was Prof. Mike Cheung, who was currently preparing a letter to the campus community detailing the mission and objectives of this task force. At a later time requests for information would be sent forth from that committee to all members of the University community.

PBC had met regularly, including several times over the winter break, and would be advising the Senate later today of its most recent activities.

Chair Sheffer concluded his remarks by stating that he was sad to say that he had a few special announcements which dealt with the deaths of a number of our colleagues. These included: Ruth Victoria Fuquen was a part-time lecturer in Spanish in the University's department of modern languages, who died on Dec. 30. Vernon Elliott died on Dec. 31. Mr. Elliott was in The University of Akron Police Dept. for 18 years and retired in 1989. And we have just learned that Lionel Haizlip, Assoc. Prof. of Engineering & Science Technology passed away yesterday. Details were not available at this time.

Chair Sheffer then asked the body to stand for a moment of silence.

#### IV. REPORTS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Kennedy began her report by stating that the Executive Committee had met several times over the last two months and addressed the following issues. As stated by the chair, we had been very active in dealing with the NCA draft self-study reports. She would not reiterate those comments. The Executive Committee also had been discussing the Balanced Scorecard. In a meeting with the President and Mrs. Herrnstein we discussed the status of that process. The issues we addressed included the level of faculty involvement and the development of the measures of standards within colleges, schools and units, as well as the time table for implementation, especially with regard to the upcoming NCA site visit. We also discussed the budget as a group and as part of our regular meeting with President Proenza. Two members of the Executive Committee were on the PBC. The Executive Committee also had a

resolution to present to the body regarding the Library. We were informed that the Library was going to be returned as a unit reporting to the Provost. In support of that the Executive committee drafted a resolution, now presented to Faculty Senate for consideration. The resolution from the Executive Committee was as follows: The Faculty Senate very favorably supports the return of the Library as a unit reporting directly to the Provost of the University.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the resolution. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body approved the resolution.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - Chair Sheffer invited President Proenza to address the body.

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and given your Secretary's comment I'm pleased to advise you that the Trustees enthusiastically accepted my resolution to indeed move the Library under the Provost, so that is already done.

Let me spend a few minutes providing you an update on several issues including the state update. In the spirit of winter humor I guess it would be helpful if I remind you that if only we could collect a toll on all of the rumors that seem to circulate on campus we might well indeed take care of all of our budget woes, but since that perhaps is not to your liking, let me dispel some other rumors. First of all, contrary to what appears to be common knowledge, I am not going to Florida State or the University of Florida or to the university system of Florida, choose A, B, or C of the above, or any other institution other than The University of Akron, where I am committed to continue to work with you on capturing all of the rightful destiny that I believe belongs to this institution. So sorry to disappoint some of you, and I trust that it may please a couple of you.

Second, again contrary to rumor, I have already asked Provost Hickey, Vice President Ray, as well as the PBC, to consider within the budget, planning appropriate salary increases for faculty, staff, and contract professionals. Specifically, I have asked that they consider within any proposed increases that they be consistent with the following two possible options providing that it is possible at the very least, we maintain the relative gains we have made relative to other institutions within the market place. Secondly, obviously again if possible, that we improve that relative position, and there are several scenarios that are being considered by the PBC and the Salary Task Force which continues to work on our plan to move those salaries forward.

Third, some of you may think that the fact that I spent a few years in Alaska does not preclude me from ever closing The University of Akron due to inclement weather. I might note for you please, that during the time I was in Alaska the university remained open, in fact never closed on any of the seven years that I was there despite the fact that during two weeks of that time the temperature descended to minus 60 degrees Fahrenheit and that's not including the wind chill, although if you know anything about interior Alaska there is not much wind there in the winter. That said, you may also wish to remember that my first official act as President of this

University was to close the University as a result of inclement weather. That said, let us deal with some other factual issues.

I am pleased to inform you, as I just did, that our Trustees approved the recommendation with regard to the Library and all other Faculty Senate recommendations presented to them at their meeting last Wednesday. Specifically, those included rule modifications regarding candidates for early tenure that were unsuccessful, minimum credits required for additional degrees, limits on repeating courses for a change of grade, and the establishment of a direct link between annual faculty evaluations and the award of merit pay, all of which you recommended and which we forwarded to the Board and which they approved. In addition, I also recommended that the division of Human Resources move from my office to that of Vice President Ray, and that too was approved.

In addition, the Board approved faculty improvement leaves as recommended, the resignation of Dean Stephen Hallam from the College of Business Administration, and phase B of the first year allocations for the compression salary equity dollars. These were the final small amount of dollars, in this case primarily effecting associate professors, as recommended by the Academic Salary Affairs Task Force. If you wish to have details, I believe Dr. Midha would be pleased to share them with you. As a result of what we have done this year again, we are in approximately the mid-level at the professor levels within Ohio, very near the mid-rank for associate professors, and still above mid-rank for assistant professors. So we've done a much better job of bringing in our younger colleagues at market, if you will.

I've asked Professor Midha and the Salary Task Force to continue to look at different scenarios so that we do not lose ground on these rankings even in these difficult times, and indeed to couple their continued analyses to include staff and contract professionals so that we finally will have brought the Mercer process and the work of the Task Force to parallel places in our ongoing plan. I've also asked the Task Force to look at summer compensation here and at other Ohio universities. From time to time we again hear speculation, read 'rumors,' that our summer compensation may not be very good. Preliminary data suggested it might be far better than we think, but until we have the actual data I would hope you would regard anything else as just unadulterated speculation, innuendo, and otherwise not worth paying any attention to whatsoever. So let's find out where we are, and Chand, we look forward to that data.

In my report to the Board I also shared excerpts from a letter received from the Executive Office of the President in relationship to the work that the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology has accomplished during the last year, and I'll provide your Secretary with a copy of that letter, but let me share a little bit of it. The letter is signed by the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, John Marburger, indicating that PCAST (President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology) had its first report on research and development priorities result in the facilitation of the enactment of the National Science Foundation's authorizing legislation, which the President signed into law in December. In case you've missed the humor, that means there will be more money for you to compete for and not

just in the health sciences. A very important recommendation we made had to do with the fact that our nation needs to rebalance its investments to pay more attention to the physical sciences, chemical sciences, and engineering relative to the biomedical sciences not to diminish its continued investment in any, but to rebalance the portfolio in further investments.

In addition, the report of PCAST also led to implementing a recommendation for which the Office of Science and Technology Policy has asked the Science Committee of the Interagency National Science and Technology Council to assess how best to establish new research and development fellowships and scholarship programs to address the very strong need for enhanced U.S. participation by U.S. students in science and technology programs, read, more graduate fellowships and assistantship opportunities, and that will continue to be a major topic for our ongoing deliberations in the next few weeks. While the PCAST report also affected the new Department of Homeland Security, energy efficiency and broadband deployment strategies of the administration, I thought you would be most interested to note that the results of PCAST funding is going up, and some of you will surely benefit from that.

Now our state funding is another story. As we have heard the news from the media and from the Governor, the budget picture is daunting. Nevertheless, let me touch briefly on two related issues and certainly understand that the budget that the Governor has presented is far better than any of us may have had a hope of. But it does depend on the enactment of his proposed measures in a timely manner lest we be called upon yet this year for some significant reductions. At the present time the Governor has proposed an executive budget that includes a number of reduced expenditures as well as a number of revenue enhancements throughout state agencies. Fortunately, the Governor's plan proposes increasing the state share of instruction by 3 percent in fiscal 04, and by 4 percent in fiscal 05. He also proposes increased financial aid and approximately \$525,000 in new research funding through the Third Frontier Network, plus the capital expenditures that are already on the books and which are being competed for. On the downside, any new funding is dependent upon the legislature's acceptance of the proposed revenue enhancement or taxes. The executive budget also includes the reinstatement of a tuition cap and a cut of a modest percentage in line-item appropriations, the details of which are still coming forward.

One other note-worthy element in relation to higher education is the Governor's announcement of a proposed Commission on Higher Education and the economy which he articulated in his inaugural address. Let me read some language from that speech so that you understand that some of what you're hearing isn't all that the Governor appears to have in mind. In that speech specifically the Governor said that he would, 'ask the commission to recommend within a year how to improve the quality of our higher education system, increase efficiencies, eliminate unnecessary duplication, broaden the use of technology and determine how higher education can most effectively support the state economy and add to our quality of life.' Now I underscore all of those things in punctuating with commas so that you understand that what you've been hearing from the press has almost exclusively focused on reducing duplication and increasing efficiency, important elements but not all that the Governor has in mind. Yes, we are

hearing that they want to close a law school, we are hearing that they are not sure, Senator Yoder, why we should have a psychology department in every one of our schools and colleges. I tell them that maybe we shouldn't have a high school in every city, but that will take some time to penetrate. Perhaps you can understand some frustration.

Now the members of the commission which are to include 'leaders of government, business, labor, and academia' will be named within the next few weeks, expectedly by the end of February, and I have been told that I may be considered as well as some others, not knowing what the size and composition will be. Regardless, I and other colleagues as well as supporters of higher education are working very aggressively to continue positioning The University of Akron in the very best possible light. As I had reported to you earlier, at the request of Representative Jim Hughes, Chairman of the House Select Committee on Ohio's System of Higher Education, I submitted a white paper that calls for enhanced and restructured funding of higher education among other recommendations. The paper has been published on the committee's web site and is in the hands of legislators. I am providing a copy which had been shared in draft form with your Executive Committee and all of those who asked for it at that time.

For now though, I want to consult with all of our faculty and colleagues in order to obtain your input, on a brochure that I hope we can develop fairly quickly to attempt to describe in lay terms the benefits and advantages that our University of Akron provides to our students, to our community, and to our state. This external communication piece, which certainly will help us internally as well, is an important and time-critical effort in this political environment, and to meet that tight frame I will be visiting beginning next week and in following weeks with each of the colleges throughout the campus so that we can discuss some items in a rough draft that we've developed to date so that I can benefit from your input.

Ultimately, the result of that work and all of the other work will continue to communicate to us that our destiny is strictly in our own hands. The state is certainly not going to help us in the next year or two in any significant fashion. No third party is going to come down the pike with 60 or 100 or 300 million dollars, and it's up to us to determine how we do our business well, increase our enrollment, increase our revenues, and in short, do our business well. We need to identify and seize opportunities to raise additional revenues and we need to do so ourselves, together. We cannot delegate that responsibility to anyone else. The legislature has not been listening; it is beginning to wake up, but I cannot expect miracles and cannot promise that to you. That said, I thank you and will be happy to take any questions that you may have."

Senator J. Yoder then addressed President Proenza, stating that, independent of what the state did and at least in the short-term given what we had seen with the PBC's budget report, we were looking at some deficits. So she would like to ask two questions about the distribution of the cuts that were likely to be coming down the road. The first part of the question had to do with what we discussed last year in Senate. This was, when we looked at the college side of the house versus the non-college side of the house, we discussed the idea of having the college side,



which counted for 60 percent of the budget, to absorb 40 percent of the cuts, and the reverse was true for the academic side. As the President knew, he had elected not to take that forward to the Board; cuts were made proportionately. As she had heard President Proenza state on Friday when he had talked to the Executive Committee, he, again, would not consider any distribution of cuts at that level that was not proportional. To avoid rumor, would he comment on that?

President Proenza replied that indeed, Senator Yoder was correct. There was no rational basis on which to recommend any major other redistribution of resources at this point. For context of this issue, he referred to three books, a book by a colleague at Cornell entitled, Tuition Rising, by Ronald Ehrenberg, or, alternatively, Senators might wish to read Donald Kennedy's Academic Duty, or the work of Frank H. Rhodes, the former president of Cornell, who wrote, The Creation of the Future. All of those would help in understanding that moving the budget of a major institution in any significant way as that of the original Senate recommendation was next to impossible for a variety of simple but very important reasons. These were things such as contractual obligations, delayed realizations of savings from elimination of departments, programs, and/or the unanticipated consequences of revenue reductions caused by seemingly very simple choices.

The President also noted that in every institution that he had been, any such adjustments had taken considerable time even when very specific, long-debated priorities were agreed upon. For example, in Alaska the Geophysical Institute was the prize possession of the university and everything was to be done to not reduce its budget in times of fiscal constraints. It was impossible to protect it absolutely 100 percent, even from 4 percent or 2 percent cuts. So until we agreed on priorities, which we had not, or found a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow which he did not think we would find, he did not think he could responsibly make any other recommendations. He would repeat to all that he would not compromise the basic infrastructure of this University as it was compromised in the 70's, 80's and early 90's, period.

Senator J. Yoder then began by stating that the second part of the question was, once this decision that 40 percent of the cuts would come from the administrative side and 60 percent from the colleges...

President Proenza interjected that that was a wrong impression; the cut was proportional. If 4 percent of a cut came from 60 percent of the budget, that was 4 percent of that portion, and 4 percent of the rest was 4 percent of the budget. Senator J. Yoder was creating a false impression.

Senator J. Yoder continued. In the colleges - at least at this point - what we had done in both houses was address cuts across the board within units. The colleges at this point at least had an alternative with ROI. Even though ROI was half done, it did offer something other than the possibility of across-the-board cuts. So her question became, what was going on with ROI on the non-academic side of the house?

President Proenza replied with the suggestion to ask PBC; it was in their hands. He did want to add a few points, however, and stated, "First, on the current portion of the ROI - the Provost did make some allocations proportional to that ROI this past fiscal year. In short, we had begun to make some differential allocations of new resources, but we were not prepared to go forward with cuts on that basis for a number of reasons, not the least of which was the PBC had not finished its full analysis and the elaboration of the ROI. Secondly, ladies and gentlemen, please let us stop talking about one side or the other side of the house. We were engaged in the University - the University was The University of Akron. If we started picking apart one versus the other, he thought we were making a serious mistake. Let us clear our language - the University."

Senator John asked whether the President could please comment about a presentation that was made to the Board of Trustees about a stand-alone college possibly here at The University of Akron?

President Proenza then replied with the following:

"Certainly. For the past two years roughly, the University community has been engaged in a dialogue particularly within the University College and the C & T College about some possible alternatives that may better serve the professional needs of our faculty and the educational interests of our students. That dialogue has been ongoing and has suggested that we may wish to consider forming a very well-recognized Summit Community College, a division of The University of Akron much like our Wayne College. The benefits to that would be that those students who now don't think there is a community college in Summit County would know that there is one. Secondly, those students who want to go to a community college but don't know there's one in Summit County and who do not want to go to the University, even C & T, because they have this psychological impression that that's too demanding for them are not coming to The University of Akron, but are going to some other school. So that would help that. It would have some other potential benefits. What we reviewed for the Board is the discussion that it had taken place during this past year and indicated that we would be continuing that dialogue with the hope of coming forward with a proposal or set of proposals perhaps by the end of the summer or early fall."

Senator Sterns then addressed President Proenza, stating that, at the last Board of Trustees meeting and following the next day in the paper, there was a report on new dormitory expansion and some creative approaches in that regard. Senator Sterns did not think we had had an opportunity to hear from the president our philosophy about housing and what we planned for the future.

President Proenza replied with the following:

"Actually, you had in a report on various things we need to do over time, and I don't recall at what meeting, but I've talked about residence halls and other facilities that we'll need

to begin planning. The Master Plan called for three parking decks and we're in stage 2 of that and only the first one was part of the initial funding. All of that of course is paid for not by operating funds but by fee reimbursements, etc. That said, if you recall at one of those times we noted that we had approximately a capacity currently at the University of about 2,100 beds. We noted that a large fraction of these were at the time undergoing remodeling and that others would be needing remodeling and would need to come in line. However, we were seeing an increased interest in residence hall facilities and in the last two years we have had more interest than we've been able to accept for students and have had to either rent facilities or simply provide a very strong dialogue with the community in order for the students who want to live near campus to at least be able to do so.

As a result of all of that, we began to explore options for creating residence hall facilities as well as continuing to remodel those we have that would not put any pressure on the basic operation and maintenance budget of the campus or on any other aspect of the budget. In other words, which would be self-financed and not complicate the other things that are on our higher education capital list; in short, which would totally be off-line, so to speak. We have not come to any final determination on how many facilities we need. However, the very large increase in the Honors Program together with the very strong response that the honors students have given to the availability of Gallucci Hall which needs to be completely replaced to a learning community has made us feel that a strong priority ought to be in a residence hall for honors students with a learning community appropriately designated.

In addition, that we would begin to build in a reasonably modest fashion some additional facilities for students so that we could begin to accommodate a larger fraction, and that we would not make any commitments on further ones until we saw that the demand would justify the additional building, since we must recover the cost from residence hall fees and not anticipate that anyone else is going to pay for it. How much in the future? I do not know, but let me tell you what my working parameters are in my head. If you look at other urban-situated institutions that have made a commitment to residence halls; for example, The Ohio State University, Toledo, and a few others, you find that approximately 20 percent of the students are able to find on-campus housing. For us that would probably mean in terms of our full-time equivalent something in the order of 3-4,500 spaces for these students approximately.

Likewise, that we would need in the near vicinity to the campus an additional 5,000 spaces of good quality not owned by the University but accessible to the students within distance to the campus, but of high quality and not of the sort that most of you if you saw some facilities that are often made available to our students, would not want to live there yourself and you might not wish to have your sons and daughters there - approximately 3,500-4,000 on-campus that we manage to control with our housing abilities."

Senator Sterns replied that he respectfully requested that the President let the Facilities Planning Committee know so as to have a chance to explore and add our ideas to the planning process. He thought recently we had been forced into more of a reactive position than being able

to be part of the up-front decision making. He mentioned it because many times we did much better, but on this one he thought we needed to use it as an example.

President Proenza replied that that would be no problem. He then asked Dr. Roney to invite our good colleague Dr. Sterns to all of the planning meetings that would ever take place in the future. The President then asked that any time anyone wished to offer input on anything, would he or she please offer it.

Senator Lee then stated that he had a question, just actually in the nature of going forward for PBC. The President probably knew we were working on trying to find ways to bridge the gap on the current deficit. Senator Lee wanted to be sure that the President was not committing himself to something he did not mean. When the President had said across-the-board cuts, Senator Lee presumed the President had not meant that, as PBC went through the budget line by line and we found particular lines to cut, and PBC could not do that.

President Proenza replied that he knew this and apologized for not phrasing this as best he might have. He continued by saying that we were looking at anyone that had an idea that might work – he encouraged the bringing of it forward. For example, in our discussion last week we talked about the possibility that we might reorder the way that we allocated overtime. Currently, we were actually paying for it. One way to save money and hence enact a cut that was not proportional in across-the-board sense was to simply, for whatever period of time we needed, not grant overtime except by compensatory time. There was no added expense that would reduce our budget because we currently had thousands of dollars we were paying in overtime. So it was simply creating a more flexible approach for the allocation of our work force to reduce our expenditures. There were many other such possibilities. He had asked Vice President Ray to construct a preliminary list to share so we could debate as to how many of those might be approachable or not, but beyond our ability to identify such things, then the across-the-board would kick in. If anyone wanted to abolish his or her department we would do that, but only if he or she volunteered.

Senator Witt then asked whether it had to be one's own department.

President Proenza replied that, in this political environment, as there was about six years ago, the legislature was going to be thinking about lobbying this, lobbying that, so please, he asked of Senators, think about what each would want him to say.

Senator Gerlach then spoke, addressing Chair Sheffer, As the Senator recalled, several months ago the Senate requested the President to carry to the Board of Trustees a suggestion that the Gardner name be retained on an appropriate building on this campus. Senate had not heard what he determined to do about that request. Perhaps the President could say something about it now.

President Proenza stated he would do so gladly. He had asked several of you who wanted to provide input to provide him rationale. Some had been provided. George Knepper had provided some wonderful analyses, and Senator Sterns just provided a wonderful piece on Simmons. Vice President Roney had provided a very fine piece on Gardner and his contributions. The President stated that he had asked for a set of option recommendations appropriately backed up with that and whatever other material could come forward so that he could deliberate with the Board and provide them a set of recommendations from which they might take. The President stated that he could assure the body with 100 percent certainty that those two names would live on in the campus. In what fashion, he was not in a position to say.

Senator Gerlach then asked if there was any notion of a kind of timetable for this, or was this to be strung out ad infinitum. Senator Gerlach then asked what he could do personally to help things along beyond what he had already gotten through Senator Sterns' committee, etc.?

President Proenza replied that in the spirit of collegiality, he thought we could get it done in the next six months. He could not promise that, so please add that caveat to the minutes, but it would be done he trusted, before his lifetime was done. To which Senator Gerlach added that the President might think about the Senator's lifetime as well.

UNIVERSITY WELL-BEING COMMITTEE – Senator Erickson stated that she would give a very brief oral report to inform Senators that the committee was working on the health insurance contract, both the subcommittee and the committee as a whole. That was in process so we had not got a detailed, end-result to report, but hopefully would have one for the next Senate meeting. The other issues were ones that we were looking into, in many cases, again. One was the expansion of child care which was in subcommittee spearheaded by chairs under John Zipp. The committee was bringing up the issues again of banking sick leave and domestic partner benefits. Finally, the committee was working with difficulties faced when trying to get any expansion of wellness activities on the campus. Again, this was ongoing; we had not gotten a final report. If any had any input into any of these issues, please either see or email her.

GRADUATE COUNCIL - See (Appendix A) for monthly report.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Stokes stated that the committee had several motions that were forwarded to the Senators a couple of weeks ago. She directed the Senators' attention to the proposed changes in the rule that dealt with incompletes (Appendix B-1). A suggestion came from Senator Norfolk that the words be changed to say that, "Failure to make up omitted work satisfactorily by the end of the following term" be changed to, "Failure to make up the omitted work satisfactorily by the date that grades are due for the following term." The way it reads currently indicated that the incomplete had to be completed before final exams. By changing it, it allowed completion of incompletes through exam week. This came as a motion from APCC.

Senator J. Yoder then stated she wanted to speak against the motion, because if faculty got work on the day the grades were due, we had no time to grade it. So she would like to leave it the way it was, which was due at the end of the semester. Students had had a full semester to work on it, and she thought by the end of classes they should have their work completed.

Chair Sheffer then called for further discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote on the motion. Division of the house indicated 15 votes in favor of the motion and 24 opposed. The motion failed.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the next motion which dealt with transient work at another university (**Appendix B-2**). Suggested changes were that, "Prior written permission be obtained before transient work can be applied towards the degree, and it needs to be obtained from the student's degree-granting college. This question was brought by the College of Business. They were concerned that too much transient work was being requested and applied towards degrees here at the University.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. Senator Sterns stated that there were certain agreements among state universities, that if people took courses at other universities, there were certain formal agreements between Ohio universities where work done at one was to be recognized by the others. He was not trying to be problematic about this, but he remembered being involved in this discussion a number of years ago. He thought there were certain rules and regs. that applied to all state universities that might go against this motion. Associate Provost Stokes replied that the motion did not state that the university would not accept the credit.

Senator Erickson then stated that she was a little confused about permission being granted before. It needed to be clear to every single person that permission had to be obtained in advance. The fact it absolutely had to be done before and not afterward did not give any flexibility to an adviser. It was not clear what the College of Business had in mind here. It seemed to her there was a degree of flexibility that was needed in this situation that would be eliminated with this motion.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that part of the discussion in committee was to put prior written permission so as not to disadvantage the student who took a class somewhere and expected that it would be transferred, came back and then found out that it was not accepted and they had already paid for it.

Senator Norfolk stated that he felt it did not have much to do Senator Stern's comment; it really had much to do with the residency requirement issue, because we still must accept the credits once we officially said they were actually transferred. It was a question of whether we were going to let them modify the residency requirement for a degree to bring the credits back.

Senator Steiner then asked, is it not in the current policy that there is no need to be approved if they were transferring credit in? Assoc. Provost Stokes replied that this was correct.

Senator Steiner then continued. So it was just that permission had to come beforehand rather than after the fact. The second thing was, did we know anything about the policies of other area universities in this manner, because it also worked the other way if they were enrolled in programs at other universities that took transient credit here and transferred it. He would not want to jeopardize that if our policy was more stringent than that of our competitors.

No further discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote of the motion. The Chair ruled that the motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. Moving from transient to transfer credit, Senators also had a chart attached to this about addressing Senator Steiner's question; we did know what the transfer policy was at neighboring institutions (**Appendix B-3**). APCC was recommending that the transfer policy be changed so that only grades of C or better transfer, except for the Ohio transfer module for general education classes.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the motion. Dean K. Mugler indicated she would like to address the body. Chair Sheffer sought permission from the body for her to do so. Granted, Dean K. Mugler began by stating that she did have some responsibility for the course equivalencies and transfer services. Her office did the general education evaluation of the students' records when they arrived. She also knew that our transfer population was increasing. This last year we had over 900 new students in the fall as transfer students. If the students were transferring in on probation with less than a 2. GPA, in University College they had to do a contract. She would say that a lot of our students who were coming from other institutions did choose The University of Akron because we were liberal and allowed D work to transfer in. Whether it met college's requirements or not or department's requirements or not would be up to the department. Sometimes students must retake a course here that they got a D in somewhere else. But in allowing students to transfer in with a D, we have found that, when students have done a contract - we had about 75 this term - only 22 of those students were dismissed as related to having to do well within one term. She was presenting this as evidence as to how our students had succeeded when they had not done well somewhere else but were still able to use those courses to meet either general education requirements or other requirements.

The Chair called for further discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes continued with the dean's list policy (**Appendix B-4**). APCC proposed a change as being made to have the dean's list GPA be consistent with the GPA for honors. Currently the dean's list GPA was 3.25 and the lowest GPA for honors was a 3.4. So consequently, a student could make dean's list their entire career here at the institution and still not graduate with honors. So we were suggesting that we raise the GPA for dean's list to 3.4 to be consistent with the honors and that developmental programs that were not considered in determining dean's list honors.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote. The motion carried.

Associate Provost Stokes continued. The next motion coming from APCC dealt with advanced study for University faculty and University programs (**Appendix B-5**). This was brought forward by Vice President Newkome, who wanted to have a policy in place that addressed what our faculty could do in order to obtain an advanced degree here at our University. We currently had no rule that addressed that at all, so this was first forwarded by VP Newkome. The committee had worked on it to expand it because the original request only dealt with doctoral study. The committee felt that we should also include master study and the juris doctor study. This came as a motion from APCC.

The Chair called for discussion of the motion, and Senator Sterns obliged. He stated he wanted to raise a couple of issues that were worthy of our spending some time on in regard to this policy. That was, we had to understand that each university had its own unique way of bringing departments together in different clusters and in different colleges. When he reviewed this, we had under the College of Education that someone could be in the department of sports science & wellness but want to pursue a degree in counseling. Now counseling was also under the College of Education, an entirely different department, whole different area and faculty but it was in the same college. He thought this piece was fine if we just brought it down to the department level. He thought we had to be real careful about this. He could look around this room and know a number of people here who had done advanced degrees right here on campus that would violate this rule. Also, one of his distinguished colleagues who was an expert in this area, Dr. Michael Sugarman, actually sent a message along these lines. He stated that the tech.ed. program had been a major vehicle for many faculty on campus to get special degrees; often they had been within the same college. The questions also could be raised as to how this applied to spouses and dependents. Senator Sterns stated that his wife had a Ph.D. from the joint sociology program which was in the same college cluster; his son had a Ph.D. in IO psychology. He had recused himself in all aspects of that program as he went through it, so his family totally violated this.

Chair Sheffer then asked Senator Sterns whether he proposed any amendments or whether he was speaking against the whole thing. Senator Sterns replied that he felt it deserved further study.

Associate Provost Stokes then offered a timely suggestion. If (A)(1) were reworded to mirror what (B)(1)(a) stated and it was added that a full-time faculty member may not become a doctoral candidate within his or her own department or school, would this be acceptable? Senator Sterns replied that it would be closer to what he had in mind. He then made this motion to amend; Senator Norfolk seconded this motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion on the amendment to change the wording in (A)(1): A full-time faculty member may not become a doctoral candidate within his or her own



department or school. The same would follow on (B)(1)(a): We would take our (a) and (b) and just make it (1): A full-time faculty member may not become a master's candidate within his or her own college.

No discussion forthcoming, a vote on the amendment was taken. The amendment passed. Senator Jordan then began discussion on the amended motion. He stated that he had at least a proposal for an amendment and then another concern. The document referred to juris doctorate study, and there was no such thing as a juris doctorate. He would move that the term juris doctorate be replaced by the term juris doctor in the places in which it appeared

This was seconded by Senator Lee. No discussion of this amendment forthcoming, a vote was taken. The amendment was passed.

Senator Jordan then continued. The second problem was that in (D) it said that a faculty member may register for no more than 6 hours of formal course work in any semester, etc. If you wanted to come to the Law School you had to take a minimum of 9 hours to be in our part-time program. We did take a look at whether we could arrange some kind of special program, and it did not appear that you could get through the Law School within the time required by taking a 6 hour load. Our concern in part was that it said in the end of (D), in no case shall the opportunity for advanced study be denied, which would have to mean you would be given permission to take the juris doctor despite the general 6 hour credit limit. So he proposed the following language as an amendment, which would be after the reference to 6 credit hours of formal course work in part (D), to insert the parenthetical (9 hours if pursuing a juris doctor degree).

Senator Lee seconded this amendment. Chair Sheffer then called for discussion.

Associate Provost Stokes replied that she understood Senator Jordan's concern to the Law School and appreciated that he had looked into whether or not the Law School could readjust scheduling. However, she would be concerned that if we did that, that meant that department chairs would not be able to say to anyone who wished to pursue a law degree, "No you cannot because your work load is too great," or, "We need more attention and taking 9 hours was too much." This would not allow any flexibility for the department chair to make that kind of a decision. If the person wished to pursue the juris doctor degree, they would have to be allowed to.

Senator Jordan added that at the end of (D) it said, "However in no case shall the opportunity for advanced study be denied." The problem was that it would create a misimpression among faculty because they would not be able to take less than 9 credits at the Law School. So there really was not an opportunity to go to the Law School under some arrangement that you took fewer than 9 or fewer than 6 or just 6.

Senator Braun then spoke in favor of the amendment. This was taken as a part-time student, so it was taken outside the framework of what you were doing here at the University. Secondly, if you selectively denied some people the right to go and improve themselves, then you created a second tier of people versus all the others. Including this exception here because these were the rules of the Law School should be allowed. Now if you wanted to put something there saying department heads of their departments should be notified, he would agree with that. But he strongly disagreed with them having a veto to tell you what to do with your life. He strongly supported this amendment.

President Proenza suggested that this might be handled with a qualifier that in a sense goes to the issue of conflict of commitment and enables that to be a management plan developed for people that would need to take more than 6 hours.

Senator Gerlach then called for a reading of the amendment as proposed by Senator Jordan. Chair Sheffer did so and called for further discussion of the amendment. None forthcoming, the amendment to the motion was approved.

Senator Erickson then pointed out to Senator Jordan that a similar issue existed in (E) in this same proposal. Senator Jordan then offered a similar amendment to this section of the motion. No discussion forthcoming from the floor, the Chair called for a vote. This amendment was passed as well. No further discussion forthcoming on the motion as amended, the body then voted. The amended motion was passed.

Associate Provost continued with the last motion coming from the committee. This dealt with changes to the academic reassessment policy and reflected current practice at the institutions across the state of Ohio and beyond (**Appendix B-6**). The revised version was sent to Senators yesterday and the revisions came in an email from joint conversations with people who had concerns when the first version went out. Again, she thought that it was very good that we were sending things out ahead of time because that way the system worked.

Chair Sheffer then called for discussion of the motion.

Secretary Kennedy stated that she had been talking with the colleagues in her college about some of this. There was the feeling that this was still a very punitive policy even though the revisions had been made. One question that needed clarification was item 3, the "new" item 3 which was previously item 5. Could Associate Provost Stokes explain exactly what that item meant?

Associate Provost Stokes stated that in the case of an associate program, 50% of a student's degree would be 32 hours, where normally it's 64. So following re-enrollment the student would have to come back and take 32 hours here - 24 of those or the first 24 they have to take at 2.5 average, so that means they would have 8 remaining credit hours to take to meet the 50 percent requirement.

Secretary Kennedy then asked that, if a student completed 60 percent and then took off some time, grew up and came back and decided to pursue the same degree, they would not be allowed to do that?

Associate Provost Stokes stated no, the student would have to retake anything they got a D in.

Secretary Kennedy stated that that was part of her point. The policy said students had to have completed a minimum of 50 percent of the total hours required – or what? Associate Provost Stokes replied that they were not reassessed. So, if a student did not have 50 percent remaining, he or she would not be reassessed. Secretary Kennedy then asked, if a student had 60 percent completed and then came back for reassessment, he or she could not? Associate Provost Stokes replied that the student could, but would be told that a D credit would have to be repeated and then that would count in the new number because the D or the F would not count.

Senator Braun then asked that if these decisions made it harder to come back, what was the thinking behind it? Why would we implement a policy to make it harder for the people to actually come back? Associate Provost Stokes replied that they could come back; they just may not be reassessed.

Senator Braun questioned what the consequence would be if they were not reassessed? Did they pick up where they stopped, or did they have to pick up from the beginning? Because assessment basically said, "I'm going to see what you are doing and am going to tell you how much of this still can count."

Associate Provost Stokes stated that what reassessment did was to state that any grade at D+ or lower would not count toward a student's degree. In the reassessment it would remove those GPA grades from a student's record so that his or her new GPA would not reflect those D+'s, D's, D-'s or F's. Reassessment is so a student can raise his or her GPA. Senator Braun then asked whether this were a compulsory thing. Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was elective.

Senator Erickson asked for clarification of statements under 2: "Only courses taken prior to the first 3-year absence will be subject to academic reassessment." She had had discussions with people in her college who had said that when dealing with a student who got their act together and was coming back, there was only one chance here. What happened if a student came back and dropped and came back again? Wouldn't we want some flexibility here?

Associate Provost Stokes then stated that the intent of the policy was to aid students who came and were ill-prepared for the University in the first place, if they did very poorly, quit and went out and worked in the world. Then, they came back years later and were more mature and were ready to actually learn and do well. So now they had to get 24 credits in order to apply for reassessment at 2.5 or above and it did not matter how long it would take them to get that

24 credits. They could be here for two semesters and then out for a year, here for 3 semesters, out for 2 more years until they get those 24 credits.

Senator Erickson then asked whether it did not matter what grades these students got. Associate Provost Stokes replied that it did. These students had to have a 2.5 or above in those first 24 credits, and then they were reassessed for the time where they were not prepared and not ready to come to school in the first place.

Senator Erickson replied that while she herself did not have to go through this situation, listening to those who did, she felt they were concerned that what had before been a fairly flexible policy was now a very, very inflexible policy. It seemed these people would consider this to be to the detriment of students who were trying to get an effective degree at The University of Akron.

Secretary Kennedy added that she would like to echo that as well as Senator Braun's concern that it was punitive and in effect would be driving students from the University. Senator Braun then added a final comment. This policy was optional; students did not have to have it if they did not want it.

Senator Spiker then responded to the terminology, in reference to things being referred to as "punitive." She would ask people to consider that this was an elective policy and the fact of the matter was, if there were no policy at all students would be stuck with whatever they got in bad grades. The fact that the policy even existed was a benefit for the students. She asked that terminology be used which did not include the use of the word punitive.

Dean K. Mugler asked for permission to speak to the body. This was granted. Dean K. Mugler stated that in 2001 we had 32 students in University College reassessed; 19 in 2002. This was a way for students to come back. Yes, we had had students with a lot of credits reassessed, but they still had to do 60+ credits in their program. Sometimes there were students who had earned an associate degree, got on into taking a certificate, and then finally decided what they wanted to do with the rest of their lives so they used it. Regarding what Professor Erickson said about the first, second or the third stop-out, we had had students in the past and we've been able to use the second 3-yr. break in attendance. Take for example, a student who had done very poorly in the very beginning, was out for three years and worked a little while, came back and just earned 2. grades and did 30 credits at about 2. level. Then the person was out for ten years, had kids, came back, and now wanted to get into nursing or education. That person was going to have to work and work to take at least 30 credits of B or better work to get to a 2.5 to be even considered for that program. They wouldn't qualify, because the first 30 credits they did after the first stop-out didn't work for them. So as a dean she used the flexibility of whatever worked in the best interest of the student to come back. She knew that the committee had chosen not to do it that way. She knew that Deborah Gwin, who was director of Adult Focus, had said that the proposal as written did disadvantage mothers and others who had more than one stop-out in their college careers.

Senator John then added to the discussion. Overall, he thought we were headed in the right direction, but it needed a little bit more fine-tuning. Like the new no. 3. After reading the statement in the new no. 3, the first thing that came into his mind was - or what? Maybe we could put "for example," and give an example. He felt it left too much open for interpretation. Secondly, he had a problem with the very last statement about the conditions of this policy. That it could not be appealed. Who did the assessment? Was it the Registrar's office?

Associate Provost Stokes replied that it was the dean of the college first, and then the Registrar.

To which Senator John asked whether there were any way a student could appeal this decision. He had a problem with the lack of flexibility there. Overall, he was heading toward a motion that this be tabled and sent back to committee for more input.

To which Secretary Kennedy added that the motion would also include APCC considering input from the Academic Support Services Committee out of VP Roney's office, which had also worked on this policy issue.

The motion was seconded. The chair called for discussion on the motion to refer this back to APCC with additional input from Vice President Roney's committee. None forthcoming, a vote was taken. The body passed this motion.

Senator Sterns asked for the chair's indulgence; he wanted to raise one point with regard to advanced study for University faculty. To clarify the rule we passed, how would this rule affect those faculty already in graduate programs? If someone was already pursuing a degree who did not meet this level, he would like to make a recommendation to consider grandfathering.

Senator Witt then raised a concern about the reporting mechanism as to how Faculty Senate was notified of regulations when they became policy. We amended and forwarded on, and then he was not sure what happened. Chair Sheffer advised that that be taken up as part of New Business.

Senator Norfolk then made a motion that the Senate move to committee of the whole. Senator Steiner seconded this, and the body voted its approval.

After discussion during committee of the whole, Senator Norfolk made a motion to rise and report. This was seconded; the body approved this motion. Vice Chair Erickson rose to report that regarding the incomplete policy that had been voted on earlier, there were suggestions that the wording was a problem, and with rewording it could well be reconsidered.

Senator Hebert, who voted against the motion initially, so moved to reconsider. Senator Norfolk seconded this motion. The Senate then approved the reconsideration of the motion.

Associate Provost Stokes then provided language to amend the policy: "Failure to make up the amended work satisfactorily by the end of exam week and the grade to be reported on the date the grades are due for the following term."

Senator Norfolk moved to accept this amendment; Senator Wilkinson seconded this motion. No further discussion forthcoming, the body then approved the amendment. Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the motion as amended. President Proenza stated he wished to recognize a wonderful achievement. The body then voted to approve the amended motion.

Dean K. Mugler, with permission to address the body once more, asked, with regard to the grades coming in for transfer students, when would that go into effect? We already had students applying and we needed to be able to have the admission officers inform those students coming in. So would it be for summer or for fall, 2003?

Based on discussion of possible suggestions on the floor, Senator Soucek then moved that this policy go into effect Fall of 2003. Chair Sheffer called for further discussion of the motion. None forthcoming, the body voted its approval of the motion.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Stokes reported that the committee was bringing a motion to the Senate so that language can be placed in the Bulletin and on-line to say, "Students who wish to substitute equivalent course work for course prerequisites may be unable to register on-line. These students must contact the department to register." We had had students try to register and then not be able to because of equivalencies and course substitutions. We would like to notify them that they may be unable to do that.

No discussion forthcoming, the Chair called for a vote on the motion. The motion carried.

See (Appendix C) for list of Curriculum Proposals.

CAMPUS FACILITIES AND PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Sterns promised to make his report quick. He presented to Senate a write up on President Hezleton Simmons done by Dr. Simmons' daughter, Patricia. This was the background information that we all had been waiting for to understand better the role that President Hezleton Simmons played in the history of our University. Senator Sterns had asked Mrs. Quillin to provide each one of the Senators an emailed copy of this document (Appendix D). He hoped that we would be able to find a way to recognize Dr. Simmons' contribution. He had made a number of suggestions to Patricia Simmons; he had steered her to Mr. Laguardia because he thought we had an opportunity here to do some significant development for the University. There were many people who viewed Simmons Hall as part of their history at The University of Akron, as a major part of their life here in the 30's and 40's, right up until just a few years ago. There might be a fundraising aspect there, and he has also addressed this with Mrs. Graves who was in charge of that area of our Board of Trustees. He would like to say to Dr. Proenza that we had an opportunity here to

do something good for the University from both a developmental perspective and also to meet the concerns of some alumni who had spoken to him personally about this issue. Dr. Simmons might be the person who could most relate to running this University in tough times, because so far the Great Depression probably was more of a challenge than the current era.

President Proenza again rose to recognize the due diligence and excellent work on behalf of the committee and all who had supported that. Given that this was perhaps the largest change in the stock market since the Great Depression, he was not sure about how that particular historical fact would fare in future years.

Senator Gerlach wanted to briefly reiterate something that needed to be kept in mind by Senator Sterns' committee and everyone else. That was his strong, strong urging that these two names in particular, Gardner and Simmons, be attached to buildings. That we have a Gardner Hall or Student Center or Student Services Building, and that we have a new Simmons Hall. Because, if nothing else, it was in keeping with the precedence that we had had in previous years. Old Crouse Hall was replaced with a new Crouse Hall; old Olin Hall was replaced with a new Olin Hall. The Bierce Library which disappeared for a while resurfaced, and was now on the library. We owed it as an act of filial piety to these people in the past of this University to keep their names alive in this particular way. Since the names were affixed to buildings, let's follow the precedent.

Senator Sterns replied that while he could not speak for the committee as a whole, he as an individual did support Dr. Gerlach. Senator Sterns felt the committee would have to address this officially.

FACULTY RESEARCH COMMITTEE - See (Appendix E) for 2003 Summer Fellowships.

PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE - Senator Fenwick began his report by stating that he hoped Senators had had a chance to read the report that had been put out on the Senate listserve (Appendix F). Fundamentally, the PBC had been working on the budget, which had doubled in the size of the deficit since December. Now we were looking at trying toward zero. We were working with the same set of assumptions we started in December with one exception. The assumptions we were making included a flat enrollment, a flat subsidy from the state, a 6 percent tuition increase in a cap. The one assumption that we had in December that had changed was that we had accepted the Well-Being Committee's insistence in a recommendation that health care insurance costs would be \$2.4 million instead of \$1.2 million. Based on those assumptions the budget deficit had gone up from approximately \$7 million to 14.5 million. The last draft we were working with, draft 4 which was presented to the PBC last week, included the following major scenarios. We included a 3% merit pay pool that came to little over \$3 million; salary compression pool that came to \$1 million; an increase in payroll-related fringes that were not related to health care to \$1.3 million. Not all those increases in the fringe benefit costs were due to the salary pool compression. There was about a \$600,000 increase in fringe benefits in our December draft with no pay increase and no compression. No. 4, a \$2.1 million increase that

was earmarked for the upgrade to Peoplesoft 8. This PBC saw was the first of a 3-year spread out of costs that would take the University to upgrade Peoplesoft 8. It was projected by Vice President Ray that the cost would be \$6 million in total. Then finally, an increase in the campus budget reserve of \$1.7 million from approximately \$300,000. Again, Senator Fenwick cautioned everyone that these were not final numbers, but the numbers we were using in further discussion. These numbers might go up or down in the next month. The other point was, in an attempt to gain more information about the budget, PBC met in December and had asked the various vice presidents and unit heads for more detailed budget information. We asked for prioritizing of their budgets and budget cuts under the following scenarios: with 5%, 10% and 15% budget cuts. We asked for the impacts those budget cuts would have on the overall mission of the University. Again, there was some misinterpretation that we were implying across-the-board cuts by asking the unit heads for these budget numbers. Everything was on the table. The memo was sent out not to imply any scenario or strategy for cutting the budget. Again, this was something that was in process, and at the current time we as a committee were in the process of evaluating these responses and putting them into budgets.

The other action PBC engaged in was to recommend to APCC approval of the creation of an Honors College for the current University Honors Program, the change not to involve any additional revenues or resources.

President Proenza then offered the following comments on Senator Fenwick's report.

"I might just make two observations - I thank you, Senator Fenwick, for the report and the due diligence. Indeed Senator Lee expressed very well some of the struggles that we're all going through in trying to figure out how we're going to adjust to the current budget scenario. It is not easy and any and all good ideas are welcome. One good piece of news which may not have been appropriately signaled to you is that while going into the beginning of spring semester we had anticipated the possibility of a shortfall because of enrollment in spring semester, the news at the 14th day is very positive. We actually had in head count a little over 1% increase and in semester credit hours also a little over 1% increase. So both of those will make the current fiscal year scenario a little bit better, particularly in light of some possible yet year-end cuts that may result from the legislature and the Governor's recommendation. Secondly, I am pleased that Senator Fenwick reported on the request of PBC to all of us, the entire University, for these various scenarios. This request was reported by another group in the University as not coming from the PBC, and as is often the case, rumors abound, and I did not get the chance to collect a tax, but since you've dispelled that other rumor, I thank you."

Senator Fenwick pointed out that the memo in question really came about from the Senate members of the committee. The Senate members got together over the Christmas break because we wanted more information. So the response was really kind of a grassroots movement to obtain more information from units. It implied no strategy for raising or changing numbers.



Senator Norfolk spoke, stating that he had raised both of these issues last year when on PBC. With the situation as dire as it was now, PBC should seriously consider doing away with a plateau - the 12 to 15 credit plateau. The other thing, given what he had seen of the ROI figures, he thought we should seriously consider differential tuition in every one of the professional schools - Nursing and Law already had it; but in Engineering and Business also.

Senator Witt then asked whether the report considered any state reductions. Senator Fenwick replied that it did not; it was just flat. Senator Witt then followed with a question about the four scenarios. Everything was on the table? These four were brought to our attention for a specific reason?

Senator Fenwick replied that it was for informational reasons. It was important to keep the Senate notified of what PBC was doing and what we were working with.

Senator Witt asked whether PBC was considering these things and the rest of the budget. Senator Fenwick answered that these were the major changes that had been put in the budget since the first draft came about in December - the merit pay, which was not in the Dec. budget, compression was not, the payroll fringes were \$600,000 and there was no upgrade to Peoplesoft put in the budget. Looking back, he thought the budget reserve increase was zero. What he wanted to do was go through the budget and look at the line items with increases of a million dollars or more and highlight those changes.

Secretary Kennedy then stated that she wanted to direct a question to Senator Norfolk regarding his comments about the plateau issue. In particular, which college was he talking about? Secretary Kennedy knew that when the plateau was in place before for the C& T college, it disproportionately affected our students. Our students were seeing up to a 38% increase in their tuition. She wanted clarification of who Senator Norfolk was addressing when he discussed removing the plateau.

Senator Norfolk replied that we would have to readdress it for all students; we had to. We might be able to juggle it so that we did not increase tuition by 6% per credit, but essentially, giving students free credits when we were \$14 million in the hole, we could not afford.

Senator Calvo asked, when a Senator wanted to make a recommendation on something in the budget, what was the best way to go about doing that?

Chair Sheffer suggested that a Senator wishing to do so contact his or her college's Senate representative on PBC and that individual could forward it to PBC.

Senator Calvo then asked a question regarding how PBC is considering priorities. To which Senator Lee replied that it was important to convey that all the line items were being focused on really hard because it was hard to get \$50 million. There was nothing exempt. There were particular concerns about the Library; they were being as fully heard as any issue is on

PBC. There was a very strong contingent on PBC that wanted to protect the Library, but no decision had been made that it would be held harmless or that it was going to have to share the cuts. So that was a report on how the process was going but not on any specifics.

Senator Soucek then asked whose responsibility the budget was really. He had served on other senates at other universities and he had never seen so much detail and almost taking over administrative caveats than this in his whole tenure. Whose responsibility was it to do the budgeting and to choose where the cuts came from?

Chair Sheffer replied that from our bylaws, it was a consultative process. The Planning & Budgeting Committee was made up of Senators and was also made up of the Provost, VP of Business and Finance, several other individuals who could be there for informational purposes. PBC formulated a budget, brought it to Senate, Senate would approve, modify, amend it, and as all other decisions in Senate, we made a recommendation to the President who took that budget either as it was, amended it, sent it back for reconsideration. But the President took it to the Board of Trustees, so that was the final authority.

Senator Soucek then asked whether the Senate had real input other than advice? Essentially, the buck stopped with the President because he was the President and he was appointed to do so. Chair Sheffer agreed but stated that by Faculty Senate bylaws, we had to give him a recommendation.

Senator J. Yoder asked whether Senator Fenwick could report on the progress of the ROI for the administrative units. Senator Fenwick replied that PBC had two subcommittees who were working on the ROI reassessment and ROI quality measures. However, they had been primarily concerned with measures on the academic side.

Senator Lee added for clarification that he was working on one of those ROI subcommittees. It was not on our agenda to talk about a way to apply ROI to the administrative side. So if that was on PBC's plate, he did not think it had been discussed at all.

Senator Lee then asked Senator Fenwick to report with regard to the information we asked for from all of the units. Had PBC gotten reports back from all the units?

Senator Fenwick replied that with three exceptions, PBC had gotten reports back. Those three with no response were from Dean Newkome in the Graduate School, from Kathy Watson in Human Resources (that had been sent late because Amy Gilliland said that for purposes of budget she was a vice president), and from Ted Mallo in Legal. PBC was informed that Mr. Mallo's office worked directly under the Board; we might not have the authority to ask for those numbers. But everyone else had timely sent them in and some were very good reports. We were in the process of evaluating those reports now.

President Proenza then offered these comments on the plateau issue:

"Just to inform of a suggestion that's been made - the concept of altering the plateau is meritorious to look at. As with anything, it's important that we be sure to address all of the subtleties associated with it. For example, the fact that we're not collecting tuition on those hours within the plateau does not necessarily mean however that we're not collecting state subsidy. So if we alter the students' behavior and they drop back, do not pay tuition and we do not get subsidy, we actually have a net revenue loss. To that end, because we do have a window of experience, I have asked Institutional Research to begin to inform that question with the behavior that has taken place over the last year and a half. I think we did alter the plateau about a year and a half ago, so we have a year and a half of data and we will certainly provide that data to inform the question. But again, here's an example of the subtleties in which a very simple and on the surface immediately obvious suggestion may in fact cause a negative budgetary result unless we actually understand what the outcome will be."

Senator Clark asked for information as to what the plateau was. Senator Norfolk stated that essentially, a student taking between 12 and 15 credits pays the same price in a semester. They pay for 12 - no additional. Senator Clark then asked why. Senator Norfolk offered one answer, which was tradition.

Senator Sterns had a question for Senator Fenwick who had mentioned there was one area that PBC was not able to get information from. As this was a public institution of the state of Ohio, and all financial information was open to the public, why was that not possible? Senator Fenwick replied that he would check into that.

**V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** - Chair Sheffer directed the body's attention to the one item of old business, the consideration of the proposed addition to The University of Akron Bylaws of the Faculty Senate 3359-10-02(B)(6): "Motions or resolutions which embody major recommendations shall be posted on the Senate listserv at least seven days prior to a scheduled meeting at which a vote is to occur. All messages must include a statement of the rationale in support of the motion. The Senate may by majority vote override this provision to bring a motion to the floor." That was moved and seconded at our last meeting and is now on the table for discussion.

The Chair then called for discussion of this motion.

Senator Gerlach stated that he wanted to make a motion to amend it slightly, because as he read the rationale for it, a great deal of emphasis was placed here on the work of committees. We ought to make clear that these recommendations were coming from committees, not necessarily from individual Senators. Because if the language was adopted as it was originally proposed, it would put a gag in every Senator's mouth unless he or she had done his advanced homework. He begged to point out that the rationale that all Senators could both receive and post messages through the Senate listserv - he could not receive anything as he was not on that line. So he wanted to make a simple motion so as to insert the words, "from committees" after

recommendations in the second line. So it would read then, "Motions or resolutions which embody major recommendations from committees shall be posted..."

This motion was seconded by Senator Steiner. The Chair then called for discussion of the amendment.

Senator Sterns pointed out that the Senate would probably have to change totally how we did business. For instance, resolutions that regularly came from the Facilities Planning Committee, as we have to meet quickly the week before, would now not be eligible without Senate voting to override. He wanted to point out that it affected all committees that way.

Senator Gerlach mentioned that the last sentence should save Senator Sterns from this concern. This did not, however, safeguard individual Senators who might want to bring something up at the last minute, at least for consideration because it could always be voted down or referred to committee. He asked Senators to defend their senatorial right to speak and introduce things and yet at the same time back this motion to bring business in a timely way before the Senate in advance of its meetings from the committees.

Senator Kreidler then moved to amend the amendment so that the word "major" was changed to "committee." Senator Gerlach accepted this as a friendly amendment. Senator Sterns seconded it.

Secretary Kennedy asked whether the amendment then stated that any recommendation from a committee had to be posted. She felt that the reason for putting major in there was to indicate motions of significance that needed some time for discussion. She then asked Senator Yoder whether that had not been the original idea as coming from the Executive Committee. Senator Yoder replied it was one on which the Executive Committee had disagreed. She had wanted major out.

Secretary Kennedy then pointed out that this now said every committee recommendation had to go on the listserve. To which Senator J. Yoder replied that they should. Senator Kennedy replied that that did not take into account the point made by Senator Sterns; some committees are unable to meet until right before a Senate meeting. They would now either have to wait for the next meeting or spend meeting time going through a vote. Speaking as Secretary and on behalf of Marilyn Quillin whose duty it is to collect reports from committees before meetings, timeliness is not the norm.

Senator Kreidler replied that it just left such an opening; what's major, what's minor and what's in between. We did this in most of our colleges, and then if something came up you dealt with it.

Senator Jordan asked whether the body could hear why this was proposed in the first place. In order to vote on the amendment he needed to understand why the main motion itself

was proposed in the first place. His impression was that committee reports had already come in sufficiently well in advance and we knew those things, and that it was more a matter of addressing individuals.

Senator J. Yoder replied that the intent was to have committee work come to us soon enough that we could have an informed discussion of it among ourselves and with our constituents.

Senator Dechambeau then stated that the motion needed to be amended; there were copyright concerns regarding the word "listserve". It would be best to change this word to the phrase, "electronic discussion list" to be safe.

She proposed this amendment as a motion to the body; Senator Steiner seconded her motion.

Chair Sheffer called for discussion of the amendment. None forthcoming, the body approved the amendment. The Chair called for further discussion of the motion as amended. Associate Provost Stokes asked for permission to address the body. As to intent, was it for informational purposes so people had a chance to talk to their constituencies? Was there also the intent to have feedback come to the committee so that it could make whatever alterations it might be able to make before it went forward to facilitate? This was affirmed.

Chair Sheffer called for additional discussion. None forthcoming, he called for a vote on the motion. The Chair ruled that the motion passed in excess of 60 percent.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS** - Senator Witt made a request of the Executive Committee. He wanted to know when the rules and regulations that Senate passes are implemented as University policy. Regarding the University rules, there was sometimes a lag time between that sort of thing. He did not want to have to check a website or wait for postings. He would like a scoreboard.

Chair Sheffer replied to Senator Witt, stating that the Executive Committee would work on a mechanism to make sure he got this.

Associate Provost Stokes offered her assistance in this process.

Dean Capers then asked for permission to speak. She asked as to when the new policy regarding Dean's list and GPA was going to go into effect and whether that would affect students currently enrolled in our programs that might be graduating this spring?

Chair Sheffer replied that the Senate would send the recommendations to President Proenza, who would deal with it either himself or send it to the Board for approval. Then he

would inform us of his decisions. He had 45 days to do that from the time we sent him the results of our vote.

Senator Gerlach added that it would be an ex post facto law; it had to take effect somewhere in the future.

**VII. GOOD OF THE ORDER** – Per Mrs. Quillin, Secretary Kennedy asked that Senators arriving late be sure to sign an attendance sheet posted on one of the doors to the meeting room.

The Chair then called for a motion to adjourn. This was so moved and seconded. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

*Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillin*

APPENDIX A**Report to Faculty Senate from Graduate Council****Synopsis of Minutes from December 9, 2002 meeting:**

- Minutes of the November 25, 2002 meeting were approved.
- Dr. Newkome reported that he is still having a difficult time acquiring data from Institutional Planning, data necessary to understand current procedures and plan future operations.
- 29 Curriculum Proposals were approved (proposals came from Arts & Sciences, Business, Education and Nursing).
- The Graduate Faculty Membership Committee reported that 19 graduate faculty applications and revised graduate faculty membership criteria were received from the School of Dance, Theatre, and Arts Administration and the College of Engineering. After reviewing these submissions, the committee referred six applications back to their respective departments, as the applicants did not meet the criteria of the category for which they had applied. Twelve applications were approved for the category requested. One application was distributed to Graduate Council for review. The GC approved both sets of membership criteria. After discussion, GC voted unanimously to approve the proposed use of a university exception (Rule 3359-D-2-G) affording renowned Polymer scientist, Dr. R.B. Pipes, Category II graduate faculty membership. Dr. Newkome noted that colleges should be aware that similar situations may arise in the future, wherein exceptional individuals from either academia or industry need to be rewarded by the University for their contributions.

**Synopsis of January 27, 2003 meeting (minutes not yet available):**

- Minutes of the December 9, 2002 meeting were approved.
- 22 Curriculum Proposals were approved (proposals came from Arts & Sciences, Business, Education, Nursing, Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering).
- There were no committee reports.

APPENDIX B-1

## INCOMPLETE

From rule 3359-60-03.5-A-4

"I" - "Incomplete:" indicates that the student has done passing work in the course but that some part of the work is, for good and acceptable reason, not complete at the end of the term. Failure to make up the omitted work satisfactorily by the end of the following term, not including summer sessions, converts the "I" to an "F." When the work is satisfactorily completed within the allotted time, the "I" is converted to whatever grade the student has earned. (If instructors wish to extend the "I" grade beyond the following term for which the student is registered, prior to the end of the term they must notify the registrar's office in writing of the extension and indicate the date of its termination. It is the responsibility of the student to make arrangements to make up the incomplete work. The faculty member should submit the new grade to the registrar's office in writing.)

## INCOMLETE

From Undergraduate bulletin, pg. 43

I - Incomplete: indicates that the student has done passing work in the course but that some part of the work is, for good and acceptable reason, not complete at the end of the term. Failure to make up the omitted work satisfactorily by the end of the following term, not including summer sessions, converts the "I" to an "F." When the work is satisfactorily completed within the allotted time, the "I" is converted to whatever grade the student has earned. (If instructors wish to extend the "I" grade beyond the following term for which the student is registered, prior to the end of the term they must notify the Office of the Registrar in writing of the extension and indicate the date of its termination. It is the responsibility of the student to make arrangements to make up the incomplete work. The faculty member should submit the new grade to the Office of the Registrar in writing.)

## PROPOSED CHANGES:

"I" - "Incomplete:" indicates that the student has done passing work in the course but that some part of the work is, for good and acceptable reason, not complete at the end of the term. Failure to make up the omitted work satisfactorily by the ~~end of~~ date that grades are due for the following term, not including summer sessions, converts the "I" to an "F." When the work is satisfactorily completed within the allotted time, the "I" is converted to whatever grade the student has earned. (If instructors wish to extend the "I" grade beyond the following term for which the student is registered, prior to the end of the term they must notify the registrar's office in writing of the extension and indicate the date of its termination. It is the responsibility of the student to make arrangements to make up the incomplete work. The faculty member should submit the new grade to the registrar's office in writing.)



APPENDIX B-2

Transient Work at Another University  
Undergraduate Bulletin, pg. 44

Any University of Akron Student who wishes to take course work at another accredited institution of higher education must receive prior approval by the academic dean of the appropriate unit if the student intends to apply this course work toward a degree at The University of Akron.

1. A student can make an official request for transient credit by submitting a Transient Permission form. If the course work taken at another institution is to be used to satisfy University of Akron General Education requirements, **prior written** permission to take the course must be received from the University College Dean's office.
2. If the course work taken at another institution will be used to satisfy an upper college degree requirement or as elective credit, **prior written** permission to take the course must be received from the **student's degree granting college department or college in which the course is taught at The University of Akron.**
3. If a student is within 32 credits of receiving a baccalaureate degree or within 16 units of receiving an associate degree, the student must receive **transient prior written** permission from the student's degree-granting college.

**Note:** Course work taken at another institution cannot be considered for The University of Akron *Repeat for Change of Grade* policy or *Academic Reassessment* policy and will not be calculated into the UA grade-point average.

#### GUEST STUDENT

From rule 3359-60-03.1-B

Guest student. A university of Akron student may take coursework at another institution of higher education as a transient student. For all courses other than general studies, students must obtain prior written permission from the dean of the college in which they are enrolled; for general studies courses, prior written permission must be obtained from the dean of the university college. These courses will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record. Each course will reflect the course number, title, grade and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record and the grade for such course will not be included in the university of Akron grade-point calculation. The name of the institution will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record as well as the date that the coursework was taken.

From Undergraduate Bulletin, pg. 42

A University of Akron student may take coursework at another institution of higher education as a guest student. For all courses other than general education requirements, students must obtain **prior written** permission from the dean of the college in which they are enrolled; for general education courses, **prior written** permission must be obtained from the dean of the University College. These courses will be listed on the University official academic record. Each course will reflect the course number, title and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record and no grade-point average will be calculated for the course work listed. The name of the institution will be listed on the University official academic record as well as the date that the coursework was taken.

**RATIONALE**

**This change will align all three policies so there is not conflict. It continues to place the responsibility for the granting of permission to receive and apply transient credit with the Dean of the student's degree granting college.**

**Further, it is recommended that this issue be taken to the Council of Deans so that the Deans may discuss whether or not they wish to impose limitations on the number of transient credits allowed.**

APPENDIX B-3**CURRENT TRANSFER CREDIT**

Undergraduate Bulletin, pg. 46

Credit for course work taken at an institution of higher education in the United States which is fully accredited or has been granted candidacy status by Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Higher Education (MSA/CHE); New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC); North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA); Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC); Southern Association of Colleges and Schools-Commission on Colleges (SACS); Western Association of Schools and Colleges-Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges (WASC-SR.); Western Association of Schools and Colleges-Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior colleges (WASC-JR.); as designated in "Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education-Programs/Candidates" as published for "The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA)" by the "American Council on Education" will be listed on The University of Akron official academic record. No grade-point average will appear on the record and no grade-point average will be calculated for the course work listed; however, grade-point average may be considered for purposes of evaluating ranking, or otherwise determining admissibility to the university or to specific programs. In addition, the name of the institution as well as the time period during which the courses were taken will be listed on the University of Akron official academic record.

For courses that have been taken at the institution of higher education noted in the reference document above, the dean of the college in which the student intends to obtain the degree will specify which courses, other than general studies, will apply toward the degree requirements at the University. University College will specify which courses listed will apply toward the general education requirements.

CLEP or Advanced Placement credit posted on transcripts from previous institutions is eligible for credit at The University of Akron.

**CURRENT TRANSFER CREDIT**

Rule 3359-60-03.1-A

Coursework taken at an institution of higher education in the United States which is fully accredited or has been granted candidacy status by middle states association of colleges and schools/commission on higher education (MSA/CHE); New England association of schools and colleges (NEASC); north central association of colleges and schools (NCA); northwest association of schools and colleges (NASC); southern association of colleges and schools-commission on colleges (SACS); western association of schools and colleges-accrediting commission for senior colleges (WASC-SR.); western association of schools and colleges-accrediting commission for community and junior colleges (WASC-JR.); as designated in "Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education-Programs/Candidates" as published for "The Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA)" by the "American Council on Education" will be listed on The University of Akron official academic record. Each course POSTED will reflect the course number,

title, grade and credit value; no grade-point value will appear on the record; however, grade-point average may be considered for purposes of evaluating, ranking or otherwise determining admissibility to the university or to specific programs. In addition, the name of the institution as well as the time period during which the courses were taken will be listed on the university of Akron official academic record.

For courses which have been taken at the institution of higher education noted in the reference above, the dean of the college in which the student intends to obtain the degree will specify which courses listed, other than general studies, will apply toward the degree requirements at the university of Akron. This specification will be made at the time the student enters the degree-granting college. The dean of the university college will specify which courses listed will apply toward the general studies requirements when the student enters the university.

#### **PROPOSED CHANGE:**

The University of Akron awards transfer credit for college-level coursework completed at an accredited institution as designated in *Accredited Institutions of Postsecondary Education Programs/Candidates* with earned grades of "C" or better. A summary of the number of credits accepted will be listed on the official academic transcript along with the name of the institution and dates of attendance. Students who meet the requirements of the Transfer Module and receive an Associate of Arts or an Associate of Science degree with a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 or better will receive transfer credit for college-level coursework passed with a grade of "D" or better. Any "D" work earned after the awarding of the associate degree will not be accepted for transfer credit.

No grade-point value will appear on the record; and no grade-point average will be calculated for the course work listed. Transfer students shall be accorded the same class standing and other privileges as all other students on the basis of the number of credits earned. All residency requirements must be completed successfully at the receiving institution prior to the granting of a degree.

The University of Akron does not guarantee that a transfer student automatically will be admitted to all majors, minors, or fields of concentration at the institution. For courses that have been taken at an institution of higher education noted in the reference above, the dean of the college in which the student intends to obtain a degree will specify which courses, other than general studies, will apply toward the degree requirements at the University. University College will specify which courses listed will apply toward the general education requirements.

CLEP or Advanced Placement credit posted on transcripts from previous institutions is not eligible for credit at The University of Akron. Students must present original documentation attesting to scores earned prior to receiving alternative credit considerations.

**A COMPARISON OF THE TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY AT MANY 4-YEAR  
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS IN OHIO**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Lowest Transfer Grade Accepted</b>	<b>Ohio Transfer Module Rule</b>
<b>Bowling Green State Univ.</b>	<b>"C"</b>	<b>"D" if within an Assoc. Deg.</b>
<b>The Ohio State University</b>	<b>"C"</b>	<b>Same</b>
<b>Ohio University</b>	<b>"C-"</b>	<b>Same</b>
<b>Miami University</b>	<b>"C"</b>	<b>Same</b>
<b>Kent State University</b>	<b>"C"</b>	<b>Same</b>
<b>University of Toledo</b>	<b>"C"</b>	<b>Same</b>
<b>Cleveland State University</b>	<b>"C-"</b>	<b>Same</b>
<b>The University of Akron</b>	<b>"D-"</b>	<b>Same</b>

Official transcripts and/or documentation for alternative credit can be obtained from the following Web sites:

[www.acenet.edu](http://www.acenet.edu)  
[www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com)  
[www.collegeboard.org/clep/](http://www.collegeboard.org/clep/)  
[www.getcollegecredit.com](http://www.getcollegecredit.com)

APPENDIX B-4**Current Dean's List Policy**  
Undergraduate Bulletin, pg. 43

Undergraduate students who carry 12 graded credits or more without receiving an "Incomplete" or "In Progress" grade and earn a grade point average of 3.25 or better are eligible for inclusion on the dean's List of their respective college. This is an undergraduate academic honor recognizing excellence in the classroom prior to the completion of the degree. Developmental Program course load hours do not carry academic credit toward a degree program but do count in computing a student's course load for financial aid or student employment and are used in probation and dismissal decisions.

**PROPOSED CHANGE**

Undergraduate students who carry 12 graded credits or more without receiving an "Incomplete" or "In Progress" grade and earn a grade point average of ~~3.25~~ 3.40 or better are eligible for inclusion on the Dean's List of their respective college. This is an undergraduate academic honor recognizing excellence in the classroom prior to the completion of the degree. Developmental Program course load hours do not carry academic credit toward a degree program but do count in computing a student's course load for financial aid or student employment and are used in probation and dismissal decisions and are not considered in determining Dean's List honors.

**RATIONALE:** Each semester the University recognizes students for academic excellence in the classroom by identifying them on the Dean's List. Ironically however, a student may achieve Dean's List recognition every semester in attendance, earning between a 3.25 – 3.39, and never have the opportunity to graduate with Cum Laude (3.40) distinctions. (This situation may have been created in error when the University adopted new standards for Latin Honors but failed to also raise the academic standards for Dean's List. Before this change, students who maintained a minimum Dean's List GPA of 3.25 were guaranteed to at least graduate with the distinction of Cum Laude, which required a 3.25 cumulative grade point average.)

The practice of associating the minimum GPA requirement for Dean's List with the minimum Cum Laude requirements tends to be standard practice throughout the academic institutions in Ohio. This is substantiated by the enclosed Comparison of all 4 year Public Institutions in Ohio chart.

Of the 13 universities listed only three do not maintain this policy:

The University of Akron

Cleveland State University

University of Cincinnati (Cum Laude honors is the highest in the state)

**GPA Comparisons of 4 year Public Institutions in Ohio for Dean's List and Cum Laude (Graduation Honors)**

<b>Institutions</b>	<b>Required GPA Dean's List</b>	<b>Minimum GPA required for Cum Laude (Graduation Honors)</b>
Bowling Green	3.5	3.5
Miami of Ohio	3.5	3.5
The Ohio State University	3.5	3.5
Shawnee State	3.5	3.5
University of Toledo	3.5	3.3
University of Cincinnati	3.4	3.6
Wright State University	3.4	3.4
Ohio University	3.4	3.4
Youngstown State University	3.4	3.4
Kent State	3.4	3.4
The University of Akron	3.25	3.4
Cleveland State University	3.25	3.3
Central State University	3.2	3.2

APPENDIX B-53359-xx-xx **Advanced study for university faculty in university programs****(A) Doctoral Study**

The university of Akron encourages faculty, who do not possess the doctorate degree, to pursue doctoral work at this and other universities. Those faculty possessing the doctorate and wishing to develop additional competencies are also encouraged to pursue further graduate study. Full-time faculty of the university may, subject to restrictions, undertake work toward the Ph.D. or Ed.D. at this university. The restrictions given below are not intended to inhibit advanced study by faculty, but are formulated to protect the interests of both the faculty member and the institution.

- (1) A full-time faculty member may not become a doctoral candidate within his/her own college with the exception of the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences, in which a faculty member may become a doctoral degree candidate but not within his/her division (humanities, natural sciences, social sciences)
- (2) Faculty are subject to the university's residency requirements as defined in university rule 3359-60-06.4(C) residence requirements. During the period of residency, the faculty member must be a full-time student and shall not be allowed to assume obligations in the academic unit of his/her faculty appointment.

**(B) Master's Study**

Those faculty wishing to develop additional competencies are encouraged to pursue further graduate study. Full-time faculty of the university may, subject to restrictions, undertake work toward a master's degree at this university. The restrictions given below are not intended to inhibit advanced study by faculty, but are formulated to protect the interests of both the faculty member and the institution.

- (1) A full-time faculty member may not become a master's candidate within his/her own college with the following exceptions
  - (a) Faculty members in the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences may become a master's degree candidate but not within his/her division (humanities, natural sciences, social sciences)
  - (b) Faculty members in the College of Fine and Applied Arts may become a master's degree candidate but not within his/her own school.

**(C) Juris Doctorate Study**



Those faculty wishing to develop additional competencies are encouraged to pursue further professional study. Full-time faculty of the university may, subject to restrictions, undertake work toward a juris doctorate degree at this university. The restrictions given below are not intended to inhibit advanced study by faculty, but are formulated to protect the interests of both the faculty member and the institution.

(D) Registration

- (1) A faculty member may register for no more than six credit hours of formal coursework in any semester in which he/she is teaching a full load. Exceptions may be made by the vice president for research and dean of the graduate school, with concurrence from the senior vice president and provost, after written recommendations of the department chair or school director and the dean of the college of the degree program. Conversely, if, in the opinion of his/her department chair or school director and college dean, the faculty member's advanced study involvement is having an adverse effect on his/her teaching, scholarship, and/or other departmental and college activities, a reduced doctoral course registration below six credits may be requested; however, in no case shall the opportunity for advanced study be denied.

(E) Fee reduction

- (1) Fee reduction for full-time faculty enrolled in coursework at the university of Akron is a special education privilege outlined in university rule 3359-20-04.3(B)(7)(a)(i)(a). Accordingly, fee reduction for a full-time faculty member engaged in advanced study will at no time exceed six credit hours per semester or summer session.

Effective:

Certification:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ted A. Mallo  
Secretary  
Board of Trustees

Prom. Under: 111.15

Rule Amp.: Ch. 3359

Stat. Auth. CH. 3359

APPENDIX B-6**ACADEMIC REASSESSMENT POLICY**

The Academic Reassessment Policy is designed to benefit undergraduate students who have not attended the university of Akron for a period of no less than three calendar years and whose cumulative GPA when last enrolled at the university of Akron was less than a 2.00. Students who demonstrate the ability to do well upon reenrollment may use academic reassessment to remove the effect of earlier unsatisfactory grades of "C-", "D+", "D", "D-", and "F" that were earned at the university of Akron. Students are encouraged to discuss this policy with their advisors prior to petitioning their college dean for approval.

To be eligible for academic reassessment, a student shall:

1. Not have attended the university of Akron for at least three calendar years. A semester in which the student received all "W" grades cannot be counted as part of the separation period; and
2. Have had an unsatisfactory cumulative grade point average of less than 2.00 during the previous enrollment period at the university of Akron; and
3. Have reenrolled and maintained a grade point average of 2.50 or higher for the first 24 letter-graded ("A" through "F") hours attempted at the university of Akron; and
4. Not have used academic reassessment before at the university of Akron; and
5. Request academic reassessment in writing from the student's dean's office.

To apply for academic reassessment, the student shall complete the appropriate form in consultation with his/her advisor.

Once eligibility has been confirmed by the Office of the University Registrar, the following adjustments will be made to the student's academic record:

The student begins with a new recalculated grade point average and adjusted credit hour totals which will be obtained in the following manner:

- All grades earned at university of Akron prior to reenrollment are excluded from the calculation of the GPA ;
- Credit hours earned for courses at university of Akron during the previous enrollment with a grade of "C" or better including "CR" are retained;
- Credit hours from all courses taken during the previous enrollment at university of Akron with a grade of "C-" or lower are removed (although the grades are retained on the academic transcript with the notation "Academic Reassessment Policy");
- All grades of "C-" or lower earned during the previous enrollment at the university of Akron are forfeited and may not be used to satisfy any degree requirement. The student must either retake the course or the dean of the college must approve a suitable substitution.

The Office of the University Registrar will apply the following provisions of the Academic Reassessment Policy.

1. When counting the first 24 credits attempted, if the 24<sup>th</sup> credit is part of other credits earned during a semester, the entire number of credits earned for that semester will be calculated into the grade-point average. Repeat for change of grade will apply as long as the repeat process occurs and is counted within the first 24 hours of completed credits.
2. A request for academic reassessment shall be made following the semester in which the requirement for the completion of 24 credits was first met. The first 24 credits completion rule begins with the student's reenrollment after the first three years absence period and continues regardless of the number or length of additional stop-outs that may occur. Only courses taken prior to the first three-year absence will be subject to the Academic Reassessment Policy.
3. Grades from all courses ever taken at university of Akron and the resulting GPA (unadjusted by the Academic Reassessment Policy) will be used for purposes of determining eligibility for University, departmental or professional honors or other recognition based upon the student's undergraduate academic career and record of academic performance.
4. An undergraduate student may utilize this Academic Reassessment Policy only one time in his/her career at the university of Akron, and academic reassessment must be prior to the award of the degree for which the hours and grades involved will be applicable. (For example, a student who is pursuing a baccalaureate degree and has earned an associate degree from the university of Akron cannot apply the policy to any credit earned prior to the completion of the associate degree.)
5. Following reenrollment, students opting for academic reassessment must complete a minimum of 50 percent of the total hours required for their degree program.
6. This policy applies to undergraduate course work taken at the university of Akron and only for undergraduate students earning a first undergraduate degree. (The Graduate School has adopted its own Academic Reassessment Policy, 3359-60-034.)
7. Any academic probations, suspensions or dismissals from forgiven semesters will not be forgiven. They will count when the Probation-Dismissal Policy is applied to the student's record after readmission.

This policy will become effective beginning \_\_\_\_\_. The conditions of this policy cannot be appealed.

APPENDIX C**Proposals Approved By Provost  
To Faculty Senate February 2003****Butchel College of Arts and Sciences**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-03-01	Political Science	Additions of existing coursework to minor in Conflict Management
AS-03-02	Political Science	Delete req Summer Domestic Violence Workshop
AS-03-03	Political Science	Delete current Conflict Management certificate
AS-03-04	History	Number and title change: from 3400:260 to 3400:362 and from African American People of the US, 1492-1877 to African American History 1492-1877
AS-03-05	History	Number and title change: from 3400:261 to 3400:362 and from African American People of the U.S., 1877 to Present to African American History, 1877 to Present
AS-03-06	History	Title change from Women in the United States to U.S. Women's History 3400:350
AS-03-07	History	Title change from The West in the Development of the United States to The American West.
AS-03-08	History	Title change from The American City to Urban America.
As-03-09	History	Title change from Recent America: The United States since 1945 to The United States since 1945.
As-03-10	History	Title change from U.S. Diplomacy Since 1919 to The United States as a World Power.
AS-03-14	History	Title change from U.S. Social-Cultural History since 1877 to History of American Pop Culture
AS-03-16	History	Title change from Historical Agency Administration to History Museums and Archives
AS-03-17	History	Title change from Functions of Historical Agencies to History, Communities, and Memory
AS-03-18	History	Title change from Western Science since 1800 to Science and Technology in U.S. History
AS-03-19	Modern Languages	Departmental policy change: only courses passed with a grade of C or better will count toward fulfillment of the major requirements in a foreign language.
AS-03-20	Sociology	Cross listing of 3850:700; change from CR/NC to letter grade
AS-03-22	Sociology	Remove 3230:150 as elective for BS Sociology
AS-03-24	Biology	Deletion of all 3120 courses: Medical Technology
AS-03-25	Biology	Deletion of all 3130 courses: Cytotechnology
AS-03-29	Biology	Course deletion 3100:264 Anatomy and Physiology: Speech and Hearing

AS-03-30	Psychology	Reduce credit from 4 to 2 for 3750:750 Advanced Psychological Tests and Measures
AS-03-31	Psychology	Title change and restructuring of 3750:752 Personnel Selection and Performance Evaluation to Personnel Selection and Advanced Applied Testing Issues
AS-03-32	Psychology	Title change 3750:660 from Advanced Industrial/Organizational Psychology to Advanced Survey of Industrial Psychology and credit reduction from 4 to 2
AS-03-33	Psychology	New course: 3750:763 Performance Feedback and Evaluation
AS-03-35	Psychology	Curriculum changes to I/O Psychology MA and PHD program
AS-03-36	Psychology	New course: 3750:709 Introduction to Counseling Psychology
AS-03-37	Biology	Division of Animal Physiology into lecture (3100:473/573) and lab (3100:474/574) courses
AS-03-38	Biology	Division of Animal Physiology into lecture (3100:473/573) and lab (3100:474/574) courses
AS-03-39	Biology	BS Biology program change to incorporate number changes and course additions
AS-03-40	History	Departmental policy to allow up to six credits of cognate courses to be included in the history major.
AS-03-41	Physics	Course deletion: 3650:310 Electronics and Measurement Techniques
AS-03-42	Physics	Course deletion: 3650:320 Waves
AS-03-43	Physics	Course deletion: 3650:331 Intermediate Astronomy
AS-03-44	Physics	Course deletion: 3650:400/500 History of Physics
AS-03-45	Physics	Course deletion: 3650:410/510 Vacuum Science an Technology
AS-03-46	Physics	Course deletion: 3650:468/568 Digital Data Acquisition
AS-03-47	Physics	Restructuring of BS Physics
AS-03-48	Physics	Increase credit hours 3650:350 Modeling and Simulation from 3-4
AS-03-49	Physics	New prereq for 3650:431 Mechanics I
AS-03-50	Physics	New prereq for 3650:436 Electromagnetism I
AS-03-51	Physics	New prereq for 3650:441 Quantum Physics I
AS-03-52	Physics	New prereq for 46450:481 Methods of Mathematical Physics I
AS-03-53	Psychology	Change course number for Industrial/Organizational Psychology from 3750:240 to 3750:380
AS-03-54	Biology	New course 3100:482/582 Neurobiology
AS-03-55	Biology	Change prereq for 3100:465/565 Advanced Cardiovascular Physiology
AS-03-56	Biology	Change prereq for 3100:469/469 Respiratory Physiology
AS-03-57	Biology	Change prereq for 3100:471/571 Physiological

		Genetics
AS-03-58	Biology	Change prereq for 3100:468/568 The Physiology of Reproduction
AS-03-59	Biology	Change prereq for 3100:472/572 Biological Mechanisms of Stress
AS-03-61	Statistics	New course: 3470:661 Statistics for the Life Sciences
AS-03-69	History	Title change from The 18th Century Colonies and the Founding of the U.S., 1713-1800.
AS-03-71	Philosophy	New course 3600:333 Philosophy of Science and Religion
AS-03-72	Philosophy	Title change from Analytic Philosophy to 20th Century Analytic Philosophy.
AS-03-74	Psychology	Restructuring curriculum for MA-PhD Counseling Psychology
AS-03-75	Statistics	New course 3740:401 Probability and Statistics for Engineers
AS-03-76	Physics	New prereq for 3650:406 Optics
AS-03-77	Physics	Delete physics program option for student preparing for teaching secondary school science
AS-03-78	Physics	Delete Option A in MS program and renumber options B and C
AS-03-79	Modern Languages	Change in wording for 1 <sup>st</sup> year French prereqs
AS-03-80	Modern Languages	Change in wording for 2 <sup>nd</sup> year French prereqs
AS-03-81	Modern Languages	Change in wording for 1 <sup>st</sup> year German prereqs
AS-03-82	Modern Languages	Change in wording for 2 <sup>nd</sup> year German prereqs
AS-03-83	Modern Languages	Change in wording for 1 <sup>st</sup> year Spanish prereqs
AS-03-85	Modern Languages	Change in wording for 2 <sup>nd</sup> year Spanish prereqs
AS-03-88	Math	New course 3450:147 Trigonometry and Advanced Algebra
AS-03-89	Modern Languages	Latin instruction moved from CSAA to Modern Languages; change subject area number from 3200 to 3510.
AS-03-90	Geology	Increase credit hours for 3370:230 Crystallography from 3 to 4
AS-03-91	Geology	Increase credit hours for 3370:231 Silicate Mineralogy and Petrology from 3 to 4
AS-03-92	Geology	Increase number of credits for 3370:230 and 3370:231 3 to 4. Change prereqs and increase number of geology electives from 12 to 13 for BS Geology
AS-03-93	Geology	Decrease elective credits for BS Geology from 19-18
AS-03-94	Geology	Decrease elective credits for BS Engineering Geology from 5 to 3
AS-03-95	Geology	New course: 3370:171 Introduction to the Oceans
AS-03-96	Sociology	Change in prereqs to match math requirement
AS-03-98	Geology	Delete 3370:136 Earth's Oceans
AS-03-99	History	Change in credit hours for 3400:694 from 3 to variable 1-6
AS-03-101	History	Change in credit hours for 3400:898 from 1-12 to 1-15
AS-03-102	History	Change in credit hours for 3400:898 from 1-12 to 1-15

AS-03-103	English	New course 3300:645 Poe and Hawthorne
AS-03-104	Computer Science	Change in course description for 3460:518 Introduction to Discrete Structures
AS-03-105	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:526 Operating Systems
AS-03-106	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:530 Theory of Programming Languages
AS-03-107	Computer Science	Change in course description for 3460:565 Computer Organization
AS-03-108	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:501 Fundamentals of Data Structures
AS-03-109	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:506 Introduction to C and UNIX
AS-03-110	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:591 Workshop in Computer Science
AS-03-111	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:589 Topics in Computer Science
AS-03-112	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:597 Individual Readings in Computer Science
AS-03-113	Computer Science	Change in course description 3460:689 Advanced Topics in Computer Science
AS-03-114	Computer Science	Delete 3460:335 Java
AS-03-115	Computer Science	Add co-op program option to MS Computer Science
AS-03-116	Chemistry	Change in admissions requirements for students using intercollege transfer
AS-03-117	English	New course 3300:592 Internship in English
AS-03-120	Biology	Delete 1880:501 Special Topics: Medical Education
AS-03-121	Biology	Delete 1880:401 Special Topics: Medical Education
AS-03-122	Biology	Change in prereqs BS/MD program; Biology
AS-03-124	Geography	Minor program name change from Cartography to Geographic Information Science and Cartography; restructure
AS-03-125	Geography	Certificate name change from Cartographic Specialization Certificate to Geographic Information Science and Cartography Certificate; restructure
AS-03-126	Geography	Minor name change from General Geography to Geography; restructure
AS-03-129	CSAA	Delete 3200:405/505 Assyriology
AS-03-130	CSAA	Delete 3200:402/502 Egyptology II
AS-03-131	Computer Science	Change course description 3460:457/557 Computer Graphics
AS-03-133	CSAA	New course 3240:320 Medieval Archeology
AS-03-139	CSAA	Change number of Archeological Methods Lab from 3240:340 to 3240:440/540
AS-03-142	CSAA	New course 3240:440/540 Archeological Methods Lab
AS-03-143	Political Science	Delete prereq from 3700:334 Law, Mediation and Violence

### College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-03-02	Accounting	Change prereqs for 6200:460 Advanced Managerial Accounting
BA-03-03	Marketing	Change Certificate in Global Sales Management admissions requirement
BA-03-04	Management	Change Master degree program admissions policy
BA-03-05	Management	Change in E-Business Certificate Program admission policy
BA-03-07	Finance	Change name of Financial Services Program to Financial Services Program: Financial Planning Concentration
BA-03-08	Finance	Restructure Corporate Financial Management program
BA-03-09	Finance	Add elective options to Financial Services program
BA-03-10	Finance	New course 6400:417 Retirement And Estate Planning
BA-03-11	Finance	Restructuring of Financial Services program – Financial Planning Concentration
BA-03-12	Finance	Restructure Financial Planning Certificate
BA-03-13	Finance	Change course number and prereqs for 6400:371 Business Finance – new number 6400:301
BA-03-14	Finance	Change prereqs for 6400:675 Strategic Financial Decision Making
BA-03-15	Finance	Change number 6140:370 Introduction to Finance to 6140:300
BA-03-16	Accounting	Delete 6200:360 Budgeting
BA-03-17	Accounting	Delete 6200:401 Accounting Survey
BA-03-18	Accounting	Delete 6200:402 Advanced Cost Accounting
BA-03-19	Accounting	Delete 6200:480 Accounting Problems
BA-03-20	Accounting	Delete 6200:485 CPA Problems: Commercial Law
BA-03-21	Accounting	Delete 6200:486 CPA Problems: Accounting Practice
BA-03-22	Accounting	Delete 6200:487 CPA Problems: Taxation
BA-03-23	Accounting	Delete 6200:489 CPA Problems: Theory
BA-03-24	Accounting	Delete 6200:491 Workshop in Accounting
BA-03-25	Accounting	Delete 6200:488 CPA Problems: Auditing
BA-03-27	Marketing	Add elective to Global Sales Management Concentration (MBA)
BA-03-28	Marketing	Add requirement 6600:665 Business Relationship Management to Global Sales Management Concentration (MBA)
BA-03-34	Management	Change prereqs for 6500:427 E-Business Systems Integration
BA-03-37	Management	Addition of electives to Minor in Entrepreneurship



BA-03-38	Management	Addition of elective to Certificate in Entrepreneurship
BA-03-42	Marketing	Restructuring and description change for major in Marketing Management
BA-03-43	Marketing	Restructuring of major in Sales Management
BA-03-44	Marketing	Restructuring of major in E-Marketing and Advertising
BA-03-45	Marketing	Restructuring of major International Business
BA-03-46	Accounting	Delete 6200:495 Internship in Accounting
BA-03-47	Accounting	Delete 6200:497 Honors Project
BA-03-49	Management	Restructuring of Bachelor of Science in Industrial Management: Information Systems Management Option
BA-03-50	Management	Option name change option to Bachelor of Science in Industrial Management, Supply Chain Management Option as a result of merging the Production/Operations Management Option with the Supply Chain Management option
BA-03-51	Management	Delete Bachelor of Science in Industrial Management, Production/Operations Management Option
BA-03-52	Management	Restructuring of Bachelor of Science in Industrial Management, Industrial Accounting Option
BA-03-53	Management	Change prereqs for 6500:645 Advanced Management Information Systems
BA-03-54	Management	Change course description 6500:640 Management Information Systems
BA-03-56	General Business	New course 6100:100 Career Planning in Business Administration
BA-03-57	General	New course 6100:495 Internship in Business Administration
BA-03-58	General	New course 6100:497 Honors Project in Business Administration
BA-03-59	General	New course 6100:499 Independent Study in Business Administration
BA-03-60	Accounting	Delete 6200:300 Professional Orientation
BA-03-62	Management	Restructure Human Resource Management Option
BA-03-63	Management	Restructure E-Business Technology
BA-03-64	Marketing	Restructure International Business Certificate
BA-03-65	Marketing	Restructure International Business Minor
BA-03-66	Marketing	Restructure Sales Management Minor

### Community and Technical College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-03-01	Business Technology	Restructuring Computer Maintenance and Networking Technology Minor
CT-03-02	Business Technology	Deletion of Medical Front Office Certificate
CT-03-03	Business Technology	Restructuring of Medical Transcriptionist

		Certificate
CT-03-04	Business Technology	Restructuring of Office Administration Medical Secretarial Option Associate Degree
CT-03-05	Business Technology	Restructuring Office Administration Administrative Assistant Associate Degree
CT-03-06	Business Technology	Restructuring Office Administration International Secretarial Option Associate Degree
CT-03-11	Engineering and Science Technology	Restructure Surveying & Mapping Technology
CT-03-12	Business Technology	Restructuring Hospitality Management Culinary Arts Associate Degree
CT-03-13	Business Technology	Restructuring Hospitality Management, Hotel/Motel Management Associate Degree; new course 2280:250 Front Office Operations; name change to Hospitality Management , Hotel/Lodging Management Associate Degree
CT-03-14	Business Technology	Restructuring Hospitality Management, Hotel Marketing and Sales Associate Degree
CT-03-15	Business Technology	Restructuring Hospitality Management, Restaurant Management
CT-03-20	Business Technology	Multiple course deletions
CT-03-21	Business Technology	Change prereqs 2440:211 Interactive Web Programming; restructure Computer Information Systems, Webmaster Certificate
CT-03-22	Business Technology	2 new courses 2440:248 Advanced Hardware Support and 2440:240 Computer Information Systems Internship; restructure Computer Maintenance & Networking Associate Degree
CT-03-23	Business Technology	Delete 2280:232 Dining Room Service and Training
CT-03-24	Business Technology	Restructure Hospitality Management, Hotel/Lodging Management Certificate
CT-03-25	Business Technology	Restructure Hospitality Management, Culinary Arts Minor
CT-03-26	Business Technology	Restructure Hospitality Management, Restaurant Management Minor
CT-03-27	Business Technology	Restructure Hospitality Management, Hotel/Lodging Management Minor
CT-03-29	Business Technology	Restructure Computer Information Systems, Microcomputer Specialist Minor
CT-03-30	Business Technology	Restructure Business Management Technology Associate Degree
CT-03-31	Business Technology	Restructure Business Management Technology, Accounting Option Associate Degree; reduce credit hours from 4-3 for 2420:227 Entrepreneurship Projects; change prereqs for 2420:217 Survey of Taxation
CT-03-32	Business Technology	Restructure Business Management Technology, Small Business Management Option Associate Degree
CT-03-33	Business Technology	Restructure Marketing and Sales Technology,

		Sales Emphasis Associate Degree
CT-03-34	Business Technology	Restructure Marketing and Sales Technology, Advertising Emphasis Associate Degree
CT-03-35	Business Technology	Restructure Marketing and Sales Technology, Retailing Option Associate Degree
CT-03-36	Business Technology	Restructure Marketing and Sales Technology Fashion Option Associate Degree
CT-03-37	Business Technology	Restructure Computer Information Systems, Microcomputer Specialist Associate Degree
CT-03-38	Business Technology	Restructure Computer Information Systems, Programming Specialist Associate Degree
CT-03-51	Business Technology	Add prereq to Marketing and Sales Technology Minor; changes to 2520:240 Marketing Internship 2520:103 Principles of Advertising 2520:212 Principles of Sales

### College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-03-02	Sports Science and Wellness	2 new courses 5550:424/524 Sport Leadership 5550:410/510 Introduction to Sport Sociology; creation of two tracks for the current Sport and Exercise Science major: (1) Exercise Science and (2) Sport Science.
ED-03-03	Curricular and Instructional Studies	New course 5250:430 Senior Honors Project: Middle Level Education
ED-03-04	Counseling	Name change for 5600:663 from Seminar in School Counseling to Developmental Guidance and Emotional Education
ED-03-05	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Remove MAT requirement for admission to the Elementary Master's Reading program; change degree option title from Reading to Literacy.
ED-03-06	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Remove MAT requirement for admission to the Secondary Master's program
ED-03-08	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Remove MAT Requirement: Elementary Master's
ED-03-09	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Remove MAT Requirement: Special Education Master's
ED-03-10	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Remove MAT Requirement: Postsecondary Technical Education Master's
ED-03-11	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Add prereq to 5100:741 Data Collection Methods
ED-03-12	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Mode of delivery change for 5100:614 Planning for Technology
ED-03-13	Educational Foundations and Leadership	Mode of delivery change for 5100:420/520 Introduction to Instructional Computing
ED-03-14	Educational Foundations and	Mode of delivery change for 5100:631 Instructional Design

	Leadership	
ED-03-17	Counseling	Change subsidy level for 5600:622 Introduction to Play Therapy
ED-03-18	Counseling	Change subsidy level for 5600:660 Counseling Children
ED-03-19	Counseling	Change description of Community Counseling Master's Program
ED-03-27	Counseling	Change prereqs for 5600:653 Group Counseling
ED-03-28	Counseling	Change prereqs for 5600:702 Advanced Practicum
ED-03-29	Counseling	Restructure and change description for 5600:648, Individual & Family Development
ED-03-30	Counseling	Change prereqs for 5600:755, Assessment Methods/Doctoral Course
ED-03-31	Counseling	Restructure and change description for 5600:785, Doctoral Internship
ED-03-36	Counseling	Change prereqs and description for 5600:716, Research Design II
ED-03-37	Sports Science and Wellness	Adds 5 new courses and changes 5 existing courses in Athletic Training for Sports Medicine program
ED-03-38	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add elective to AYA Integrated Social Studies Licensure (Grades 7-12)
ED-03-39	Curricular and Instructional Studies	New course 5250:497 Independent Study
ED-03-40	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Restructure Secondary Master's with Licensure: P-12 Foreign Language (Spanish) Program
ED-03-41	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Restructure Secondary Master's with Licensure: P-12 Foreign Language (French) Program
ED-03-42	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Mode of delivery change 5400:430 Systematic Curriculum Design for Postsecondary Education
ED-03-43	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Mode of delivery change for 5400:420 Postsecondary Instructional Technology
ED-03-44	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Mode of delivery change for 5400:401 Learning with Technology
ED-03-45	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Mode of delivery change for 5400:435 Systematic Instructional Design in Postsecondary Education
ED-03-46	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Mode of delivery change for 5400:400 Postsecondary Learner
ED-03-47	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Suspend admission to the German undergraduate teacher education program
ED-03-48	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Suspend admission to the Latin undergraduate teacher licensure program
ED-03-49	Curricular and Instructional Studies	New course 5610:100 Orientation to Intervention Specialist
ED-03-50	Curricular and Instructional Studies	New course 5200:100 Orientation to Early Childhood Education
ED-03-51	Curricular and Instructional Studies	New course 5250:100 Orientation to Middle Level Education
ED-03-52	Curricular and	Suspend admission to graduate teacher

	Instructional Studies	licensure program in Latin
ED-03-53	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Mode of delivery change for 5400:660 Postsecondary Distance Learning
ED-03-54	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Change title of 5500:625 from Contemporary Issues in reading Instruction to Contemporary Issues in Literacy Instruction
ED-03-55	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Change title of 5500:522 from Developmental Reading in the Content Areas Elementary to Content Area Literacy
ED-03-57	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Change the concentration for social studies for the Middle School licensure major from 34-36 hours to a fixed 44 hours to meet accreditation requirements
ED-03-67	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Integrated Language Arts program
ED-03-68	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Integrated Mathematics Education
ED-03-69	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Integrated Social Studies
ED-03-70	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Science: Biology (Life Science) and Earth Science
ED-03-71	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Science: Biology (Life Science) and Chemistry
ED-03-72	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Science: Biology (Life Science) and Physics
ED-03-73	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Science: Earth Science and Chemistry
ED-03-74	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Science: Earth Science and Physics
ED-03-75	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5300:325, Content Reading in Secondary Schools to AYA Science: Chemistry and Physics
ED-03-81	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5500:286, Teaching Multiple Texts Through Genre to Intervention Specialist: Moderate/Intensive Educational Needs program
ED-03-82	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5500:480, ST: Reading in P-12/Multi-age to Multi-Age Licensure: Foreign Language-Spanish
ED-03-83	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5500:480, ST: Reading in P-12/Multi-age to Multi-Age Licensure: Foreign Language-French
ED-03-85	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5500:286, Teaching Multiple Texts through Genre to Intervention Specialist: Mild/Moderate Educational Needs
ED-03-86	Curricular and Instructional Studies	Add requirement 5500:286, Teaching Multiple Texts through Genre to Intervention

		Specialist: Early Childhood

### College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
EN-03-01	General	New course 4100:600 Curricular Practical Training
EN-03-02	Mechanical	Change 4300:202 from prereq to a co-req for 4600:380 Mechanical Metallurgy
EN-03-03	Mechanical	Rename 4600:310 from Fluid Mechanics to Fluid Mechanics I
EN-03-04	Mechanical	New course 4600:311 Fluid Mechanics II
EN-03-05	Mechanical	Reduce credit for 4600:300 Thermodynamics I from 4 to 3
EN-03-06	Mechanical	Reduce credit for 4600:301 Thermodynamics II from 3 to 2; deletes 4600:310 as pre-req
EN-03-07	Mechanical	Restructure BS and MS Mech Engr to add 4600:311 Fluid Mechanics II
EN-03-08	Mechanical	Restructure BS Mech Poly Engr to add 4600:402 and 3470:401
EN-03-09	Chemical	4 new courses 4200:110, 210, 310, 410 Project Management and Teamwork I, II, III, IV and reduce credit hour for 4200:101 Tools for Chemical Engineering from 3 to 2
EN-03-10	Biomedical	Restructure BS in Biomedical Engineering - Instrumentation, Signals & Imaging Track to allow a Math minor
EN-03-12	Chemical	New course 4200:450 Chemical Product Design and Development
EN-03-14	Civil	Restructure BS in Civil Engineering
EN-03-17	Electrical	Add 3470:401 Probability and Statistics for Engineers as requirement to BS Electrical Engineering
EN-03-18	Electrical	Add 3470:401 Probability and Statistics for Engineers as requirement to BS Computer Engineering

### College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title

### University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title

### School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title

### College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
NU-03-01		Change credit hours for 8200:895 Special Topics in Nursing from 2-6 to 1-6
NU-03-02		Delete 8200:845 Advanced Methods for Nursing Research
NU-03-04		New course 8200:846 AMNR: Measurement in Nursing Research
NU-03-05		New course 8200:847 AMNR: Application of Qualitative Methods
NU-03-06		New course 8200:848 AMNR: Program Evaluation in Nursing
NU-03-07		New course 8200:849 AMNR: Grant Development and Funding
NUI-03-08		Change course description and prereqs for 8200:409 International Health
NU-03-09		Change course description and prereqs for 8200:509 International Health

### College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title

### University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title

### Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-03-10		Change in requirements for Legal Office Assistant Certificate
WC-03-11		Change in requirements for Medical Billing Certificate
WC-03-12		Change in requirements for Medical Transcription Certificate
WC-03-13		Change in requirements for Office Software Specialist Certificate

**Proposals Approved By Provost  
New Programs To Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees February 2003**

**Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-03-21	Sociology	A joint certificate program in Victim Studies which will be a collaboration between the Department of Sociology and the School of Social Work
AS-03-70	Philosophy	A new Minor in Philosophy of Science and Religion that studies the common quest for truth in contemporary science and religion, e.g., the overlapping domains of the origin and nature of the universe, biological life, mind, value, meaningfulness/meaninglessness, and religion.
ASA-03-127	Geography	A new certificate program in Transportation Planning which will be a collaboration between the Departments of Geography & Planning and Civil Engineering

**College of Business Administration**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
BA-03-26	Marketing	A certificate in Health Care Selling to meet a growing need within the health care industry,

**Community and Technical College**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
CT-03-39	Engineering and Science Technology	Certificate in Heavy Construction

**College of Education**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-03-22	Curricular and Instructional Studies	MS with Licensure in Middle Level Education

**College of Engineering**

Proposal No.	Department	Title



**College of Fine and Applied Arts**

Proposal No.	Department	Title

**School of Law**

Proposal No.	Department	Title

**College of Nursing**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
NU-03-12		Change title from Behavioral Health Nurse Practitioner Track to Behavioral Health Nursing
NU-03-13		Change title from Child and Adolescent Health Nurse Practitioner to Child and Adolescent Health Nursing

**College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering**

Proposal No.	Department	Title

**University College**

Proposal No.	Department	Title

**Wayne College**

Proposal No.	Department	Title
WC-03-01		New certificate in Mental Health Social Services designed to meet the needs of individuals preparing for paraprofessional social service work in the mental health.
WC-03-02		New certificate in Environmental and Safety Management
WC-03-03		New minor in Environmental Health and Safety Technology
WC-03-04		New certificate in Workplace Communication
WC-03-05		Program name change from Office Administration to Office Technology
WC-03-06		Option name change from Office Administration: Executive Assistant option to Office Technology: Administrative Professional option

WC-03-07		Option name change from Office Administration: Health Care Administrative Assistant option to Office Technology: Health Care Administrative Assistant option
WC-03-08		Option name change from Office Administration: Legal Administrative Assistant option to Office Technology: Legal Administrative Assistant option
WC-03-09		New option: Office Technology: Business Office Manager Option

ced expenses for a young man who worked to pay for  
 Professor of Chemistry, Charles M. Knight, who had  
 who had resigned the presidency of Buchtel College  
 recognized something special in this serious farm boy  
 nship wakened Hez Simmons to science and industry,  
 l rubber industry. Galvanized by Knight's teaching,  
 long passion. With his mentor's guidance, Simmons,  
 lege in 1908, went to the University of Pennsylvania  
 and served as instructor in chemistry before returning  
 nted Assistant Professor, Simmons joined Knight in  
 on September 13th, 1910, they launched the world's  
*Chemistry of India Rubber*-with Knight leading and

### *University*

1913-the same year Buchtel College became the  
 rubber baton passed to Simmons, who not only did  
 nerations.  
 ic force in the field of rubber compounding chemistry ,  
 aching rubber chemistry and expanding the college's  
 beat a path to the Knight Chemical Laboratory.  
*of Fortune: The Story of Rubber in Akron*, writes, "He  
 oin rubber companies that wanted to clothe and feed  
 naccustomed. Instead, he chose to feed the rubber  
  
*ubber Age* advertised a correspondence course that  
 n correspondence courses of the Rubber Division of  
 e lessons were based on young Professor Simmons'  
 vere to be published serially and the actual

This was only a part of Simmons' connections with the broader rubber community. In 1918, the Goodyear and Firestone rubber companies, recognizing the role of the university in Akron rubber manufacturing, funded graduate fellowships in rubber chemistry. In 1919, Simmons joined the executive committee of the Rubber Chemistry Section of the American Chemical Society that would convert this section into a full-fledged division. From 1928 until 1935, Simmons was, in fact, secretary of the Division of Rubber Chemistry.

Using information gained, in part, from working two summers in Akron tire factories, Simmons wrote *Rubber Manufacture*, published in 1921 by Van Nostrand. Simmons saw workers who wanted to improve their skills and gain more education but needed to do so after working hours. So he organized evening university courses, becoming Director of Extension Courses in 1921 and Director of the Evening Session in 1923.

### ***Rotary crippled children's camp***

Simmons had deep and abiding interest in people and the community, which is seen in the diversity and scope of his contribution. He became president of The Association of Urban Universities, which he and Dr. Parke Kolbe founded, vice-president of the Ohio College Association, and a trustee of the Universalist General Convention of the Universalist Church. He also served on the board of directors of the Ohio Farmers Insurance Company, and, locally, the Police Pension Board, Committee on Equity in Employment, the Metropolitan Park Board, and governing bodies of the Akron Art Institute and City Hospital, as well as Chairman of the March of Dimes.

In addition to being a leader and officer of scientific societies, mentor and confidant to chieftains of industry and owners of small rubber shops, Simmons served as a major in the Chemical Warfare Reserves, U.S. Army. His most revealing involvement, however, may have been his affection and dedication to handicapped children.

In 1923 Simmons and pediatric surgeon Dr. Walter Hoyt had seen enough of the neglect of crippled children in the Akron area. These children were often hidden away by families, receiving little or no services from the community. As a two-man team, Simmons and Dr. Hoyt convinced Akron's Rotary Club to take up the cause of these ignored children. Members investigated reports of neglect or abuse, visited homes to

persuade families to educate their children and make use of existing services, and to enroll them in a new Rotary summer camp for crippled children.

Simmons both directed the camp and lived there with his family every summer from 1925 until 1933, when he became university president. He maintained warm and guiding relationships with many of his former campers, helping and sponsoring them his entire life.

### ***The Depression years***

The Depression knocked industrialized Akron for a loop. Money was so scarce that for a time city employees were paid, in part, with local script. Maintaining the fiscal solvency and educational quality of a municipal university under such harsh circumstances required someone up to the challenge.

For more than 20 years, Simmons had distinguished himself as a respected and well-liked teacher whose students were sought throughout the rubber industry. He was an administrator of innovative higher education. He pioneered, published, and served officially in chemical science, and had proved capable of transferring knowledge from the classroom to the industrial plant floor. He was people-sensitive, a leader in many civic organizations and his church, and had gained public admiration.

Nonetheless, it is possible that the culminating reason for the university presidency being routed Simmons' way was his active extracurricular dedication to handicapped children, during the full decade before 1933, right up to the beginning of his presidency. Here was a man naturally struggling against adversity and sorrow, conveying humanity, inspiring faith and hope. The qualities motivating this commitment were not unlike those that the municipal university needed in dire 1933, in the midst of the depression !

An important feature of his presidency was the enhancement of student morale, drive and sense of self and place in the university. Simmons aimed wide, however: "I shall devote my time to raising the spirit of the students, and faculty, and in so doing raise the spirit of the citizens."

Much testimony exists regarding President Simmons' accessibility and interest in students. He became known affectionately among students as "Prez Hez." He prompted the university trustees to become involved with the Works Progress

Administration and Public Works Administration to construct needed campus buildings. A student movement ignited to have one of the new buildings named after Prez Hez; it became Simmons Hall. Dr. Frank Simonetti, later head of Industrial Management in the College of Business Administration, led the drive when he was a student. Reflecting in 2002, at the age of 87, on the students' reasoning, Simonetti said, "It was just the right thing to do." Thus an essentially modest man was honored by the naming of a building after him during his presidency and lifetime.

### ***"Second Manhattan Project"***

In World War II the United States found itself in critical short supply of rubber after the main source in the Far East was cut off. Victory demanded rubber and so the country launched a massive effort to develop a synthetic replacement.

President Simmons divided his time between Akron and Washington. Dr. James D. D'lanni, retired Goodyear executive and former University of Akron student, states that Simmons played a vital role building the U.S. Government Synthetic Rubber Program, second in importance only to the Manhattan Project to build a nuclear bomb. Simmons was chosen Associate Chief of the Rubber and Rubber Products Section of the War Production Board. Maurice Morton reports, Simmons helped "to recruit a large group of companies, research institutes and universities, including the University of Akron. ..." for the national agenda. The government program eventually built 51 synthetic rubber plants at a total cost of 700 million dollars.

Simmons also served as Chairman of the Allocations Board, which determined which industries most needed the little natural rubber available. It was a sensitive position with industrial, economic, and political ramifications, delegated to Simmons because of rubber executives' respect and trust of him.

While significantly busy in Washington, Simmons had negotiated a hub-role for the University of Akron, given that the four major rubber companies were located in Akron, in the countrywide academic-industrial-scientific network racing for synthetic rubber. To head up the university research group, Simmons in 1942 wisely recruited G. Stafford Whitby, the director of Chemical Research Laboratories of England's Department of Scientific and Industrial Research and a well-known scientific name in both natural and synthetic rubber.

Simmons and Whitby, both early starters in rubber chemistry, were friends and had collaborated on research projects. Whitby developed super rubber trees in Malaya earlier in the century, and had major contributions to his credit in opening up synthetic rubber science. A result of the Simmons-Whitby relationship was Whitby becoming Director of Rubber Research and Professor of Rubber Chemistry at the University of Akron.

Despite a small facility and little manpower, Whitby's genius and practical leadership allowed the university to make a hefty contribution to the immediate production of synthetic rubber and the war effort. He also created the basis for the institution's future in, yet undefined, polymer science.

During World War II Simmons was more than occupied in Washington and at his Akron base. With unassuming dynamism, sensitivity to people, and the advantage of many former students in the field, Simmons informed, persuaded, and facilitated across the national industrial-academic spectrum in the interest of synthetic rubber, the "Second Manhattan Project."

### ***Education on demand***

Following the university epochs of depression and war, Prez Hez faced his third grand challenge-GIs returning home in great numbers, eager to learn and enabled to do so owing to governmental backing. The needs of demobilized veterans required extraordinarily rapid and extensive educational expansion-swift, competent augmentation of faculty, curriculum, classrooms, and myriad, diverse supporting services. Quonset huts and physical makeshift are the symbols of that period, but these were the least of what had to be provided for the tremendous number of new students.

It was a happy time for Simmons, creating an environment in which teachers could teach and students-who, by every measure, had earned the right-could learn. It was his pleasure seeing that the veterans received their just due!

### ***From India rubber to portal of polymer science***

The world's first College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering essentially starts with Knight's pioneering interest and, in 1910, all-time first class in

rubber chemistry in which Simmons assisted. It roots with Simmons' development of rubber science and education at the university, and the industrial exposure and practice that flowed from this. The groundwork builds dramatically with Simmons' securing the University of Akron its role in the war-time U.S. Government Synthetic Rubber Program, then presciently hiring English whiz G. Stafford Whit by to lead it. Whit by brought rubber chemistry into the synthetic rubber age and was awarded the Charles Goodyear Medal of the American Chemical Society's Rubber Division in 1954, his year of retirement, and later inducted into the International Rubber Science Hall of Fame. Whit by was first in a chain of brilliant polymer science leaders. Maurice Morton, second in the chain, came in 1948. By the time he retired as president of the university in 1951, Hezzleton E. Simmons had, Steve Love states, "set the cornerstone for today's polymer science program." A year after he was awarded the Charles Goodyear Medal.

Although energetic, active, productive-sometimes appearing to be everywhere and doing everything-one could call Hez Simmons "uncomplicated." His very sincerity and straightforwardness could make him difficult to understand. For example, his comfort with the relatively modest material rewards of the life he chose compared to the potential wealth and power to be had from the offers keen, appreciative magnates sent his way? Robustly urban in adult life-intensely into college and general education, science and technology, church, city, corporations, and government-he, nonetheless, experienced himself farm-rooted and agrarian. He would have fondly embraced the sometimes broad stroke "country-bumpkin" reading of himself.

Simmons embodied the early settlement culture of Ohio, as construed through fervent minority Protestant Universalism. Ohio, not Yale and the old East, was the land "on the hill." Right tilling, cooperation, worship, family life and community expressed, and exemplified for others, divinity. The ancestral church he attended, finished in 1849, was built "to show if possible a purer. ..fellowship and love" to surrounding people. We may surmise a warm and temperate family of origin in that Hezzleton doughtily internalized family and group values, and lived as consummate son of this Ohio his entire life.



Universalists founded Buchtel College in Akron *before* they built an actual church house. The college assembly hall was used eight years for worship until a church was finished. Holy education came before comfortable worship. Simmons "modeled for the students the kind of 'moral character' that had been mandated in the early days of Buchtel College." He lived the Buchtel ethic, effortlessly, out of joy. Even with doing a lot, he did things unfazed. Generally what he did had meaning for him, as if doused in divine dust, luminous within divine plan.

The family motor boat used to connect between Pointe-au-Baril, Ontario and the Simmons family cottage was adjusted for slow travel, while other boats whizzed by. Simmons believed in the beauty of the trip, which he said was in the trip and not in rushing to the end. Visitors were prepared with proper passage for the camaraderie and hilarity of the stay. Significantly, there was an unspoken rule of self-direction and quietness between the ritual meals and routines of the day. The pattern of island life reflected Simmons' personal path, earnestly meditative and self-reflective while anchored and active in the world, which is seen in the high cultivation of his character.

Up-keep duties were parceled out. One of the most important, maintenance of the outdoor privy, Simmons assigned to himself. So did he lead and inspire.

Most important to this multi-faceted person were educational craft and product. Dr. James D'lanni attests to inspiring lectures and love of students. Just before retiring, Simmons said, "I am inclined to the belief that my greatest contribution was made as a teacher. Here, I came into the closest contact with students and it is for their welfare that I have given all my energies." Modest words, indeed-nonetheless expressing innermost nature.

Simmons was a serious churchman all his adult life. Education was the sweet, bright prayer of his boyhood church. Simmons believed in teaching and learning as divinely inspired fruition and celebration. The focus was the student, no matter what age, the evolving human being, showpiece of heavenly creation.

APPENDIX E

**2003 Summer Fellowships  
Awarded 12/16/02**

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

<u>ACCT.#</u>	<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
2-07508	1545	Brian Bagatto, Biology	Ontogeny of the Adrenergic Stress Response in Fish.	\$8,000.00
2-07509	1546	Charles Beneke, Art	Full: A Series of Digitally Manipulated Photogravures.	8,000.00
2-07510	1547	Andrew Borowiec, Art	Pittsburgh: A Photographic Investigation of the City's Social Landscape.	8,000.00
2-07511	1548	Sandra Stansbery Buckland, School of Family and Consumer Sciences	Limitation Order 85: The U. S. Government and Conservation of Resources.	8,000.00
2-07512	1549	Alper Buldum, Physics	Electronic Properties of Carbon Nanobutes and their Nanodevice Applications.	8,000.00
2-07513	1550	Ang Chen, Physics	Lead-free Piezoelectric Materials.	8,000.00
2-07514	1551	David Cohen, Political Science	The Chief of Staff Project: Stage II.	8,000.00
2-07515	1552	Kevin Concannon, Art	Yoko Ono in the 1960's.	8,000.00
2-07516	1553	Matthew Espe, Chemistry	Understanding and Optimizing Non-Stick Surface.	8,000.00
2-07517	1554	Jun Hu, Chemistry	Developing a Model Kit for Molecular Electronics.	8,000.00
2-07518	1555	Matthew Kolodziej, Art	Painting as Archaeology.	8,000.00
2-07519	1556	Alan Kornspan, Sports Science and Wellness	The Development of the Field of Sport Psychology: An In-Depth Comprehensive Historical Analysis.	8,000.00
2-07520	1557	Jane Leonard, History	Timeliness and Innovation in Qing Legal Codes on Grain Transport Administration.	8,000.00
2-07521	1558	Jon Miller, English	The Myth of Bartenders.	8,000.00

<u>ACCT.#</u>	<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
2-07522	1559	Ernian Pan, Civil Engineering	Interaction of Two Quantum Dots in a Semiconductor Substrate.	\$ 8,000.00
2-07523	1560	Jack Schantz, Music	Restoration of Al Waslon Library.	8,000.00
2-07524	1561	Mary Triece, Communication	The Enduring Impact of the "Forgotten Women:" Recovering The Voices of Ella Reeve Bloor and Women of the Depression Era.	8,000.00
2-07525	1562	J. Patrick Wilber, Theoretical and Applied Math	Mathematical Problems in Tissue Mechanics.	8,000.00
2-07526	1563	Gregory Wilson, History	Making the Marginal Mainstream: Liberalism and Area Redevelopment in the U.S., 1933-1965.	8,000.00
2-07527	1564	Eric Wright, Theoretical and Applied Math	Analysis of the Effects of Non-linear Reactions Upon Taylor Dispersive Phenomena.	8,000.00
2-07528	1565	Christopher Ziegler Chemistry	Borate-based Materials: Discovery and Applications.	8,000.00

**TOTAL FUNDED: \$168,000**

APPENDIX F**PLANNING AND BUDGETING COMMITTEE****Report to the Faculty Senate  
February 6, 2003**

**Meetings of December 5, January 9, 16, 23 and 30.** The committee continued its efforts at developing a University budget. By January 30, the committee had looked at four drafts of the budget. The basic assumptions for developing the FY03-04 budget remain the same as those presented to the Senate on December, with one exception: The committee accepted the projections of the Well Being Committee that anticipated increase in group insurance contract will be \$2.4 million for the first 6 months of 2004. This doubles the projected increases used as a budget assumption on 12/5/02.

Based on these assumptions and other budget scenarios presented in Draft 4 (1/30/03) the overall budget deficit for the University for FY03-04 is projected at \$14,481,006.

Draft 4 considered by the committee also contains the following scenarios:

1. A 3% merit pay increase pool = \$3,043,522
2. A salary compression pool = \$1,000,000
3. An increase in payroll-related fringes = \$1,307,399
4. \$2.1 million earmarked for the upgrade to PeopleSoft 8 (first year of a three-year spread of costs (total for the 3 years ~ \$6 million)
5. An increase in the Campus Budget Reserve of \$ 1.7 million.

**THE ABOVE ARE NOT FINAL AND ARE SUBJECT TO CONTINUAL BUDGET INFORMATION AND DEVELOPMENT**

In order to obtain greater information, the committee approved the attached letter that was sent to all Vice Presidents/Unit Heads on January 10, 2003. In addition to specific information on unit budgets, the committee asked for each unit to prioritize budget cuts under scenarios of 5%, 10%, and 15% reductions in the budget of each unit. **THESE NUMBERS ARE SCENARIOS FOR THE USE OF PBC IN ITS PLANNING, AND DO NOT IMPLY ACROSS THE BOARD CUTS OR ANY OTHER STRATEGY FOR DEFICIT REDUCTIONS.**

The committee is currently in the process of evaluating the responses.

**Other action:** The committee voted on January 30 to recommend to the Academic Policies and Calendar Committee approval of the creation of an Honors College from the current University Honors Program. This change does not involve any additional resources.

Respectfully Submitted  
Rudy Fenwick

**Date:** January 10, 2003

**TO:** Dr. Luis M. Proenza, President  
Dr. Terry Hickey, Senior VP & Provost  
University of Akron Vice Presidents:  
Mr. R. Ray  
Dr. T. Gaylord  
Mr. T. Curtis  
Mr. T. Mallo  
Mr. J. LaGuardia  
Dr. G. Newkome  
Dr. M. Roney

**FROM:** PLANNING & BUDGETING COMMITTEE

**RE:** 2003-04 BUDGET PLANNING

The Planning and Budgeting Committee is currently developing a budget for FY 2003-04 based on the following basic assumptions: (1) the \$5.2 million shortfall from FY02-03, which was addressed with one-time funding in FY03, will add to the FY04 shortfall; (2) enrollment will remain at the current level; (3) the state will cap tuition increases at 6%; (4) Budgeted State Share of Instruction will be flat with anticipated FY03 receipts; (5) because the current group insurance contract will expire on 12/31/03, it is expected that costs for the first six-months of 04 will increase by at least \$1.2 million. With these assumptions in mind, your response to the following questions is necessary and will be of valuable assistance to the committee in preparing the final budget recommendation:

1. What is the total of your 2002-03 personnel and operating budget broken down by departmental/operational units;
2. What is the amount of carryover and how is it used;
3. Define your contractually fixed costs with annual amounts;
4. Identify and prioritize the cuts to your budgets based on 5, 10 and 15 percent budget reduction scenarios;
5. For each percentage scenario, describe the immediate and long-term impact of the cuts on your division and the mission of the University;
6. What are the guiding principles by which you are determining priorities and cuts;
7. In light of these cuts, what additional efficiencies could your division continue to achieve?

Due to the time lines with which we are working, we will need to have your response no later than (January 24, 2003). Please send it to Rudy Fenwick electronically at <fenwick@uakron.edu>. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.