

SENATE ACTIONS

- * Approved Curriculum proposals page 7
- * Received General Education Advisory Committee report on implications for fall scheduling of change in state requirement for transfer and articulation guides page 10
- * Report by Ohio Faculty Council representative page 12
- * Approved the Fall graduation list page 16
- * Requested President Proenza inform the Trustees of proposed legislation House Bill 315 and to report his and their response page 16

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle* may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held December 6, 2007 3

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of December 6, 2007

- A. Report of the Senior Vice President and Provost 19
- B. Report from Academic Policies Committee 21
- C. Report from Curriculum Review Committee 22
- D. Report from Athletics Committee 25
- E. Report from General Education Advisory Committee 26
- F. Report from Ohio Faculty Council 32
- G. Final 2007 Fall Graduation Statistics 42

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of December 6, 2007

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, December 6, 2007, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Harvey Sterns called the meeting to order at 3:14 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-four Senators, 29 were present for this meeting. Senators Arter, Bagatto, Bohland, Bowman, Clark, Elliott, Elman, Erickson, Hallett, Ida, Kelly, Leigh, Plummer, Schantz, Tabatcher, Vierheller, Vinnedge and Williams were absent with notice. Senators Broadway, Gerber, Hamed, Lyons, Sadler and Sancaktar were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – **Acting Chair Rich** called the meeting to order and asked for the approval of the agenda. Senator Halter moved to approve the agenda (second Senator Matney). The agenda was approved.

II. Chairman’s Remarks & Special Announcements – **Acting Chair Rich** announced that the Faculty Senate office will move the week of December 17th to Schrank Hall fourth floor, room 460. There may be some disruption during the move; in particular the telephone service may not transfer over right away. If you’re trying to reach the Faculty Senate office and don’t get an answer, just leave a voice mail and your message will be returned. Alternatively, you can send e-mail.

III. Reports – a. Executive Committee – **Senator Stratton** reported that since our last meeting on November 8th, the Executive Committee “met only once on December 4th to set the agenda for today’s meeting and also the agenda for our meeting with the President and the Provost on December 14th. Some issues discussed at the December 4th meeting included the invitation from the Provost to participate in discussions to help to derive the data and metrics that will be used for the academic alignment work. I see from her agenda that she’s going to talk about this as well today. We talked about the parking situation and the report from Chair Sterns; issues with facilities planning include new parking, new stadium, new building and so on. Also issues related to the University Council Exploratory Committee and the Ohio Faculty Council report. That concludes my report today. Are there any questions?”

Senator Gerlach stated that “at our last meeting we passed a resolution without dissent supporting the House Bill 315 dealing with retiree’s medical insurance. The motion included a request that the Chair or the Secretary send this communication to the offices of the Speaker of the Assembly and the President of the Ohio Senate. Was that done?”

Senator Stratton: “Yes it was.”

Senator Gerlach: “Any acknowledgement yet?”

Senator Stratton: “Not to my knowledge.”

Acting Chair Rich, seeing no further questions for Senator Stratton and noting that President Proenza was out of town, asked Vice President Stroble for her remarks.

b. Remarks from the Provost – Provost Stroble “Well first of all I thank you; it’s always good at this time in the semester to congratulate ourselves on coming soon to the close of the semester which on the whole I think has been entirely successful. Best wishes for all of us to get some good rest and recuperation. I would say a toast to us: so good to go and get some rest so we can start in again in January.

I want to report on just a couple of items. During “Make a Difference Day in University Park Alliance” many of us and our students have a connection and come together for that one Saturday, October 27th, to do various service projects in service of the neighborhood. We actually had record participation this year. I’m going to give you the numbers: over 1,100 volunteers preregistered, there were over 100 walk-in volunteers and ultimately the final number was 800 people that worked on that day in University Park neighborhood. We had student athletes, Greek organizations, classes that have service learning components. There were sixty-plus projects that included painting, packing, home rehab, installation of solar lighting for home owners and trash pickup among a host of other things. So it seems to me that that’s a successful effort again and a good effort by us and our students.

There’s also ongoing consideration of the use of space in Quaker Square. Clearly the hotel rooms are up and operating and apparently last weekend was filled to capacity. Starting in January, we’ll have students moving into half of the rooms. The wish list for people who want to stay at Quaker Square in the residence hall is also voluminous. It seems to be quite an attractive place to be. My task [concerns] the space that’s not being used for hotel and residence halls. How might we think creatively about that space that is immediately available or will be available as tenants move out of offices and other spaces? We received 17 proposals; a committee which was a subcommittee of Operations Advisory Committee with Faculty Senate representation narrowed that down to eight. After the first of the year we’ll do interviews with the proposers of those eight top ranked proposals and figure out whether it’s feasible from a space viewpoint as well as a financial viewpoint to move them into the space that’s available, so that’s moving along.

The NEO commission, the University System of Ohio and academic alignment and you know the list just starts there and goes on and on. We’re certainly in a time when there are multiple external bodies looking at ways that we need to be accountable to them for various goals, metrics and targets. I met recently with Deans, Department Chairs and the leadership of Faculty Senate to look at the documents that we have so far with a real strong focus on the Northeast Ohio Commission to see what we can anticipate is going to come in the form of a final report. This week was the next to learn more. Then finally coordination of summer camps and all the kind of afterschool things we do across campus. We all feel like across colleges and units that we keep duplicating effort and we need to have more coordination. Now clearly all these topics bump into other people’s units and you know it interacts with Student Affairs, it interacts with Student Accounts, it interacts with

the last meeting of the commission. Next week they should wrap up their work and be in the final stages of producing a report which will be issued sometime in December, we don't know the exact timing yet of that. But we have some hints of what those final recommendations are going to be. If you go on the Northeast Ohio Commission website all these documents in their various draft forms are there, but I think soon we'll be able to post on our website a link to final document. They're likely to be seventeen or eighteen different recommendations; about half being academic in focus and half being more administrative and operational in their focus. We began as Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty Senate Executive Committee leadership to consider what we think these things are going to imply for our campus community. Then we started to look at what the Chancellor's master plan for ten years out for University System of Ohio might also mean. What I gave you today is admittedly bad copy but it's the best I have because this was scanned from a Dayton newspaper article that appeared yesterday and seems to be the latest graphic version of what the Chancellor intends to be the master plan. Now there's great detail underneath this I'm sure and we've seen some narrative in other draft forms that gave the detail, but this is the best and most current version I have right now of what kinds of metrics the University of Akron will be held to as a member of the system. After that meeting with Deans, Department Chairs, Faculty Senate Executive Committee I asked each of those groups to give me their best ideas of what the kinds of measures that would be meaningful to The University of Akron as well as responsive to external bodies' calls for accountability. I received a list from Chairs, I received a list from Deans, I received a list from Faculty Senate Executive Committee. We've been massaging those lists and coming up with the measures we actually know we have the data for right now. And that not only at the University of Akron do we have that data but we know it's available publicly for other institutions so that we can see how we line up. We will meet again as Council of Deans in about two weeks. I've asked Faculty Senate Executive Committee to join us for that meeting and we'll start looking at how the numbers actually shake out on a shorter list of measures. So we're trying to wrap up before the end of the semester, if at all possible, getting ourselves a realistic assessment of how we look on these measures. Particularly, how do we look compared to the competition in Northeast Ohio because that's where Northeast Ohio Commission work is going to focus? So that's what I know at the moment about that.

Then progress in preparing for the spring 2008 NCA focus visit: case studies have been drafted. They've been vetted by external reviewers in the self-study team. Very soon those will start to be available to the campus community to react to, to respond to, to add to so that during the spring we'll really be putting the finishing touches on case studies, building an electronic exhibit room and getting ourselves ready for the interviews at that April visit.

And then finally, Operations Advisory Committee which is responsible for a number of responsibilities on this campus and includes Faculty Senate representation has decided that they will deal with a short number of topics this year in an operational way. One being, what does it take to have the capacity attached to the fact that our enrollment keeps growing and not only from a staffing viewpoint. We know it's stressing our faculty, advisors, every other aspect of the people that are needed to support the enrollment but what does it also mean in terms of facilities and services and all the other things that go with that. A second topic that another subcommittee of Operations Advisory Committee will give some study to is what are some budget efficiencies linked to

benchmarking that give us ways to allocate funds from one source to another source, from an operational viewpoint. Campus communication will be a third topic. A fourth more specific topic is how we look at scheduling of Student Union because we've heard issues there. We just need to Enrollment Management. Operations Advisory Committee is scheduled to meet tomorrow and they will start to say who are the people that Operations Advisory Committee needs to interact with to actually learn more about this and to come up with some reasonable recommendations that improve our circumstance.

And I remind everybody to vote for Zippy if you haven't done so yet today. I voted about 10:30 this morning and we were narrowly ahead of Otto from Syracuse. Clearly next week's going to be the important week, but next week you won't be able to see how your vote shifts the competition. You'll just vote and not know so it's important to vote everyday. So here's to a great holiday season and thanks for all that you do."

Acting Chair Rich asked if there were questions for Provost Stroble.

Senator Gerlach wondered "whether the Provost can tell us whether the administration, including the Board of Trustees, has expressed any interest at all in supporting the Senate's motion in favor of this House Bill 315?"

Provost Stroble responded that she could not "speak on behalf of all the administration and Board of Trustees. If the Faculty Senate indicated in a correspondence to the President that you wished to know the reaction to your action, then that would be the mechanism that would trigger our ability to report back to you. I don't know whether the Board of Trustees even knows that Faculty Senate did this."

Senator Gerlach suggested that "perhaps the President et al. ought to inform them of this kind of business that's before Ohio legislature. Whatever it takes, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we communicate with the President and ask him for some response since he's not here as to whether he and/or the Trustees have any awareness and interest in backing this as we did."

Acting Chair Rich stated that a motion to that effect could be entertained under New Business. There being no further questions for the Provost, the Senate proceeded with committee reports.

c. Committee Reports – Academic Policies Committee –

Dr. Ramsier noted that “there is a written report. The Academic Policies Committee met four times this past semester. One issue that we will be bringing to Faculty Senate in February is a draft policy for direct withdrawal/change of grade. We also looked at final exams scheduling and we think we’ve decided that Registrar’s communication mechanism if improved will fix the issues we were dealing with. Residency requirements are still an issue under discussion that we’ll bring to the Senate in the spring. And a new issue about academic reassessment is actually an old issue that we’re going to revisit. Thank you.”

Curriculum Review committee –

Dr. Ramsier reported the “Curriculum Review Committee met five times. As mentioned previously we did hold a hearing about a mature objection to one proposal. We’re still waiting on more information in order to try to resolve that issue before bringing it to the Senate. The Distance Learning Review Committee has been quite active as well. We have a lot of proposals coming in that want to go online. There is actually a list of proposals that will constitute a motion for approval and I think there are copies on the table.

Acting Chair Rich stated “the Curriculum Review Committee has moved the adoption of these proposals” [FAA-08-003, FAA-08-004, FAA-08-005, FAA-08-25, PS-07-11, MS-07-01, SC-07-64, SC-07-65, SC-08-08, SC-08-09, SC-08-10] and asked if there were any debate. Hearing none, he called for a vote. Motion carried.

He then observed that “as the chair of a Senate committee you [Dr. Ramsier] are ex-officio a member of this body, no permission to speak is granted, though you must still have to be recognized by the Chair.”

Athletics Committee –

Senator Lillie reported “there is a brief written report. We had one meeting since the last report was filed. Basically we were finding out something about the role of the Honors College and the academic mission of the university as it relates to athletics. So the written report is there if you have any questions I’ll be happy to entertain them.” There were no questions.

Student Affairs Committee –

Senator Gamble “met with Dr. Fey after being asked to discuss where we think our role should be going as it applies to him. The issue that was brought up last year was that everything as far as monetary and any other issues that the student organizations do need to go through the Faculty Senate. He [Dr. Fey] said we have over 200 organizations and that would end up bogging most of the Senate’s meeting time by just getting approval. He suggested that perhaps once a semester he could bring forth to the Senate the actions that are going on or what they propose to do in these extracurricular activity organizations. So I plan on meeting in January with the rest of the committee to discuss what it is that we need to go forward on this and then also the decision is it’s already in our by-laws and do those need to be revisited as far as having every time a student organization is going to do something getting permission through us.”

Senator Lillie asked if he understood “correctly that you said that the current Senate by-laws say that student organizations have to somehow get permission to do something from this body?”

Senator Gamble replied “they go through this body to get agreement. The example was that Greek Affairs had come and they had talked to the Director of Student Affairs and came up with a fining system for the Greek organizations. They came out with a twenty-five dollar [fine] if they missed handing their paperwork in on time. And so from that, and that was all agreed upon by all the fraternities except for one that did not, chose not to show up during this time when they were actually discussing this. It was agreed upon that they could do this fining; they had talked to Student Affairs and they thought it was a great idea. The advisor for Lone Star stated that they had to go through the Faculty Senate in order for there to be a fining system. It is at that point that we started to look at this and we would like to be able to look at this a little closer and with in relationship to Dr. Fey and see is this really something that Faculty Senate needs to be involved with?”

Senator Lillie replied “that more than answers my question. My reaction is that if there is a policy action if you will, that would affect Student Affairs that it would seem right that this body would at some point or other be involved in actually approving that to go forward by the usual procedure. But that would also involve a kind of formal approval through the Board of Trustees as well. I think that’s just a matter of policy rather than every little thing. On the other hand if that’s what our by-laws say, it does seem to me right that we ought to get that clarified. Thank you.”

Acting Chair Rich suggested it would be helpful if Senator Gamble could refer to a particular provision of the by-laws that requires that actions by student organizations require Senate approval.

Senator Gamble indicated she did not bring my by-laws with her and apologized for that. She reiterated that with over 200 organizations for the Senate to make such decisions would take up all the Senate’s time.

Acting Chair Rich replied that to “the Chair’s knowledge the only provision has to do with the recognition of student organizations.”

The exchange between Senators Gamble, Lillie, and Rich continued in an attempt to clarify the issues.

Senator Gerlach referring to the By-laws suggested Senator Gamble’s interpretation was correct. He quoted: “one provides the recommendations to the Vice President of Student Affairs concerning operations of the division of Student Affairs, two reviews and recommends policy concerning Student Affairs to the Faculty Senate.” He concluded the “fining system which they propose to enact is something that would be proposed to us and we would review, through the committee’s work, they would review and recommend this policy for our approval, if the Faculty Senate “reviews and recommends policy concerning student affairs to the Faculty Senate.” So that’s two, three “reviews and recommends policy in granting scholarships, awards, grants and loans to university students to appropriate bodies” and four, “recommends to the Senate the extension for official registration of student organizations.”

Acting Chair Rich agreed, but indicated “none of that says that decisions by a student organization must approved by the Senate. These are decisions about university policies that govern student organizations.”

Senator Gerlach replied that the “second point I think is very broadly sketched: “Reviews and recommends policy concerning student affairs to the Faculty Senate”. Now this so called fining system falls under this business of policy concerning student affairs and do we think that this is a wise thing for them to do, I suppose is the question or are we not interested and just let them go ahead. But I can see that the idea comes that they might want to report this to our body with a view toward approving something or disapproving.”

Senator Gamble noted she “talked to legal affairs here and they were saying exactly what you were just saying also that this should be going through the Faculty Senate according to our by-laws.”

Acting Chair Rich responded that his “point didn’t have to do with that, but with the broad statement that decisions by student organizations must be approved by this body and I’m quite certain that would run into serious constitutional difficulty if it were the rule, which it’s not.”

Senator Gerlach: “The key word here is policy and this scheme suggests a policy proposal over which the Student Affairs committee has some jurisdiction. They can then report to the Senate and say we approve this policy or not.”

Senator Moritz asked for a “point of clarification. I was wondering: what was the date of the by-laws from which you were quoting. Because I have the copy that Senator Sterns sent out and it’s got totally different language on it on this issue. I thought we should clarify it for the record. I’m not sure if mine’s right or yours is right.”

Senator Gerlach replied that he was “not certain either. Mr. Chairman I assume that I’ve got a copy that is in force as I’ve also tried to keep track of amendments from time to time. Now I may have fallen behind somehow but perhaps the Secretary of the Senate or office secretary can double-check this and point out to us exactly we find an accurate copy of the by-laws. Paper I mean not in some confounded computer.”

Senator Moritz indicated his “version is dated September 7, 2006 and can be printed. The paragraph on Student Affairs actually has two paragraphs and I’ll just read it very briefly because there’s not that much to it. “Recommends policy, subject to approval of faculty senate, regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants and loans to university students.” And then subsection B is possibly applicable: “Proposes regulations concerning all extracurricular activities (except athletics) to faculty senate.” And then there’s the “Recommends to the senate the extension of official recognition of student organizations.” And that’s it.”

Acting Chair Rich noted “that’s the same language that is on the copy on the Faculty Senate website, but we’ll try to ascertain the current version.” There being no further questions, the Senate moved on to the report from General Education Advisory Committee.

General Education Advisory Committee -

Dr. Ramsier reported the “General Education Advisory Committee presents a written report and I’d like to emphasize what we feel is the importance of this. Since we now understand what this new policy [on Transfer/Articulation of general education credits] from the Ohio Board of Regents actually means on our campus, I think that we will want to take this into consideration. We have shared this week with Council of Deans and also with the leadership of the AAUP and we bring it to the Senate for discussion. The second page of the handout is a scanned copy of our current undergraduate bulletin. If you focus on the right hand column, you’ll notice certain courses with asterisks next to them and at the very bottom of the page it says “the courses with an asterisk will apply toward the general education degree requirement only for students enrolled in Summit College”. That has been the policy here for as long as people can remember. The new Ohio Board of Regents action requires that remove this asterisk in our new undergraduate bulletin. The implications could be far reaching, we’re not sure. But basically we’ve tried to come up with some suggestions about what may happen. There may be shifting enrollment patterns between the Summit College and other departments, ie in English versus Technical Writing. In certain math courses, in certain other courses in Humanities, in the School of Communications there may be shifting enrollment into Summit College’s courses that now may substitute or counts for GenEd in both campuses if you will. That may then mean that resources or at least staffing has to be considered, if a department all of a sudden has a huge influx of new students. In particular we want to make sure that we think about it ahead of time so that students who must take a certain GenEd course for their major aren’t bumped out because of the huge influx of students who just feel like taking that course. That would delay their graduation. So this may have potential ramifications across campus, we’re just not sure. But we wanted to bring it to everyone’s attention right away so we could see a plan for next fall. Thank you.”

Senator Hajjafar asked if “these courses are all accepted by Transfer/Articulation with the state or not? They are all accepted by them?”

Dr. Ramsier replied that “Karla Mugler was going to try to be here today to answer some of these specific questions but she had a doctor’s appointment. The new catalog statement came from the articulation/transfer agreements. These courses that are currently with an asterisk in our catalog are currently accepted by Kent State’s four year programs. We accept these courses [that are starred in our catalogue] from Lorain and Stark State and Tri-C in our four year programs. We simply haven’t been accepting them from our own Summit College and now we have to.”

Senator Hajjafar: “But are they accepted by the Board of Regents committee?”

Dr. Ramsier: “Yes. They all are part of that articulation/transfer process, at least to my knowledge. That’s the issue now: an open, seamless transfer is what the Chancellor is after.”

Senator Hajjafar continued. “If they’re accepted it makes sense, to be moved, but if they are not accepted by the Board of Regents Committee they should go through Curriculum Committee to be discussed and then removed. I think if it is not if a course is not accepted by the committee, Board of Regents committee I think then we should discuss them more. If they are accepted by the

committee so that makes sense to be removed. If they are not accepted if there is a course which is not accepted I think we should be more careful and discuss them in Curriculum Review Committee.”

Provost Stroble indicated “We’ll be glad to check to make sure that they’re in transfer and articulation guides, my impression is that they all are. The reason they are having the conversation state-wide about transfer and articulation is that at many institutions, including ours historically, favor our native students in treatment and advising and letting courses count over those who transfer into us. And so the state said those kinds of barriers must go away but we had an artifact or a remnant of actually treating our native students who came from one of our colleges, Summit College, in a way that was a disadvantageous to them compared to how we would treat students that transferred in. So we had almost the reverse or inverse reality here and I think what this really is is the state saying to us that they really expect courses that are on the transfer and articulation guide, regardless of where the students take them, will be fully counted as meeting their general education requirement. I think that’s a good thing for this institution and its students.”

Senator Lillie asked to follow up on that. “What I’m hearing is that at present English Comp one and two might be required. In the future it might be English or English Comp one, Technical Writing or English Comp two, or English and Technical Writing, or English and English Comp two if you can get in. Any one of the number of those [combinations] would be acceptable. Is that what I’m hearing? There would be an expansion of the number of courses available.”

Provost Stroble replied yes, “in terms of a general education requirement, but every program, just as it does now, might say to students there are some general education courses that we prefer that you take because they’re better aligned with what our requirements are. So the College of Engineering, for example, already prefers Technical Writing over some of the more traditional comp courses. What the transfer and articulation guides really do is help students say if I’m going to do this major at this institution here’s what they prefer I take in the general education course. So you’re right, the effect is broadening options, but every program can always say here’s what we really require as prerequisites.”

Senator Lillie: “I think I understand this so if a particular program said we think that for good reasons English Comp one and two is what you must take, that’s still up to the program.”

Provost Stroble: “I believe that’s right.”

Senator Matney asked, “Rex you say shifting enrollment patterns, is the concern they will be a shift from the English department to Summit College or from Summit College to say the English department. In other words is there concern that English will have more or fewer students?”

Dr. Ramsier replied that “we really don’t know which way the shifts will actually go or if there will be any. It could be that people will just keep taking the courses that their friends historically took and so on. We just don’t know. We just want people to be aware that next year’s bulletin will be different, that the asterisks will not exist assuming that those courses are in the transfer and articulation process.”

Senator Ash asked if there is a cost difference between English at the University versus English at Summit College.

Provost Stroble responded that she thought it depends on what degree program the student is pursuing, but she would have to look it up. Dr. Case was not sure either.

Senator Ash said that was also his understanding, but would need to check. He thinks that students that enroll today in a major in Arts and Sciences pay the same tuition no matter where they take it.

Provost Stroble also thought that's right and that even in Summit College there's a different rate for people who are in Bachelor's degrees programs from Associate degree programs. But she was hesitant to go on the record saying that without double checking it.

There being no further questions, **Acting Chair Rich** requested the report from the Ohio Faculty Council and granted Dr. Fenwick to address the Senate.

Ohio Faculty Council

Dr. Fenwick reported: "Columbus and the Ohio University System has been the main focus of the Ohio Faculty Council discussion. In September we met with Harry Andrist from the Ohio Board of Regents. He was there to talk about the Ohio Innovation Partnership but he is also on one of the working groups for the Ohio Systems. In October we heard from John Cuppoletti, president of OFC, about his discussion with Chancellor Fingerhut. Our November notes that are not out on our website yet, report that we met with Bruce Johnson, President of IUC the President' group at OBOR, and next Friday we're meeting with Chancellor Fingerhut. So if you have any questions that you would like for us to talk to the Chancellor about please let me know.

A couple of things if you've read the minutes, that were sent out on the Senate listserve, in our discussion with Dr. Andrist he makes mention of having common textbooks for introductory courses across the state. In the discussion that came up in October there is a bill in the Senate 151, which primarily deals with the State Assembly's attempt to reduce textbook costs. Let me read one of its provisions to you verbatim: "prohibits professor, faculty, or instructor or any other employee of the state institution of higher education from profiting from the sale of textbooks and/or learning material used in the class taught by that person, including royalties from authorship." In other words, if you were using one of your textbooks in courses that you taught, you could not receive the royalties for that textbook. It was introduced in April of this year. As far as I know, as of this morning, that bill is still in the education committee of the state senate. As Bruce Johnson told us last month when we talked to him, he didn't think that that bill would come out of committee. Now most of the divisions of the bill deal with publishers and bookstores, and their practices of selling material to students. Also it's unlikely that the University System will require that we use the same textbooks in all of our courses; that was just a brainstorming session, or brainlocking session. So the main topic of concern has been the University System. There's been only limited discussion of the Northeast Ohio Commission because only four schools, five schools if you include NEOUCOM are involved in that. Their report as the Provost said is due out this month. We will keep the Ohio Faculty Council apprised of those results."

Dr. Fenwick then asked Senator Gerlach about his concern for Bill 315. Senator Gerlach then explained that it was the legislation designed to create a dedicated revenue source for the retirees' medical insurance.

Dr. Fenwick indicated that OFC "had a discussion with a member of STRS, one of the board members, as you can see if you look at the OFC notes. I can look for you and send you a hard copy of that discussion but we have discussed that so, you want us to support that. I think OFC is already on record as supporting that but we can see."

Senator Gerlach stated that "the Senate certainly expressed their support of it at their last meeting and instructed the Secretary to inform the presiding officers of the house and the senate of our sentiments. So it would be entirely appropriate for you to carry on with that and to tell the Council our position on that and as the more of the support we can gain with the members of the legislature perhaps the more favorable they will be to looking at it."

Dr. Fenwick agreed to look back in the notes and send Senator Gerlach a copy.

Senator Gehani asked "Are you in your meetings, benchmarking what other states are doing or are you to some degree creating your method from scratch?"

Dr. Fenwick asked: "Benchmarking what?"

Senator Gehani replied: "Like what are the practices in respect to textbooks?"

Dr. Fenwick stated that "there is something in Arizona that is very similar, I haven't looked specifically but they do have a statewide policy on textbooks."

Senator Gehani then ask how the \$1.3 million cost of implementing the USO goals was to be financed. [See the Oct. 12 minutes of the OFC meeting.]

Dr. Fenwick replied that he thought "that's one of the problems that they're going to have to look at; where is the additional money going to come from. There is a working group from OBOR concerning the Ohio Systems that is studying benchmarking; there is another one on paying the cost. Where are we going to come up with the money as a state for this? There's another subgroup that's working on how to get this system through the legislature; how to get it approved, how to build public support and legislative support for this idea. As far as I know, I wish the Provost had stayed, to kind of see if we're on the same track, it's still more of an idea than a done deal. I would encourage everyone to go to the website for the University System of Ohio and to link onto the four kind of measures that they're using and last month they opened a public forum where people could send responses and comments from around the state and so I would encourage people to do that and if it's still open to add your own comments."

Senator Lenavitt: “In as much as being the Secretary you’re giving us a broad and abstracted view of the reports that are mentioned to the university. Could you also give us a pulse on the health of our enterprise? How is it as seen by that group of people relative to the other discussions or just a pulse on the University System?”

Dr. Fenwick thinks “every university is different in their response to the system. Most universities I think, with the exception of Ohio State and Miami, have also been engaged in what the Provost called the academic alignment process; that they’re doing program reviews to see how they fit with the goals of this system. As far as Ohio Faculty Council, it is in general support of this I think. I think we don’t want to get out in front in one way or another, and offend people. We want to talk to both sides of the aisle and have relationships with both sides of the aisle. We’ve got a good working relationship with Speaker Hustead, a Republican, and with Eric Fingerhut, the Democrat. We also have a good working relationship with Redford the minority leader of the house, from Sandusky and Port Clinton. So that is a kind of wait and see and this point we’re concerned that everybody that comes and talks to us about this and we bring up these issues that are specific to faculty like: if you want common textbooks how are you actually going to do that. And they say well we should get the faculty input. Well let’s get it; but nothing ever happens. So we keep pushing everyone we see that you need faculty input, you need people who are on the street doing this for a living to see whether it’s really doable but at this point again it’s not that specific, there’s nothing specific done. As far as I know on this, it’s still at a very general level. But we do want to have input before we have to respond to the final draft.”

Senator Lenavitt asked if OFC would be making recommendations or providing position papers that Dr. Fenwick could bring back to this institution.

Dr. Fenwick indicated that OFC represents the Faculty Senates in the universities of Ohio, so anything that comes out of this would be reported back to the senates for a resolution of support or opposition, just like they did with the academic bill of rights a few years ago.

Senator Gehani: “Well if you want faculty input the input is that common textbooks are not a good idea.”

Dr. Fenwick: “I think you’re in the majority there.”

Senator Gehani continued: “you can specify that these topics ought to be covered, but I think to specify that this textbook should be used across the entire land of Ohio is I think off to say the least. Another question that some of our faculty members are wondering about. Are you also discussing the CSU/Akron U merger or takeover?”

Dr. Fenwick replied that “the topic has come up and it came up even before the Northeast Ohio Commission was established; there had been rumors, especially at CSU about not so much a merger of the two schools but of swapping professional schools perhaps. So for example, I know the Senate Chair at CSU is concerned about the viability and the future of their Engineering School, compared to ours. And again, these are the kinds of rumors.”

Senator Gehani: “Would we give them our arts and get their engineering?”

Dr. Fenwick: “I don’t know. These are rumors; it has not been a topic of major discussion because again we’re only talking about five schools of the thirteen or fourteen universities that make up Ohio Faculty Council and the representatives from NEOUCOM never come so you really only have Youngstown and Kent, us and Cleveland State that would send representatives to this. And certainly now that we have the draft report and hopefully by next Friday a finished report of the Northeast Ohio Commission we can ask Chancellor Fingerhut whether or not those recommendations can fit with where the University System is going. I can see on the one hand that because the Northeast Ohio Commission was established by a former Governor it may not be politically palatable to the current administration, but who knows. But I don’t expect them at this point to give us a firm answer either because their not going to want to show their hands this early in the process. And because again with the Ohio System nothings fixed, nothings finished.”

Senator Lillie: “You said that that commission was formed by the former governor I thought that it was established by the legislature.”

Dr. Fenwick: “Well under Governor Taft. There is speculation that some of the proposals may be crosspurposed with some of the goals of the Ohio System.”

University Council Exploratory Committee –

Senator Lillie reported that at their last meeting they “had basically processed the information that we had received at the special meeting of the Faculty Senate. We are meeting again next Thursday to see if we can come up with a definition of what substantive means that would allow us to move forward with some of the other work that’s in the current proposal in a fashion that would allow us to move forward quickly and try to come to a draft of this proposal that might be more widely acceptable. At this point though, it’s hard to say more until after we have that meeting.”

There being no further discussion, the Senate moved to old business.

IV. Old Business - Senator Gerlach rose to ask: “We still have not heard a final report of the Ad hoc Committee on Student Disciplinary Procedures. If there were changes made in these procedures the student disciplinary code these need to be brought before the Senate for it’s consideration that’s part of our jurisdiction. So when are we going to get to this, this is very very old business.”

Senator Bove was able to address that issue. “Since my last comments there have been no changes, the committee has written its recommendations and submitted it to the Office of Legal Counsel. They’re still reviewing our recommendations. So the committee has not received the document back from the Office of General Counsel to submit or present to Faculty Senate as of yet.”

Senator Gerlach hoped the Senate could be assured that sometime down the line we will get the report. Senator Bove hoped that would be the case.

V. New Business - Acting Chair Rich indicted the first item of New Business is the approval of the fall graduation list. Senator Hajjafar made the motion (Senator Gehani provided the second) to approve the fall graduation list. The motion passed.

Senator Gerlach then rose to make his motion concerning House Bill 315. “I ask the question that whether the administration might be supportive of this legislation. So now on behalf of the Senate I move that the Senate request the President to inform the Trustees of this proposed legislation and to report to the Senate his and their reactions or response.” Senator Sterns provided the second.

Senator Gehani asked if there is a cost implication to the university.

Senator Gerlach responded “Of course that’s the very point Mr. Chairman, does the senator not remember that this involves a half a percent increased each of five years. Well, that would be 2.5 percent. A half a percent for five years phased in so that would be the amount that both the university on it’s part and faculty members and staff members on their part would be obliged to pay into this system dedicated to medical insurance. Otherwise that medical insurance is ultimately going to run out of funds and all you will have left is the pension. And our plea was that a pension system without medical insurance going with it is not very helpful, not as helpful as it could be should be and currently is. But ultimately the calculations are that these funds for medical insurance will run out without some step like this.”

Senator Gehani asked if there would be a differentiated effect on current retirees compared to future retirees.

Senator Gerlach again replied that “it doesn’t affect us [current retirees]; we no longer contribute to the pension plan. But the point is those of us who are currently retired will be of an age that it will run out on us possibly, if we live so long. But it will affect you people [future retirees] more than us because when you come to retirement after we’re gone, you won’t have anything in there to draw upon. So we think it’s in your (the current faculty interest and staff) interest to do this for their own future. The reason why we retirees have our eyes on that is that we appreciate the benefits that we now have. Of course Senator Gandee who helped originate this for the Senate said to me well by the time this runs out you’ll be gone and I said I hope to live a little bit longer than that. Maybe into my nineties. But who knows.”

Acting Chair Rich “remind[ed] the body that the motion to endorse this bill was passed in the previous meeting; the current motion is simply to request that the President inform the Board of Trustees of this bill and report to the Senate the President and the Board of Trustees reaction to them.”

Acting Chair Rich hearing no further debate, asked Senator Gerlach to restate the motion.

Senator Gerlach: “I moved that the Senate requests that President Proenza inform the Trustees of this proposed legislation, House Bill 315 and to report to the Senate his and their response or reactions to it.”

Acting Chair Rich thanked Senator Gerlach and called the vote. The motion passed. There being no other new business he asked if there was anything for the good of the order.

VI. Good of the Order - Senator Sterns: “I’d just like to thank Vice Chairman Rich for filling in, I was released from the trial today and will be back in the morning but I want to take this opportunity to wish all the senators very happy holidays and to thank you all for your participation and look forward to all kinds of activity when we get back together.”

Acting Chair Rich: “I would add my own wishes for a happy holiday. Is there anything else for the good of the order?”

Senator Gerlach: “Looking over our attendance records since September, I beg to point out that a number of our brethren and sisters here are getting perilously close to absences without notice, a number of them one, two and even three times to date. I hope we will not have to ask why they are doing this being absent without notice but in a meeting or so we’ll find out especially after today we had so many absentees. Happy holidays.”

Senator Stratton asked Senator Gerlach to send a list of those absentees to the office so we make sure that our list is consistent with his?

Senator Gerlach: “Well indeed I got these from the minutes all those who are listed as absent without notice so you can get those for yourselves in your minutes.”

Senator Halter: “Just want you all to know that Zippy is winning.”

VII. Adjournment - Senator Broadway made the motioned to adjourn (Second Senator Gehani).

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

*Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,
Secretary of the Senate*

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF DECEMBER 6, 2007

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST DECEMBER 6, 2007

- **Congratulations on a successful semester, best wishes for a restful holiday, and a toast to the promise of 2008!**
- **Record participation in Make a Difference Day and developments in University Park Alliance**
- **Ongoing consideration of use of space at Quaker Square**
- **NEO Commission, University System of Ohio, and Academic Alignment**
- **Progress in preparing for Spring 2008 NCA Visit**
- **Operations Advisory Committee topics for 2007-08**

INSERT COPY OF OHIO'S
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM
HERE

APPENDIX B

To: Faculty Senate

From: Rex D. Ramsier, on behalf of the
Academic Policies Committee

Date: December 6th, 2007

Subject: Report on Fall 2007 Activities

The Academic Policies Committee met four times in the Fall 2007 semester. Issues considered include:

Retroactive Withdrawal and Change of Grade Request Policy: In preparation for submission to Faculty Senate in Feb. 2008.

Final Exam Scheduling: It appears that no changes are warranted. The Registrar will promote better communication of examination schedules.

Residency Requirements: Of the four undergraduate residency requirements, the only one that seems to need attention concerns the number of credits required after the first associate's or bachelor's degree before the second degree can be awarded. This will be discussed further in Spring 2008 with possible recommendations to be presented to Faculty Senate.

Academic Reassessment: We will review the past and current policies in Spring 2008 and discuss possible recommendations for presentation to Faculty Senate.

APPENDIX C

To: Faculty Senate

From: Rex D. Ramsier, on behalf of the
Curriculum Review Committee

Date: December 6th, 2007

Subject: Report on Fall 2007 Activities

The Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) met five times in the Fall 2007 semester. Issues considered include:

Mature Objection to Proposals SC-06-27 and SC-06-28: After review of all documentation a hearing was held involving participants from Computer Information Systems (CIS - proposing unit), and the objections raised by the Department of Computer Science (CS - objecting unit). Following the hearing, a memorandum was received from each unit. CRC will wait until the necessary information is provided by CIS before we can move forward with resolving this issue.

Distance Learning Review Committee: Recommendations for curriculum proposal improvements were made for all relevant proposals. Appropriate notations were made on the curriculum proposal system to update proposal status.

Curriculum Proposals Requiring Faculty Senate Approval: These are attached.

Proposals Approved By Provost To Faculty Senate December 2007

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-08-003	Communications	Change course number
FAA-08-004	Communications	Change prerequisite course number
FAA-08-005	Communications	Change course number in bulletin
FAA-08-25	Family Consumer Sci.	New course

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
PS-07-11	Polymer Science	Remove undergraduate prerequisites

Provost Office

Proposal No.	Department	Title
MS-07-01	Military Science	Change course title

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
SC-07-64	Public Service Technol.	Add a Corrections option
SC-07-65	Public Service Technol.	Update Corrections certificate
SC-08-08	Developmental Prog.	New course number
SC-08-09	Developmental Prog.	New course number
SC-08-10	Developmental Prog.	New course number

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
N/A		

APPENDIX D

Report to Faculty Senate
Athletic Committee
December 6, 2007

The Athletic Committee met once, on November 14, 2007, and presents the following report:

- a. Dr. Karyn Katz, Associate Dean of the Honors College made a brief presentation about the Honors College and the role it has with regard to student athletes. It appears that the Honors College is, for many athletes, an important part of what brings them to The University of Akron. In addition, since a number of athletes are from out of state, they contribute to the sense of diversity that the Honors College has and also to the “Inclusive Excellence” of the University.
- b. The Committee discussed ways to ensure that more faculty and staff become aware of the ways in which athletics supports the academic mission of the university.
 - i. The Faculty Senate regularly offers opportunities for brief reports to the Athletic Committee and to the NCAA Faculty Representative. The intent is to make use of this opportunity to inform the faculty and staff about athletics.

Submitted by: Timothy Lillie, Chair, Athletic Committee

APPENDIX E

INSERT GEAC PAGES HERE

INSERT GEAC PAGES HERE

GEAC

GEAC

GEAC

GEAC

APPENDIX F

OFC 9-14

OFC 9-14

OFC 9-14

OFC 9-14

OFC 9-14

OFC10-12

OFC 10-12

OFC 10-12

OFC 10-12

OFC 10-12

APPENDIX G

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Friday, October 19, 2007
AKRON, OHIO 44325

Page 1 of 4

Final 2007 Fall Graduation Statistics Report

Marching

		Number	In	Across	Marching	Not
		Conferred	Absentia	Stage	w/Other	Graduating
Number of Degrees:						
<u>The Graduate School</u>						
<u>Doctorate Candidates</u>						
1	12 Doctor of Philosophy	16	13	3	0	0
	Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	16	13	3	0	0
1	14 Doctor of Philosophy	15	5	10	0	0
	Total College of Engineering	15	5	10	0	0
1	18 Doctor of Philosophy	10	7	3	0	0
	Total College of Education	10	7	3	0	0
1	21 Doctor of Audiology	1	1	0	0	0
	Total Fine and Applied Arts	1	1	0	0	0
1	23 Doctor of Philosophy	1	1	0	0	0
	Total College of Nursing	1	1	0	0	0
1	25 Doctor of Philosophy	31	22	9	0	0
	Total Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering	31	22	9	0	0
	Total Doctorate	74	49	25	0	0
<u>Masters Candidates</u>						
1	37 Master of Applied Politics	7	5	2	0	0
1	40 Master of Arts	23	16	7	0	0
1	45 Master of Fine Arts in Creative Writing	1	1	0	0	0
1	50 Master of Public Administration	7	1	6	0	0
1	55 Master of Science	40	31	9	0	0
	Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	78	54	24	0	0
1	60 Master of Science in Chemical Engineering	2	2	0	0	0
1	70 Master of Science in Civil Engineering	7	6	1	0	0
1	80 Master of Science in Electrical Engineering	13	10	3	0	0
1	90 Master of Science in Engineering	15	13	2	0	0
1	100 Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering	10	9	1	0	0
	Total College of Engineering	47	40	7	0	0
1	110 Master of Arts in Education	47	30	17	0	0
1	120 Master of Science in Education	62	46	16	0	0
1	130 Master of Science in Technical Education	3	2	1	0	0
	Total College of Education	112	78	34	0	0
1	139 Master of Science in Accountancy	8	8	0	0	0
1	150 Master of Business Administration	35	18	17	0	0
1	160 Master of Science in Management	5	2	3	0	0
1	170 Master of Taxation	6	4	2	0	0
	Total College of Business Administration	54	32	22	0	0
1	180 Master of Arts	18	12	6	0	0
1	192 Master of Arts in Family and Consumer Sciences	3	1	2	0	0
1	198 Master of Arts in Speech - Language Pathology	2	2	0	0	0
1	200 Master of Music	10	10	0	0	0
1	205 Master of Science in Nutrition and Dietetics	2	0	2	0	0
	Total Fine and Applied Arts	35	25	10	0	0

1	209 Master of Public Health	5	4	1	0	0
	Total College of Nursing	5	4	1	0	0
1	211 Master of Science	2	2	0	0	0
1	212 Master of Science in Polymer Engineering	2	1	1	0	0
	Total Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering	4	3	1	0	0
	Total Masters	335	236	99	0	0

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Friday, October 19, 2007
 AKRON, OHIO 44325
[Final 2007 Fall Graduation Statistics Report](#)

		Number	In	Across	Marching	Marching
Number of Degrees:		Conferred	Absentia	Stage	w/Other	Not
					Degree	Graduating
	<u>Total Graduate</u>	409	285	124	0	0
<u>The School of Law</u>						
<u>Juris Doctor Candidates</u>						
3	30 Master of Law	2	2	0	0	0
3	33 Juris Doctor	17	17	0	0	0
	Total School of Law	19	19	0	0	0
	Total Juris Doctor	19	19	0	0	0
	<u>Total Law</u>	19	19	0	0	0

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Friday, October 19, 2007
 AKRON, OHIO 44325
 Final 2007 Fall Graduation Statistics Report

Page 3 of 4

	Number of Degrees:	Number Conferred	In Absentia	Across Stage	Marching w/Other Degree	Marching Not Graduating
<u>Undergraduate Degrees</u>						
<u>Baccalaureate Candidates</u>						
Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences						
1	220 Bachelor of Arts	80	47	31	2	0
1	227 Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Anthropology	3	0	3	0	0
1	228 Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies	3	2	1	0	0
1	230 Bachelor of Science	27	15	12	0	0
1	235 Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	6	4	2	0	0
1	243 Bachelor of Science in Geography - Geographic Information Sciences	1	0	1	0	0
1	250 Bachelor of Science in Labor Economics	1	1	0	0	0
1	270 Bachelor of Science in Political Science/Criminal Justice	22	9	13	0	0
	Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	143	78	63	2	0
College of Engineering						
1	280 Bachelor of Science in Chemical Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
1	290 Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering	8	3	5	0	0
1	300 Bachelor of Science in Electrical Engineering	2	0	2	0	0
1	310 Bachelor of Science in Engineering	2	2	0	0	0
1	320 Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering	6	3	3	0	0
1	325 Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Polymer Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
	Total College of Engineering	20	10	10	0	0
College of Education						
1	340 Bachelor of Arts in Education	29	8	21	0	0
1	350 Bachelor of Science in Education	132	55	77	0	0
1	360 Bachelor of Science in Technical Education	3	0	3	0	0
	Total College of Education	164	63	101	0	0
College of Business Administration						
1	370 Bachelor of Science in Accounting	46	20	26	0	0
1	375 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	9	5	4	0	0
1	378 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Advertising	5	3	2	0	0
1	380 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Finance	24	11	13	0	0
1	383 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/International Business	10	7	1	2	0
1	390 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Marketing	28	10	17	1	0
1	405 Bachelor of Science in Management	33	16	17	0	0
	Total College of Business Administration	155	72	80	3	0
Fine and Applied Arts						
1	410 Bachelor of Arts	24	9	15	0	0
1	430 Bachelor of Arts in Business and Organizational Communication	35	14	21	0	0
1	480 Bachelor of Arts in Family and Child Development	15	9	6	0	0
1	482 Bachelor of Arts in Fashion Merchandising	11	2	9	0	0
1	506 Bachelor of Arts in Interior Design	3	0	3	0	0
1	507 Bachelor of Arts in Interpersonal and Public Communication	3	1	2	0	0
1	508 Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies	1	0	1	0	0
1	510 Bachelor of Arts in Mass Media - Communication	9	6	3	0	0
1	520 Bachelor of Arts/Social Work	25	7	18	0	0
1	550 Bachelor of Fine Arts	11	5	6	0	0

1	560 Bachelor of Music	7	4	3	0	0
1	565 Bachelor of Science in Dietetics	4	2	2	0	0
Total Fine and Applied Arts		148	59	89	0	0
College of Nursing						
1	570 Bachelor of Science in Nursing	15	12	3	0	0
Total College of Nursing		15	12	3	0	0

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Friday, October 19, 2007
 AKRON, OHIO 44325
 Final 2007 Fall Graduation Statistics Report

		Number of Degrees:	Number Conferred	In Absentia	Across Stage	Marching w/Other Degree	Marching Not Graduating
Summit College							
1	577 Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems	1	0	1	0	0	
1	578 Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering Technology	7	7	0	0	0	
1	581 Bachelor of Science in Electronic Engineering Technology	6	4	2	0	0	
1	584 Bachelor of Science in Emergency Management	5	1	4	0	0	
1	586 Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology	5	2	3	0	0	
1	596 Bachelor of Science in Surveying and Mapping Technology	3	2	1	0	0	
Total Summit College		27	16	11	0	0	
Total Baccalaureate		672	310	357	5	0	

**Associate Candidates
 Summit College**

1	600 Associate of Arts	9	7	2	0	0
1	630 Associate of Applied Business in Business Management Technology	12	8	4	0	0
1	642 Associate of Applied Business in Computer Information Systems	13	7	6	0	0
1	670 Associate of Applied Business in Hospitality Management	8	6	2	0	0
1	680 Associate of Applied Business in Marketing and Sales Technology	1	0	1	0	0
1	685 Associate of Applied Business in Office Administration	1	0	1	0	0
1	740 Associate of Applied Science in Community Services Technology	3	1	1	1	0
1	745 Associate of Applied Science in Construction Engineering Technology	6	6	0	0	0
1	750 Associate of Applied Science in Criminal Justice Technology	26	20	5	1	0
1	771 Associate of Applied Science in Drafting and Computer Drafting	3	3	0	0	0
1	775 Associate of Applied Science in Early Childhood Development	5	2	3	0	0
1	791 Associate of Applied Science in Electronic Engineering Technology	1	0	0	1	0
1	792 Associate of Applied Science in Emergency Medical Services Technology	4	4	3	1	0
0						
1	800 Associate of Applied Science in Fire Protection Technology	6	5	0	1	0
1	809 Associate of Applied Science in Geographic and Land Information Systems	1	1	1	0	0
0						
1	831 Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Engineering Technology	5	2	3	0	0
1	841 Associate of Applied Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology	3	2	0	1	0
1	850 Associate of Applied Science in Medical Assisting Technology	3	1	2	0	0
1	854 Associate of Applied Science in Paralegal Studies	4	1	3	0	0
1	885 Associate of Applied Science in Surgical Technology	1	1	0	0	0
1	891 Associate of Applied Science in Surveying and Construction Engineering	4	4	4	0	0
0						
1	893 Associate of Applied Science in Surveying Engineering Technology	4	4	0	0	0
Total Summit College		123	84	34	5	0

Wayne College

1	900 Associate of Arts	1	1	0	0	0
1	910 Associate of Science	5	4	1	0	0
1	912 Associate of Applied Business in Business Management Technology	7	6	1	0	0
1	915 Associate of Applied Business in Health Care Office Management	5	3	2	0	0
1	919 Associate of Applied Business in Office Technology	3	3	0	0	0
1	925 Associate of Applied Science in Computer Network Engineering Technology	2	2	0	0	0
0						
1	930 Associate of Applied Science in Computer Service and Network	1	0	1	0	0
1	932 Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Health and Safety	1	1	0	0	0
1	940 Associate of Applied Science in Social Services Technology	2	1	1	0	0
	Total Wayne College	27	21	6	0	0
	Total Associate	150	105	40	5	0
	Total Undergraduate	822	415	397	10	0
	Total Degrees for The University of Akron	1250	719	521	10	0