

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

1-22-1990

Faculty Senate Chronicle January 22, 1990

Heather M. Loughney

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

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

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



1989-90, No. 4

35 pages

January 22, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Changes and Additions to University Council	
Membership, 1989-90.....	2
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council	
of 12/7/89.....	3
Appendix to the Minutes of the University Council	
Meeting of 12/7/89	
A. Summer Faculty Fellowships Awarded 11/30/89.....	25
B. Amendment to Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-02	
<u>Organization of the University, (B)(5)(a)</u>	26
C. Proposed Amendment to Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-02	
<u>Organization of the University, (B)(5)(iv)</u>	27
D. Curriculum Changes.....	29

Any comments concerning the contents of The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost.

CHANGES AND ADDITIONS TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP, 1989-90

Non-Traditional Student Government.....Kevin Grimes

(Mr. Grimes is being appointed as the second Non-Traditional Student Government representative to University Council for 1989-90.)

Student Bar Association.....David A. Weil II

(Mr. Weil will replace Ms. Nancy Cushion as Student Bar Association representative; he will also replace Ms. Cushion on the Student Affairs Committee.)

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Selected by Executive Committee:

Research (Faculty Projects) Committee.....Dr. Diane Vukovich

**MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
December 7, 1989**

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Senior Vice President and Provost, Dr. Frank Marini, at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, December 7, 1989 in Leigh Hall 307.

Seventy-three of the 82 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dean William Klingele, Dr. Gary Frank, Dr. Avraam Isayev, Dr. Keith Klafehn, Mr. Forrest Smith, and Mrs. Diana Sousa. Absent without notice were Dr. Paul Lam, and Associated Student Government Representatives Edward Hopson and Joseph Pallotta.

Item No. 1 - Remarks of the President. The Chairman introduced President Muse, whose remarks were as follows:

Thank you, Dr. Marini. First of all, I'd like to advise you to attend the University's mid-year Commencement exercises on the 7th of January in the James A. Rhodes Arena. Our speaker on that occasion will be Gilbert Grosvenor, who is the President and Chairman of the National Geographic Society. His appearance at the University is in celebration of the 25th anniversary of our Department of Geography. Mr. Grosvenor is expected to discuss the importance of geography in today's world. He is regarded as one of the most influential leaders of our time in the area of sharing information and understanding about other lands and other cultures. So we're indeed fortunate and pleased to have him here on that occasion.

I'd also like to invite you to the Holiday Open House that Marlene and I will be hosting on December 13 from 4 to 6 p.m. at the University Club. We hope that you will join us for that occasion so that we can extend season's greetings to you.

Third, I'd like to speak to an issue that has been on the agenda for some time. As you know, University Council recommended to me that we change the STRS calculation for service credit for part-time faculty. The effect of your resolution, if adopted by the Board of Trustees, would be to change the ratio for STRS calculation from a formula that's been in use at the University for a number of years: that is, that each credit hour taught by a part-time faculty member earns STRS credit at a ratio of 1:40, instead of 1:24, as a full-time faculty member's service is credited. Historically, this ratio has been arrived at as an effort to approximate the difference between part-time and full-time duties, especially to recognize that a full-time faculty member's normal direct instructional load is only part of a full-time load, and only part of our expectation of that faculty member - an expectation which includes not only teaching but research, advising, campus and professional service.

When Council chose to recommend changing this long-standing policy, I took the matter under careful study. Among the persons I consulted were the University's legal staff, who advised me that the change recommended could have unanticipated effects on the full-time faculty's compensation and tax liability under certain amendments to section 89 of the Internal Revenue Code. Accordingly, I reported to you that, until Congress or the IRS clarified Section 89 and we could tell what its impact might be, I would take no action on that proposal.

Well, within the last two weeks, Congress has acted and has repealed Section 89, removing that issue or that problem from our study. We are now at the point of developing a resolution for the Board of Trustees, and my recommendation will be as follows:

Because this change in STRS reporting is the considered will of Council, and because I have previously in my remarks to you indicated sympathy with the proposal, I will recommend to the Board that we change the calculation ratio for part-time faculty service to 1:24 for each credit hour taught, as you recommended.

In so recommending, I feel it is important to emphasize that I believe strongly that a credit hour taught by a part-time faculty member does not really constitute 1/24th of a full-time faculty member's load. To say otherwise would be unfair to our full-time faculty in that it would not recognize adequately the research and service expectations which constitute an important part of that load.

My recommendation to the Board will be that we report, solely for STRS purposes and explicitly and emphatically not for load purposes, the 1:24 ratio for part-time faculty. This will be an effort to deal with problems in the STRS system and should serve as an incentive, as pointed out in your resolution, for our valued part-time colleagues to continue to serve with us.

With that, I'll be happy to respond to questions you might have on this issue or other issues that I might respond to. If not, let me wish all of you a happy holiday season.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of November 2, 1989, as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle of November 20, 1989. The Chairman called for any corrections to the minutes. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adopt them. This was moved and seconded, and the Council voted its approval of the minutes.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman wanted to speak briefly about the report which he had received from the task force which had been examining the Honors Program. He commended the members of that task force for their thoughtful analysis of the Honors Program. They had identified strengths and areas which needed to be

considered carefully. There was a recommendation that the Master of the Honors Program report directly to the Provost instead of through the Dean of University College. This was not the first time that the Chairman had received this recommendation, and since it had come from the task force he would reflect upon it once more.

The Honors Task Force also suggested some plans for allowing students who have matriculated at the University the possibility of entering the program late - that is, allowing people who were not admitted into the Honors Program upon first matriculating to enter the program because of their performance in the first few semesters at the University. He thought that this was a good idea and ways to accommodate this needed to be worked out.

The Task Force also recommended that the connection between scholarship funding and the number of people in the Honors Program be severed. Since the original program had stipulated that everyone who was admitted to the Honors Program would get a scholarship, students were not admitted when there was not adequate scholarship money. The Task Force thought that it should be possible to admit people to the program even if it was not possible to give them a full scholarship.

The Task Force also recommended consideration of some changes in the admissions procedures as well as some curricular changes, including a revamping of the distribution requirements and abolishing the Honors Colloquia.

The Chairman stated that he would study these issues in consultation with the Honors Council, APCC, and the Honors Task Force. Any recommended changes in the curriculum or the academic aspects of the Honors Program would come through University Council in the normal course of its procedures.

The Chairman had no additional remarks, but he had been alerted that there would be a question.

Dr. Don R. Gerlach stated that his question related to a report of a meeting of the Council of Deans with the Chairman in which it was said that deans should review departmental guidelines and that if provisions for promotion from instructor to assistant professor existed, they should be removed unless they received specific approval from the dean and the Provost. His question, based on that reported action, was how was it or since when could it be that the Provost and deans could unilaterally alter provisions which were otherwise stipulated in the Faculty Manual without the action of this Council, and likewise alter provisions that were established by faculty guidelines in the various colleges and departments concerning promotions of this sort?

The Chairman responded that this was a good question and others had also posed it to him. The Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee had written to him about it, and he had answered at some length and offered to meet with them if they so desired. He did not want to offer

his rationale here, unless requested, for exactly why he believed that it was not consistent with University policies and expectations to have the possibility of routine promotion from a non-tenured rank of instructor to a tenured rank of assistant professor without having a search. He did not think that it was consistent with the affirmative action intentions of the University. He had explained that to the deans and asked them to take a careful look at their guidelines. If they found that there was a need for such a provision, they had to explain it to him and seek his approval. There were a couple of colleges that had already persuaded him that they were going to need the provision for some time to come. He asked those deans who thought that they did not need the provision and agreed with his rationale to get those guidelines fixed.

The minutes of the Council of Deans fairly accurately described this discussion and, as was normal, presented an action statement. This action statement was probably a bit too brief and stated things in a manner a little differently than he would have wished - something like "Action: Deans delete these if they exist." He apologized for that, but the preceding statement of his discussion with the deans made it very clear what the thing was.

Since he had been asked by several people how he assumed he could make these decisions, he had reflected on it and, if he was in error, he would be subject to correction. His understanding of University policy on RTP procedures went like this: Faculty were to prepare the guidelines and then these would be formally approved by the dean and by the Provost. These guidelines might be revised, and the department, dean, or Provost might choose to review them at any time. He had, in accordance with this, notified each dean that he was choosing to review these guidelines; and he asked them to review all the RTP guidelines in their colleges to make sure that they squared with the dean's understanding of what was necessary and required in the college and the University, and for consistency with University policy. He asked the deans to determine whether they approved of these guidelines or not, and to forward them to him, indicating their degree of approval or the specifics of that which did not meet their formal approval. He would review them all himself and would either approve them or not. If he did not approve them, his reading of the policy was that there would be no effective guidelines. The only guidelines that would be in effect would be guidelines that the faculty had prepared and the deans and the Provost had approved.

In cases where there had been difficulties because there were not approved guidelines, attempts had been made to be diligently attentive to the University's statement about standards and criteria of evaluation. This was very brief but was somewhat traditional and gave enough to go on to make the kind of judgments necessary. If departments and colleges wanted to be more specific than that general University statement of criteria for evaluation, then they would obviously have to write or, in some cases, rewrite guidelines that would meet with approval.

The Chairman stated that he was not doing this in a complete vacuum. He knew that guidelines were being rewritten and revised every semester and were rarely forwarded for the formal approval which was required by policy. For this reason, he was surveying all the guidelines. He wanted the deans to satisfy themselves that proper weight was given to instruction, and that the deans could approve of what the guidelines said about that. There were other provisions which he thought needed to be examined. If these could be revised by the faculty and approved by the deans and himself, he thought that we would be quite a bit ahead. In the course of this review, many departments might find that they had drafted all kinds of guidelines which were at variance in some cases with University policies. It would be in everyone's interests to get these squared away so that when faculty members read the guidelines, they knew that these were not only guidelines which the department was committing itself to abide by, but also ones which had been reviewed and approved by both the dean and the Provost. This would remove the possibility that departments were giving advice and leading people to believe that there was a path to success that perhaps the dean, or the Provost, would not be able to support.

He thought that this would be a constructive step and that his authority to request a review and give approval or not of the guidelines was quite clear in policy adopted by University Council.

Dr. Gerlach noted that we were currently in the midst of making recommendations for tenure, promotion, retention, etc. and departments were doing this using long-established guidelines which had not been sanctioned by the higher authorities of the deans and the Provost. Were these actions to cease and desist until these guidelines had been reviewed and, if so, what kind of timetable would we have to move these matters?

The Chairman responded that departments should proceed in accordance with the guidelines they had been working with. It was too late to change, and he looked for no more chaos than in the previous four years. The only real issue which had created a lot of concern was this question of promotion from instructor to assistant professor. There were three areas of the University where he had already agreed that he understood and acknowledged their need to do that. He did not anticipate from the rest of the University any recommendations of that nature, even in accordance with their usual procedures. When he had asked the deans to review this, he told them to make every effort to insure that this did not create anxiety in the current cycle. He hoped that the deans communicated clearly about this.

Dr. Tom Miles asked whether, in the case of instructors who had been in long service and were being considered for promotion to assistant professor, some sort of grandfather clause might be necessary.

The Chairman replied that he did not think there would be a need to either grandfather or grandmother anyone in. However, if in explaining to him the needs of a particular college a dean made such a

recommendation, he would consider it. The real problem was that many deans had told him that faculty think that there are tenure track instructors, and as he read the policy there were none and never had been. The issue which concerned him most was the question of whether one ought to routinely be able to be promoted from a non-tenure track position to a tenure track position. Was this in accordance with doing a fair and open search with tenure track positions? He did not think that this would be an issue with many units, but until the deans had reviewed the guidelines it was impossible to tell. He wanted to be fair to everybody. Since he had been here, except for the units that he had already indicated had a need for such an exception, he could only remember two or three recommendations even coming to his attention from any other unit in the University. In most cases, the very problems of qualification that had led to the person being appointed as an instructor rather than an assistant professor in the first place would make it difficult to argue that the person should be promoted to assistant professor. The only obvious contrary to that would be a place where you normally would expect a terminal degree and, at the last minute, the person you tried to hire in a tenure track position did not have the terminal degree, even though they assured you that they would have it. If you had made a prior provision in the contract that you would not hire a person as assistant professor unless they had the terminal degree, you might need some give and take there. This would be negotiated case by case as people were hired.

The Chairman stated that he would be happy to explain to Faculty Rights and Responsibilities or to University Council after the review was over exactly how many cases seemed to be involved and whether there seemed to be any plausible reasons for arguing about grandfathering in or not.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester asked three questions about the Honors Program. First, did the Master of the Honors Program report to the Dean of University College and, if so, did this imply that all those students were in University College?

The Chairman replied that the Master of the Honors Program did report to the Dean of University College, but this did not imply that these students were in University College. In addition to being a college in which students were theoretically enrolled up until their 60th or 160th hour, depending on the student, University College was also a place where some programs were housed. When he had arrived, there were a number of programs - institutes and various kinds of operations - reporting directly to the Provost's office. He had tried as best he could to have nothing, or as few things as possible, reporting directly to him. So he asked that the Master of the Honors Program report in the future to him through the Dean of University College. This had been done about three years ago and had been a matter of dispute ever since. Some people thought that by doing this the Honors Program was being devalued. The Chairman said that he did not wish to devalue the Program, nor did he see the University College as a

mechanism of devaluation. However, the question was now on the table again, and he would reflect upon it afresh.

For his second question, Dean Sylvester asked whether there was just one Honors Program or were there also honors programs within the various colleges?

The Chairman replied that there were other programs. In addition to the one University Honors Program, there were departmental honors, Presidential Scholars, and a number of other operations. His own view, which he thought was consistent with that of the Honors Task Force, was that there probably should not be exactly one honors program so narrowly constrained as some had interpreted it. There should be a full spectrum of honors possibilities within the University. He could perhaps envision a kind of umbrella honors program within which there would be some specific honors possibilities.

Finally, Dean Sylvester noted that the Chairman had stated that any changes in curriculum, etc. relating to the Honors Program would have to come through University Council. Did that imply that if a college wanted to start its own honors program this would have to come before this body for approval?

The Chairman answered that although he had reflected on this, he still had no definite response. In general, he thought that it was a very good idea to run anything through Council which had academic consequences. There probably were some things which a college wanted to do which should not come through Council. Whether a unique honors program for the college ought to come through here for action, or for information, or not at all was a question he had not thought about, but he would. His bias would be in favor of bringing it through Council in some form.

Dr. Michael Farona asked about the scholarships given to the Honors students. Was there an actual source of money for this? He had thought that this was merely a waiving of tuition.

The Chairman replied that this was an interesting way to use the word "merely." It was called tuition remission or waiver of tuition. However, there officially was a transfer of money from one part of the University's books to another; that is, the University actually paid the tuition for the people to whom it was giving a scholarship. There was a real dollar consequence in terms of the University's budget, but it was a tuition remission.

Dr. Farona asked how, if the money came from the General Fund to pay the tuition and went back into the General Fund, was there a dollar loss on that?

The Chairman said that the University might not gain a new tuition every time it extended a tuition remission. It might simply be remitting tuition of students from whom it was now collecting or was

going to collect. That was a real dollar loss. He re-emphasized that the immediate problem was that there were students here doing work which ought to be acceptable for Honors students who, for artificial reasons, had not been allowed to be called Honors students.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. There were no special announcements.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Gary H. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on November 21, and its business included making some additional committee assignments and setting the agenda for today's meeting of Council.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - The Chairman stated that the Committee had met on November 22 and continued discussion of the 5-year plan updates which were submitted by the colleges. A second subsequent meeting was cancelled.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Assistant Provost Joseph Walton reported that the Committee had met on November 21 and approved two curriculum changes, CT-90-2 and PC-90-2 (see Curriculum Changes, pp. 29-34).

CT-90-2 was a proposal for a new certificate program in Drafting Technology in the Community and Technical College. There were no objections to it, and it had been passed unanimously by the Committee. He now presented it to Council for its approval. Since there was no discussion, the Chairman called for a vote, and Council gave its approval.

The second proposal, PC-90-2, was a proposal for a language requirement for the Ph.D. in Polymer Science. The proposal presented three possible alternatives to meeting the language requirement: Plan A, a comprehensive knowledge of one language; Plan B, a reading knowledge of two languages; or Plan C, which allows an alternative research tool relevant to the degree. The proposal had been circulated to the faculty and had also been approved by the Graduate Council. There were six outstanding objections to the proposal, but it was passed by the Committee by a majority vote. He now moved for the acceptance of this proposal.

Dr. Gerlach rose to oppose the motion. He realized that doing this was a bit foolish because a number of other Ph.D. programs in the University had these various options, and the precedent had been set. However, he had been opposed to the creation of the precedent in the first place and opposed the continuation of the practice. He thought that they all should be reversed and a standard requirement reinstituted. Apart from this, he noted that he had objected to this proposal when it had been circulated because in its original form it was to eliminate totally all mention of a foreign language requirement, and

this he objected to most vigorously. Since that initial proposal had been circulated, something had happened between the Polymer Science College and the Graduate Council and the Committee. He supposed that it was discovered that it was not necessary to go as far as had been proposed in total elimination of all foreign language requirements. He was also bothered by a statement made by the Dean of the Graduate School in a memo in support of the proposal that the Graduate Faculty alone should set graduate degree requirements. If that argument were followed, it would be contrary to the established order of the University, whereby the Trustees had authorized the University Council to legislate in such matters not only rules, but also requirements for courses of study, and this was one of them. It would then also have to be argued that only a department's faculty could decide on a department's curriculum and standards, without any reference to the college, or that each college would be independent of the University and create not a university, but a multiversity, consisting of congeries of special interests and ambitious entrepreneurs without being responsible to anyone.

Dr. Gerlach could not see how anyone could be called a Doctor of Philosophy or a Master of Arts or a Bachelor of anything without the vital discipline of a foreign language as a part of the background. Language, despite the narrowing of our world, seemed to be something that many thought could be done without. He found it scandalous that in the statement circulated by the Polymer Science College it was noted that many of their students did not take a foreign language in college. He wondered how they ever got into or remained in college. People not even fluent in their own language were going through these halls, and he thought that this problem could be in part remedied by studying other languages. There was the old saying, he believed by Wittgenstein, that the limits of my language were the limits of my world. It seemed remarkable to him that, if the University had a first-class program in Polymer Science, these people with all their talents could not manage to find the discipline of foreign language helpful and useful in more ways than one, not only from a practical standpoint but also as a suitable hurdle to be passed. If people could not pass that test, they were probably not fit for the degree that had long been associated with such standards. All of this was why he had to vote no on this proposal with due regard to other existing programs, including the Ph.D. in History, for which he was ashamed on this point. By the way, he had met the requirement.

Dr. Farona stated that most had met that requirement for the Ph.D., but the purpose of the language at the graduate level was purely utilitarian. It would better be called a tool/research skill rather than a language skill. He suggested that the Graduate School redefine it that way. The Polymer Science College was not trying to get out of anything. They were attempting to expand the possibilities of research skills, and some were more relevant to their discipline than translating a foreign language. All of the objections said that a language requirement was needed; and these came from the Departments of Dance, History, English, and Philosophy, none of which was related to Polymer

Science. On what basis did they judge that Polymer Science needed a language requirement for a research skill? He believed that it was uncollegial to object on that basis unless they were intimately involved in the Polymer Science effort to make a judgment on what tool/research skills were necessary for their students. He would definitely vote in favor of the proposal because in certain cases more relevant research skills for the discipline were being emphasized.

Mr. Clifford Billions noted that the way the proposal read at the present time, it did not say one foreign language - Plan A, a comprehensive knowledge of one language.

Dr. William Fleming remarked that the question here was whether we were talking about education or training. Training was a matter of skill; education was a matter of the breadth of understanding and of empathy with cultures other than our own. If they wanted to give a Master in Science without any language, he could make a good argument that it required something more than training.

Assistant Provost Walton wanted to clarify that the term "language" rather than "foreign language" was used in most of the descriptions dealing with the foreign language requirement in the various Ph.D. programs. It was implicit that it was a foreign language.

Dean Patricia Carrell stated that the comment which Dr. Gerlach had reacted against in her memo reflected her personal views as Graduate Dean. She was not reflecting the position of Graduate Council, in which this argument was never made. She wanted to add that the change which took place in the proposal from the early stage to its present form was a direct result of the Graduate Council discovering that, indeed, the department was not trying to do away with any language requirement; it was merely requesting the ability to take advantage of the existing Plan C option. She was tempted to facetiously add that probably most of the students in this program already had mastered a foreign language, namely English.

Dean Frank Kelley offered a point of clarification. The College was often referred to as the College of Polymer Science, but it was the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. Colleagues in Polymer Engineering often found themselves left out of such remarks, and it was important to remember that the College had two components - one science and one engineering. This proposal was from one of the departments in the College, the Department of Polymer Science.

The Chairman called for a vote, and the Council approved the proposal.

Assistant Provost Walton concluded his report by stating that the Committee had discussed with Dr. Marini the General Studies area and suggested that Dr. Marini work with the General Studies Advisory Council in an effort to complete this project. Dr. Marini agreed to take their advice under consideration.

D. — Athletics Committee - Mr. David Brink, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on Thursday, November 16, and was briefed by Athletics Director Jim Dennison on several issues which would be coming before the NCAA at its January, 1990 meeting. These included 1) a proposal to make public the graduation rates of student athletes; 2) a proposal to reduce the number of days of spring football practice and to make spring practice non-contact; 3) a proposal to reduce the number of games in the basketball season; 4) a proposal to allow Proposition 42 athletes to qualify for need-based financial aid; and 5) a proposal to allow incoming student athletes to receive non-athletic financial aid. Dennison also reported that the results of Proposition 42 and Proposition 48 were good both locally and nationally. Incoming student athletes were better prepared than they used to be.

E. Campus Facilities Planning - Mr. Art Pollock, the Chairman, reported that the Committee met on November 6 and December 4 and transacted the following items of business:

- Distributed copies of "State-Funded Capital Request Summary" dated May 17, 1989 to Committee members.
- Obtained a copy of the OBR Space Utilization Guidelines for use by the Committee.
- Discussed the role of the Committee in naming of campus buildings. It felt that naming of campus buildings was one of its functions as listed in Bylaws of the University Council, and it should look at the process to fulfill this function.
- Approved a motion to send all department heads, directors, and student organizations represented on University Council a one-page survey on what they know about the facilities planning process.
- The Committee would meet at 8:30 a.m. on the first Monday of each month, except January. Dates were December 4, February 5, March 5, April 2 and May 7.
- Met on Monday, December 4, at which time Roger Ryan, Vice President for Administrative Services, provided a thorough briefing on the 6-year facilities planning cycle, which the members found to be extremely useful.
- Discussed with Mr. Ryan a variety of ways to involve the Facilities Planning Committee in the facilities planning process.
- Mr. Ryan agreed to meet with the Committee at its next meeting (February 5) to discuss space allocations.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Dr. Miles, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on November 16, 23, and December 7. At that time, it reviewed investigators' progress, correspondence, and legislative matters.

Dean Sylvester asked whether it was correct that this committee in the recent past had been studying the issue of the length of the tenure probationary period and, if so, what progress had been made. When

Dr. Miles responded that the Committee had not been investigating that issue, Dean Sylvester said that he must have been misinformed, but a former member of the Committee had told him that he thought that it had looked into the matter.

The Chairman thought that it was safe to say that the Committee must have considered the issue somewhere along the line. He did recall that there were recommendations that had come to Council some time ago to permit extension of the time for earning tenure in certain circumstances, and perhaps the discussion which led up to that was what Dean Sylvester's source might have been thinking about.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Dr. Jerry Drummond, the Chairman, stated that the Committee had not met since the last University Council meeting because it had no specific charges with which to deal. However, it had kept in contact with the Benefits office and would advise of any pertinent activity in that area. If anyone did have a matter related to the Committee's duties, he wanted that person to know that the Committee was still an active group and the matter could be brought either to him or the person's faculty representative.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee - Dr. Robert Kent, the Chairman, reported that the Committee met on November 13 and December 4. Its discussions continued to focus on the critical problems of space availability and its allocation within the University libraries. The Sub-Committee on Space presented its report and recommendations to the Committee, and these formed the basis of discussion.

Dr. Hal Foster, Director of the Educational Research and Development Center, which is housed in Bierce Library, addressed the rationale for the Center's location in the Library. The need for a neutral location on campus was stressed. In discussion with members of the Committee, it was suggested that one of the Center's rooms could be shared with the Library for use as instructional space for bibliography courses. There was presently no instructional space available in the Library, and the Map Room had to be used for that purpose.

Professor Jack Hibbs, Head of Collection Management, addressed the Committee on the rationale for the location of the Curriculum Center in the Library. He cited a range of reasons, including access to a wide range of potential users, greater availability in terms of hours, and the fact that the materials in the Center were catalogued as part of the Library collection.

The Committee planned to present a full report with its recommendation on space needs and utilization for the University Library to University Council early in the spring semester.

I. Reference Committee - it was reported that the Committee had met twice and was in the process of conducting its annual review of the Faculty Manual.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Dean Carrell, reporting on behalf of Associate Vice President John Wodarski, stated that after the discussion and rating process of the 38 applications for Summer Faculty Fellowships, there were 12 which were funded (see Appendix A for listing). This represented 32% of the submissions being funded; the total dollar commitment amounted to about \$78,000 for the summer research fellowship program. The distribution of awards fell very nicely across the various colleges, including five in Arts and Sciences, three in Fine and Applied Arts, two in the College of Business Administration, one in Nursing, and one in the Community and Technical College.

K. Student Affairs Committee - Dean Robert A. Dubick, the Chairman, reported on the activities of the two subcommittees. The Extracurricular Activities Subcommittee held four meetings this semester. It had one application for a graduate student organization in Psychology to become fully registered and reviewed and was making recommendations on 18 EAF Contingency requests (a record number in the fall semester). The 1990-91 EAF allocation process also began this week with the distribution of grant packets to all eligible groups and activities.

The Awards, Scholarships, Grants and Loans Subcommittee held its fall meeting on December 5. The Committee was briefed regarding the proposals to enhance the University Scholarship Programs, and a brochure was reviewed from the Ohio Tuition Trust Authority, which provides information regarding the Pfeifer Plan and the Jones College Savings Bond Program. In addition, the Scholarship Guidelines for 1989-90 were reviewed and no changes were recommended for 1990-91. Upon review of the Standards of Satisfactory Progress for Financial Aid Recipients, it was noted that necessary revisions will be required to revise the grade point average requirement to comply with the Federal Government's interpretation.

As a final action, the Committee decided to increase the Muehlstein Scholarship to \$5,000 per year beginning with 1990-91. This permits the Muehlstein Scholarship to cover full fees for many of the scholarship recipients.

L. Ad Hoc Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance Committee - Mrs. Linda Weiner stated that the Committee would be making its report to Council in February.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. The Chairman said that Dr. June Burton, the representative, had notified the Executive Committee that she would be in Columbus for the purpose of meeting with the Chancellor today and might or might not arrive in time to make a report. Should she arrive at a later time in the agenda, it would be appropriate for someone to move to suspend the rules to consider that report out of its normal order.

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business. The Chairman said that there was a motion before Council to replace University Council Bylaws, Section 3359-10-07 Meetings, Section E with the following:

THE QUORUM REQUIRED FOR THE CONDUCT OF BUSINESS SHALL CONSIST OF A MAJORITY OF THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL, NOT COUNTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES.

Dr. Gerlach, who had originally proposed this change, stated that in light of comments made at the last meeting, he wanted to move an amendment to the proposed replacement. It would be to strike out the words from "...not counting" to the end of the sentence and to replace them with the words "minus nine" so that it would read:

THE QUORUM REQUIRED FOR THE CONDUCT OF BUSINESS SHALL CONSIST OF A MAJORITY OF THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL, ~~NOT COUNTING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY AND THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES~~ MINUS NINE.

This was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach said that he made this suggestion because some people sensed and resented certain implications of his language in the original motion. He wanted to take the sting out of the whole business and still thought that it would be appropriate for Council to have a quorum set at something less than a majority. He started with the minus nine figure, and perhaps other people would have other suggestions and move to amend the number to something else.

Dean Claibourne Griffin commented that he had been privileged to sit in Council for fifteen years, which made him believe in original sin more strongly than he used to. In all those years, he remembered only five occasions when Council failed to have a quorum. He was not certain that in the long term this sort of proposal was really necessary. The majority as a quorum had functioned well for a long time.

Noting that he, too, had served in Council for a number of years, Dr. Gerlach disagreed with Dean Griffin. He said that it was frustrating to many members who tried conscientiously to do their duty to have any occasion arise when, by the mere absence of one or two people, there had been a failure to get a majority for establishing a quorum to even open business; and then there were those times when the quorum was jeopardized as people departed later in the meeting. He suggested that the time to make a change of rules of this sort was not exactly when there was a kind of emergency; it was at a time when there were no clouds on the horizon. He thought that the idea was good in principle, as many bodies certainly used far less than a majority for a quorum in order to conduct business.

Mr. James Inman wanted to know what the number required for a majority or quorum was at the moment. The Chairman responded that there

were 80 voting members of Council, so 41 was the majority. This proposal would make 32 a quorum.

Dr. John Bee thought that everyone who attended a meeting at which there was a failure to achieve a quorum shared in Dr. Gerlach's frustration at that sort of situation. The idea of ensuring that Council would be able to meet and have a session and do its business was certainly a legitimate one. However, Dr. Gerlach's proposal raised the specter of another problem which might be worse than not meeting. The idea of a quorum was based in part on the notion that there should be a minimum number of people before business was conducted. Traditionally that was around 50% in groups of this sort for whom there would ordinarily be no reason that 50% of the membership couldn't make it. Dr. Gerlach's proposal would reduce that critical mass substantially to a point where a minority, and maybe not even a very representative minority, could meet and conduct business. There would be no guarantee that its decisions would reflect the considered wishes of Council as a whole. In his judgment, the possibility that Council would not be able to meet occasionally for want of a quorum was considerably less serious than having a regular meeting with a small group of people who might be less than representative of the University body at large. He thought that the issue of what to decide a quorum should be and whether members elected by their academic units had some sort of implied obligation to attend were really two different questions, and in this case the proposal to reduce the quorum was using the one issue to attack the other. Although in sympathy with the feeling to which Dr. Gerlach responded, he opposed this particular motion.

Mr. Inman wanted to know how many administrators there were on Council. If Council had a quorum of 32, theoretically the administration could have a majority of that 32 and so could run Council's decisions.

The Chairman, noting that things began to look better and better all the time, indicated that there were 17, as well as the three Presidential appointments whom most would call administrators. This would be a majority of a group of 32 for a quorum.

Dr. Gerlach reminded Council that six or eight deans were absent at the last meeting, so that we might have run away with things. The Chairman replied that he thought they were trying to meet as University Council at another site.

Mr. James Neilsen did not think that this proposal was in due spirit and directly pinpointed a certain group of students and the President. He did not favor this.

The Chairman then called for a vote on Dr. Gerlach's amendment to the original motion, and it was defeated. There being no discussion on the main motion, it too was voted upon and was defeated.

The second item of unfinished business was amendments to the Faculty Manual, Section 3359-20-02 Organization of the University, relating to the question of department head appointment and review. Dr. Miles stated that this came from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, which had been asked to examine this portion of the organizational structure of the University and see how department heads were appointed, how they received tenure, and how they served in their terms of office. The proposed changes in the Faculty Manual would reflect the necessary actions for properly putting department heads in the correct structure of the University.

Dean James Long wanted to speak against the amendments. Since he was leaving, he would not be here to inherit this whether it was changed or not. He thought that the system in place was fairly good, and when something was not broken you should not fix it. While some might be able to present examples to show that the system was broken, he could give examples from the two-and-a-half years in which he had been dean to show that it was a good system. With the permission of one of his department heads, he described a situation in his college in which there was a great deal of dissatisfaction on the part of faculty in a particular department with the way it was being run. If there had been a direct vote, the department head would have received significantly less than a 50% approval. However, after an in-depth review, he had discovered that there were no existing faculty members who were in a position to take over as department head. (He noted that he was using the words "department head," although they were called "division chairs" in the C&T College and, in addition, that there was no faculty position authorized for outside recruitment.) His solution to the problem was to sit down with the entire department and the head to talk about the nature of the complaints and about the operations of the department. Out of these candid discussions, a number of points were written down as a sort of trial basis for the way things would be run in the following year. As it turned out, there was a great deal of improvement and things were significantly better. If the language of the proposed amendment had been in place, he would have had no choice but to replace the head and had no options for a replacement.

Dr. William Beyer was in favor of the review of department heads on a periodic basis, such as every four years, but he wished to speak against the motion and some of its terminology. In reading it, he was reminded of the story about the two university faculty members who were in a room and were to be executed. The executioner came in and said that he would grant each a wish. One was a full-time faculty member and one was a department head. When he asked the full-time faculty member what his wish was, he replied that he wanted to meet with the administration and with the University Council to tell them how a department ought to be run. The executioner said that his wish would be granted. When he went to the department head and asked what his wish was, he responded that he wanted to be executed first. As he read the amendment, after an extensive review by the dean, there would be a secret ballot and, if there was not a majority affirmative vote, then the dean would have nothing else to do but to replace the department

head. If that was the case, then there was no need for the substantial review because the vote would be binding. If there would be a review of the department head, in addition to discussion with the faculty, the dean needed to take into account how that department head reacted with other constituent parts of the University. Often department heads did things with regard to other parts of the University that faculty were not even aware of. This should be added to the language of the amendment if the review was kept. He also suggested that instead of a yes-no vote, secret ballot, that the dean might ask the faculty member with regard to the question of whether the department head should be retained or not to provide some rationale for his answer. He also saw a problem with regard to when the review was conducted. If it were conducted prior to salary recommendations, it might be different than if it were conducted after the faculty were informed about the salary recommendations. Timing could be very important.

Dean Isaac Hunt asked the Chairman whether Council was considering all three motions together or seriatim. The Chairman responded that he was allowing the discussion on the general motion, but when it came time to vote, each change would be taken in order. Dean Hunt suggested that there be a discussion of each one separately.

Mr. Dan Buie wanted to point out that there were several contract professionals who reported to academic deans, and the language of this was such that it was not clear whether or not that group was included in this proposal. The Chairman said that what Mr. Buie was suggesting was that there were non-academic departments and he wanted to know if they fell in here as well. He did not know the answer.

Dr. Roger Creel commented that as a department head he found it a bit awkward to speak against this. Perhaps having the yes-no secret ballot might be good because the dean might get more of a candid opinion from the department than if he just asked. However, he was bothered by its binding nature. This was a bit like using the outcome of student evaluations to determine whether a teacher could teach the course next year without any other components to measure what kind of performance he had.

Dean Griffin thought that the notion of a term of service was a bit redundant if you had, as was now in place, a four-year review with provisions for terminating the appointment with that review. The appearance of that language was also going to make it terribly difficult to recruit department heads, particularly from outside. He had tried the idea out on three people whom he had recently recruited over the last year and a half as department heads, and all three said that they would not have taken the position subject to a four-year term. One said that he wouldn't have taken the position if he had known about the review process in its present form. We would be shooting ourselves in the foot with the four-year renewable term provisions, since this was being taken care of with the situation for review under any circumstances.

Dean Jane Martin wanted to speak against the concept of the set term for a department head no matter what its length. It gave time constraints and did not work well. She wanted to make a motion to strike the phrase "to four-year renewable terms" from the proposal.

The Chairman responded that since no language had as yet really been formally presented, a motion to delete would have no effect.

Dr. C. Frank Griffin noted that in the past there had been department heads who had been less than competent and even abusive. The only major thing which they had going for them was the support of their dean. He thought that this type of proposal was one thing that would allow us to redress this situation. This was more critical than the cases that could come up which Dean Long had mentioned.

A discussion followed on the proper way to proceed in dealing with the different changes of language. The Chairman finally decided that Council would discuss each one of the changes and vote on them as though they were amendments to a main motion. Then after that had been accomplished, it would proceed to vote on the final language as though it were a motion before it.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to observe that, since there were provisions in place now for these four-year reviews of department heads, we should be even more forthright and emphasize this by putting in the "four-year renewable terms" at the beginning of the statement.

Dean Kelley pointed out that if this language for a four-year renewable term was adopted and became binding on all departments, it would at least be in conflict with the departmental provision in one of the departments of the College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering, which was that there be three-year non-renewable terms. If this were passed, was he correct in assuming that the departmental policy and procedure would have to be changed to be in conformance with it? The Chairman answered that he was.

Dean Martin stated that if you looked at the next section (B)(5)(B)(iv), the language seemed to allow provision for an earlier review. Four years was the maximum time to be allowed between them. Therefore, if the department head was one of those despicable persons described earlier who was not very well liked by faculty, it seemed to her that an earlier review was appropriate and this existing provision allowed for it.

The Chairman then called for a vote on adding the language "...TO FOUR-YEAR RENEWABLE TERMS..." This was defeated, 20-29.

Council then moved on to the next addition, "... (FOR REAPPOINTMENT, NOT LESS THAN HALF)..." Since the term of appointment had been defeated, this language was now moot. A vote was taken, and the language was defeated.

The next matter was striking the language "...hold office at the discretion of the President; and..." There was no discussion, and the Chairman called for a vote. The motion to strike was defeated and the language remained. Since the language remained, the next proposed insertion, "...DEPARTMENT HEADS...", was no longer necessary. However, a vote was taken and the insertion defeated.

The next insertion was "...AND TO THEIR DEPARTMENT FACULTY," which would make the point that department heads were responsible to their dean and to their department faculty. Dean Griffin was not sure what this meant.

Dr. Gerlach said that he would tell the Council what it meant. He had been here long enough to know the power of royal prerogative, a monarchical system that was not in keeping with republican institutions. It seemed to him that a person in the position of department head who was responsible up the line to the dean of his college ought also be responsible to his colleagues down the line. Were we all supposed to be a bunch of underlings, organized to march in lockstep in a military fashion? He did not regard himself as being subservient to the Provost or the President. He expected to be responsible to them, as well as to his dean and department head, who ought really to be called a chairman. In terms of some other principles, there was an argument of whether or not the king or queen of England should be styled the head of the Church, which was manifestly offensive to those who believed in spiritual terms that there was another head of the Church who ought not to be displaced. If we believed in collegiality, with interchanges of responsibilities, let us say that a department head was responsible in two directions, as most of us were.

Dr. Bee wanted to speak in favor of the sentiment expressed by Dr. Gerlach. The idea of a review of department heads in and of itself suggested that there was some responsibility and accountability of the department head to his or her faculty. Implicit in the proposal then there was some warrant for the idea that there was responsibility. Even if that were absent, he thought that he reflected the sentiment of most department heads in saying that they did feel responsibility to their faculty, and through their faculty to their department.

Dean Griffin commented that he had no objection to the language other than that it was recognition of something that already existed. He had just wondered whether there was some more specific meaning to it in the minds of the framers of the legislation than was apparent to him. The concept of responsibility up and responsibility down was probably more deeply appreciated by department heads than anybody else in the University.

Dr. Susan Speers said that as a department head she saw herself as an advocate for her faculty.

In response to a question regarding how a department head would resolve the conflict when instructed by the dean to do one thing and by

his faculty to do another, the Chairman said that he thought that they could and did do it all the time.

Dr. Allen Noble stated that this was exactly why this kind of language was needed, so that department chairmen would be put on notice that this was not an easy decision and that they ought to take into consideration exactly what their position was, where their responsibilities were, and that they had dual responsibilities to the dean and their faculty. Putting this language in would serve as a reminder to those new to the experience of being a department head. Having been a department head for many years, he had observed that the most successful department heads were those who understood that responsibility to their faculty. The ones who were least responsible were the ones who were constantly having difficulties.

A vote was then taken on the addition of this language, and Council gave its approval.

Dean Hunt then moved to change some of the wording in the next-to-last sentence of the amendment. He suggested striking "...policies established by the Board, ..." to the end of the sentence and replacing it with "...UNIVERSITY AND RESPECTIVE COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES." This was seconded, and the Council voted its approval.

Council then voted on the whole paragraph as it had been amended during the course of the discussion, and it was approved (see Appendix B).

Council then moved on to section 3359-20-02 (B)(5)(b)(iv), where it had been proposed that the language "...AND A YES-OR-NO SECRET BALLOT OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT ON THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AS HEAD. IF THE HEAD DOES NOT RECEIVE A MAJORITY AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE DEPARTMENT, OR IF..." be inserted.

Dr. William McGucken had some observations to make concerning this section. First, it was not clear to him how the secret ballot was to be conducted. Second, there was currently an important and regrettable difference between the appointment and reappointment processes for heads. In the appointment process, the faculty was involved collectively. They took part in the search, met the candidates who were brought to campus, read their vitae, heard them speak, etc., and then met collectively as a department and took a vote. A two-thirds majority was required before the appointment was recommended. Similar procedures were followed for reappointment, promotion and tenure decisions. However, in the reappointment process for department heads, the faculty did not and were not required to come together to discuss and to vote. This was a serious omission in our maturing and increasingly professional institution. To deal with this he therefore proposed the following amendment after the end of the second sentence: "...AS HEAD. THE BALLOT SHALL BE TAKEN AT A MEETING OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY CALLED TO CONSIDER THE RETENTION OF THE HEAD."

In the discussion which followed, it was clarified that it would be the dean who would call this meeting and that full-time faculty would include full-time non-tenure track faculty. There was also a concern as to whether or not the department head as a member of the full-time faculty would participate or even be present at the meeting.

Dr. Noble then offered a substitute motion which he thought had much clearer wording and would accomplish the same end as Dr. McGucken's. It was to place a period after the words department faculty in the second sentence and then insert the following words: "...department faculty. **AS A PART OF THIS REVIEW, THE DEAN SHALL CALL A MEETING OF ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT...**" and then to continue with the balance of the sentence that was already there. This was seconded.

Dean Carrell wanted to hear some discussion about what the motivation was for having the meeting. She imagined a number of motivations and lots of ways such a meeting might be conducted.

Dr. Noble responded that he had made the substitute motion to clearly define the meeting as a part of the review process. It also stated who was to call the meeting, and he agreed with Dean Carrell that many things could be accomplished in it. It was not restricted simply to the ballot on the department head, but the problems of the department could be reviewed. It really depended on the inclination of the dean as to how freewheeling he wanted to let the discussion be in that meeting. It was then a regular part of the process and the taking of the secret ballot was guaranteed by this wording.

Dean Sylvester thought that the amendments were getting ahead of themselves. Perhaps Council ought to consider whether it was going to have an election of a department head first before it decided how it would be carried out.

Dean Carrell wanted to point out that while it might be seen as a good idea to have the meeting of the faculty and give them some opportunity to discuss the evaluation of the head, that did not necessarily mean that there also had to be the yes-no secret ballot. She saw advantages to the meeting but was nervous about the yes-no secret ballot, which would make the retention of a head a kind of popularity contest. She wondered whether there might be some way these two issues could be separated.

Dr. Frank Griffin responded that he knew a number of faculty who had said that they would not say anything in the so-called confidential meeting with the dean because they knew that what they said would get back to the department head. The department head had a great deal of clout. If you had twenty years of service, a mere difference of \$100 in your salary would affect your lifetime earnings by something like \$3,000. That was why people did not say things in these confidential meetings, and this could be a place to get a confidential vote so they really could express their opinions.

Dean Griffin replied that he would like to insert "the dean or his designate" at some point in the amendment because he had spent 88 hours on one review, and there were 16 departments in his college. He added that he had not felt any great reluctance on the part of faculty members to express themselves to him in the confidential portions of the private interviews which he had conducted. He did not see that as a great difficulty. He thought that the idea of a meeting was an excellent one. However, he did oppose the binding nature of the yes-no vote.

Mr. Inman then pointed out that he had a proposal before him in writing, as well as two other motions - one of which was a substitute for the other - which were not yet entirely clear. He preferred to move adjournment and ask those parties to put them in writing, and circulate them with the agenda so that members could make informed decisions next time. This was seconded (see Appendix C).

Item No. 9 - Adjournment. Council voted in favor of Inman's motion, and the meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

APPENDIX A

SUMMER FACULTY FELLOWSHIPS AWARDED 11/13/89

<u>RG#</u>	<u>NAME AND DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>
1103	Dr. Elizabeth Beach College of Nursing	"Concept Analysis: Recovery Post Acute Heart Attack"
1104	Mr. Andrew Borowiec School of Art	"A Photographic Investigation of the People and Landscape of Contemporary Tunisia"
1105	Dr. James Holda Biology	"The Effect of Endotoxin on Bone Marrow Natural Suppressor Cells and Hematopoiesis"
1106	Dr. Kevin Kreider Mathematical Sciences	"An Inverse Scattering Problem for the Dispersive Sphere"
1107	Mr. David Meyer Management	"The Determinants of the Outcomes of Certification Elections: Product Market, Local Labor Market, and Union Resource Effects"
1108	Mr. Dennis Meyer School of Art	"Woodcarving and Its Creative Application to an Original Furniture Design"
1109	Dr. Daniel Nelson History	"Labor in the Midwest, 1880-1990"
1110	Mr. Stanley Silverman Associate Studies	"A Comparison of Performance Appraisal Practices in United States and Japanese Companies"
1111	Dr. A. Martin Wainwright History	"The Role of South Asia in British Strategic Policy, 1939-56"
1112	Dr. Darlene Walro Biology	"Role of Protein Kinase C in Regulating Latent Herpes Simplex Virus"
1113	Dr. Lois Ann Wodarski School of Home Economics and Family Ecology	"Coronary Heart Disease Risk Reduction in Children and Adolescents"
1114	Dr. Jeffrey Dilts Marketing	"Strategy Formulation: Effects of the Perceived Environment on Strategic Choice"

APPENDIX B

Proposed amendment to Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-02 Organization of the University, (B)(5)(a) (as proposed by the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee):

Department heads are appointed by the Board TO FOUR-YEAR RENEWABLE TERMS upon recommendation of not less than two-thirds (FOR REAPPOINTMENT, NOT LESS THAN HALF) of the faculty members of the department or division, the Dean of the college, the Provost, and the President; ~~hold office at the discretion of the President; and~~ DEPARTMENT HEADS are responsible to the Dean of their colleges AND TO THEIR DEPARTMENT FACULTY. They are the administrative heads of their respective departments, divisions, or schools (hereinafter referred to as "departments") and are charged with the general supervision of all departmental interests in accordance with policies established by the Board, the President, their Dean, their faculty, and University Council. Both the administration and the faculty will bear in mind that department heads have special obligations to build departments strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Amendment to Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-02 Organization of the University, (B)(5)(a) (as amended and passed by University Council):

Department heads are appointed by the Board upon recommendation of not less than two-thirds of the faculty members of the department or division, the Dean of the college, the Provost, and the President; ~~hold office at the discretion of the President; and are~~ responsible to the Dean of their colleges AND TO THEIR DEPARTMENT FACULTY. They are the administrative heads of their respective departments, divisions, or schools (hereinafter referred to as "departments") and are charged with the general supervision of all departmental interests in accordance with ~~policies established by the Board, the President, their Dean, their faculty, and University Council~~ UNIVERSITY AND RESPECTIVE COLLEGE AND DEPARTMENTAL POLICIES. Both the administration and the faculty will bear in mind that department heads have special obligations to build departments strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

APPENDIX C

Proposed amendment to Faculty Manual Section 3359-20-02:Amend 3359-20-02 Organization of the University, (B) (5) (b) (iv):

The Dean shall assess annually the performance of department heads. At intervals not to exceed four years, or upon the specific request of the majority of the full-time faculty members in the department, the Dean shall make a substantive review of the department head to include confidential interviews with all full-time members of the department faculty AND A YES-OR-NO SECRET BALLOT OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT ON THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AS HEAD. IF THE HEAD DOES NOT RECEIVE A MAJORITY AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE DEPARTMENT, OR IF this review reveals that the interests of the department will be better served by a replacement because of a manifest lack of confidence in the department head, or of unresolvable departmental problems, or for other sufficient reason, a search for a replacement shall be undertaken by the procedures described herein.

Motion to amend presented to Council by Dr. McGucken:
(*italic/underscored*)

The Dean shall assess annually the performance of department heads. At intervals not to exceed four years, or upon the specific request of the majority of the full-time faculty members in the department, the Dean shall make a substantive review of the department head to include confidential interviews with all full-time members of the department faculty AND A YES-OR-NO SECRET BALLOT OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT ON THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AS HEAD. THE BALLOT SHALL BE TAKEN AT A MEETING OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY CALLED TO CONSIDER THE RETENTION OF THE HEAD. IF THE HEAD DOES NOT RECEIVE A MAJORITY AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE DEPARTMENT, OR IF this review reveals that the interests of the department will be better served by a replacement because of a manifest lack of confidence in the department head, or of unresolvable departmental problems, or for other sufficient reason, a search for a replacement shall be undertaken by the procedures described herein.

Motion By Dr. Noble to substitute for Dr. McGucken's amendment :
(italic/underscored)

The Dean shall assess annually the performance of department heads. At intervals not to exceed four years, or upon the specific request of the majority of the full-time faculty members in the department, the Dean shall make a substantive review of the department head to include confidential interviews with all full-time members of the department faculty. AS A PART OF THIS REVIEW, THE DEAN SHALL CALL A MEETING OF ALL THE FULL TIME FACULTY OF THE DEPARTMENT AND A YES-OR-NO SECRET BALLOT OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY IN THE DEPARTMENT ON THE RETENTION OF THE DEPARTMENT HEAD AS HEAD. IF THE HEAD DOES NOT RECEIVE A MAJORITY AFFIRMATIVE VOTE OF THE FULL-TIME FACULTY MEMBERS IN THE DEPARTMENT, OR IF this review reveals that the interests of the department will be better served by a replacement because of a manifest lack of confidence in the department head, or of unresolvable departmental problems, or for other sufficient reason, a search for a replacement shall be undertaken by the procedures described herein.

CURRICULUM CHANGES

The following curriculum changes, in accordance with the Curricula Change process adopted by University Council on December 12, 1974, have had final approval by the Senior Vice President and Provost, or through specific vote by University Council, all effective September 1990 (unless otherwise noted).

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE**CT-90-1**

Engineering and Science Technology

Program Title Change as follows:

From: Drafting Technology
To: Drafting & Computer Drafting Technology

CT-90-2

Engineering and Science Technology

Add **Certificate Program in Drafting Technology**

The following 9 semester hours are required:

2940:121	Technical Drawing I	3
2940:122	Technical Graphics	3
2940:210	Computer Drafting	3

A minimum of 9 hours selected from the following:

2870:311	Computer Aided Drafting II	2
2940:170	Surveying Drafting	3
2940:200	Advanced Drafting	3
2940:230	Mechanical Systems Drafting	3
2940:240	Electrical & Electronic Drafting	3
2940:250	Architectural Drafting	3
2980:250	Structural Drafting	2
3350:340	Cartography	3

All courses taken may be applied toward an Associate Degree in Drafting Technology.

COLLEGE OF NURSING

NU-90-1

Description	8200:100	<u>Introduction to Nursing.</u> 1 credit. Prerequisite: None. <u>TO</u> Introduces students to influences of past, present, and future political, legal, social, and cultural processes on nursing profession and the roles of the nurses.
	8200:101	<u>Introduction to Baccalaureate Nursing for R.N.s.</u> 1 credit. Prerequisite: R.N. <u>TO</u> Introduces R.N. students to the purposes of baccalaureate nursing education. Explores philosophy, nursing theories, research, emerging roles, nursing process, and health care delivery system.
	8200:305	<u>Nursing Theories, Concepts, and Research.</u> 6 credits. Prerequisite: 101, admission to college. <u>TO</u> The specific focus is to relate concepts, theories, and investigate projects to the practice of nursing in a health-care system using the nursing process.
	8200:330	<u>Fundamentals of Pharmacology.</u> 3 credits. Prerequisite: 300 or concurrent registration. <u>TO</u> Emphasis on fundamental concepts of pharmacology as applied to major drug classes, actions, and effects. Application of nursing process to drug therapy across life span.
	8200:340	<u>Creativity and Innovation in Nursing Research.</u> 2 credits. Prerequisite: junior standing. <u>TO</u> The elements in a nursing research proposal, nursing research report, and methods of communicating nursing research are presented in a creative and individualized environment.
	8200:425	<u>Basic Assessment.</u> 3 credits. Prerequisite: senior standing. <u>TO</u> Emphasis on collection of complete health histories, also performance of systematic physical assessments across life span. Health care deficits, assets, and future planning are included.
	8200:435	<u>Basic Research.</u> 2 credits. Prerequisite: senior standing. <u>TO</u> This course presents an overview of the research process and approaches to research. The importance of nursing research is discussed.

	8200:470	<u>Community Health Nursing.</u> 4 credits. <u>Prerequisite:</u> 450, 460. <u>TO</u> The course explores selected concepts and issues relevant to community health nursing. The effect of legal, ethical, economic, and political issues on community health nursing is discussed.
	8200:480	<u>Senior Honors Project.</u> 1-3 credits. <u>Prerequisites:</u> senior standing in Honors Program and nursing major. <u>TO</u> A creative project, independent study or research relevant to nursing which is supervised by a faculty preceptor and/or sponsor.
Prerequisite- Description	8200:200	<u>Nursing Theories and Concepts.</u> 5 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisites:</u> 100, admission to college. Demonstrates relationship of relevant theories, concepts from various sciences to individual's interaction with ecosystem nursing, and health care system. Exposure to research process begins.
	8200:300	<u>Nursing: Health.</u> 10 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> 200. Focuses on healthy individual's adaptation across life cycle. Application of nursing process, basic nursing skills in health-oriented settings. Continued exposure to research process.
	8200:315	<u>Pathophysiology for Nurses.</u> 2 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> junior standing. Develop understanding of basic concepts related to pathophysiologic mechanism of health, illness as applied to nursing. Emphasis on application to nursing using the nursing process.
	8200:400	<u>Nursing: Diminished Health II.</u> 12 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> 320. Assist students in applying knowledge, skills, nursing process for integrated approach to nursing in various settings, also developing leadership, change-agent roles utilizing teaching/learning process.
	8200:405	<u>Health Maintenance Nursing.</u> 5 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> 305. Designed to focus on healthy man throughout the life cycle. Theory and practice focus on healthy man's reciprocal interaction with ecological variables.

- 8200:415 Diminished Health Nursing. 6 credits. T0
Prerequisite: 305. Focus on assisting individuals and families experiencing diminished health to attain, maintain and regain optimal levels of health including application of nursing process.
- 8200:420 Nursing: Synthesis. 10 credits. T0
Prerequisite: 400. This course requires synthesis of previous learning to provide nursing care to individuals, families, and communities across lifespan in acute, community settings.
- 8200:450 Concepts and Theories of Professional Nursing. 3 credits. T0 Prerequisite: admission to college. Selected concepts and theories relevant to professional nursing are studied and related to nursing practice. Critical thinking strategies are utilized to examine nursing theories and concepts.
- 8200:460 Issues and Roles of the Profession of Nursing. 3 credits. T0 Prerequisite: admission to college. The focus of the course is to relate role theory to personal and professional life. Issues affecting the nursing profession and delivery of nursing care are addressed.
- 8200:485 Leadership and Management Roles in Professional Nursing. 5 credits. T0 Prerequisites: 450, 460, 470. The course focuses on advanced role transition as it relates to the resocialization process of professional nurses. The course relates the resocialization of the nurse to the leadership and management roles.
- 8200:497 Independent Study. 1-3 credits. T0
Prerequisite: permission of instructor. Provides opportunity to develop greater depth in an area of nursing through methodology specific to discipline of nursing.

NU-90-2Change in Undergraduate Program Requirement as follows:

Drop ten-year time limit set on Anatomy and Physiology, also Microbiology. Students will have to provide evidence that they successfully completed courses in anatomy and physiology as well as microbiology. Students who took these courses 15-20 years ago will be strongly counseled to take review courses, and be informed that they will be held responsible for transferring knowledge from these areas into their nursing content.

COLLEGE OF POLYMER SCIENCE AND POLYMER ENGINEERINGPC-90-1Polymer Engineering

Add 9841:650 Introduction to Polymer Engineering. 2 credits.
Prerequisite: none. Basic concepts of polymer engineering taught in lecture-laboratory format intended for orientation of new graduate students.

PC-90-2Polymer Science

Revise Doctor of Philosophy in Polymer Science as follows:

Add to the list of requirements,
"Satisfy the foreign language requirement for the doctoral degree by meeting the requirements of Plan A, B, or C as specified by the student's advisory committee. Appropriate research skills for Plan C are to be specified by the Department on the basis of the student's area of specialization and intended research. These skills include proficiency in a computer programming language, special mathematical methods, applied statistical analysis, and special literature search techniques."

PC-90-3Polymer Science

Number,	9871:302	<u>Introduction to Plastics. 3 credits. TO</u>
Prerequi-	9871:402	<u>Introduction to Plastics. 3 credits.</u>
site,		Prerequisite: 401 or permission. An
Descrip-		introduction to the science and technology
tion		of plastic materials. Lecture and laboratory.

PC-90-4
Polymer Science

Number,	9871:301	<u>Introduction to Elastomers.</u> 3 credits. <u>T0</u>
Prerequi-	9871:401	<u>Introduction to Elastomers.</u> 3 credits.
sites,		Prerequisites: physical chemistry (or
Descrip-		equivalent) or permission. An introduction
tion		to the science and technology of elastomeric materials.
		Lecture and laboratory.

PC-90-5
Polymer Science

Credits,	9871:899	<u>Doctoral Research in Polymer Science.</u> <u>T0</u>
Descrip-		<u>Doctoral Research in Polymer Science.</u> <u>1-16</u>
tion		credits. Open to properly qualified students accepted as
		candidates for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Polymer
		Science depending on the availability of staff and
		facilities.

SCHOOL OF LAW —

Pursuant to prior University Council authorization (Minutes, February 19, 1970, page 12 of the Faculty Bulletin, March 5, 1970 issue), these curricular changes have been duly adopted by the Faculty of the School of Law at its meeting of October 12, 1989, to be effective beginning the academic term as stated herein.

LS-90-01

Add the following to be effective Summer Session I 1990 and thereafter:

- Add 9200:632 Seminar In Selected Legal Problems SQP I. 2 credits.
Prerequisite: none. Graded Credit/Noncredit. This course is required only when imposed as a condition for admission to the J.D. degree program. Introduction to the law and the American legal system. Designed to stimulate students to exercise their powers of reasoning through an analysis of the facts of various case situations. This, in turn, is intended to develop an appreciation of legal problem solving. Students evaluate alternative solutions and opposing views, and gain insight into the social, legal, and business problems of the time.
- 9200:634 Seminar In Selected Legal Problems SQP II. 2 credits.
Prerequisite: none. Graded Credit/Noncredit. This course is required only when imposed as a condition for admission to the J.D. degree program. Introduces students to the study of business organizations. Examines the various forms of unincorporated business organizations, with the focus on: agency relationships and concepts; the responsibilities of the actors in the agency relationship, including vicarious liability and fiduciary obligations; the formation, dissolution and termination of partnerships and limited partnerships; nature of partnership property and distribution of assets; and other unincorporated enterprises such as joint ventures and sole proprietorships. An attempt is made to use agency and partnership law to expose students to legal reasoning in the judicial process, and to the case method of study.

