The University of Akron
IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

11-20-1989

Faculty Senate Chronicle November 20, 1989

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.

the university of akron
Chronicle

a report to the faculty of
the university of akron

1989-90, No. 3 14 pages November 20, 1989

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
November 2, 1989

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Senior Vice President and Provost, Dr. Frank Marini, at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 2, 1989 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-two of the 82 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were President William Muse, Associate Provost Hilton Bonniwell, Dean Patricia Carrell, Associate Provost Robert Dubick, Acting Dean Nancy Grant, Dean Isaac Hunt, Dean Jane Martin, Dean Wallace Williams, Dr. Mary Ellen Atwood, Dr. David Bernstein, Mr. Lyle Dye, Dr. F. Bruce Simmons, and Dr. Walter Yoder. Absent without notice were Mr. Clifford Billions, Dr. Gary Frank, Dr. Frank Griffin, Dr. Nathan Ida, Dr. Susan Speers, Student Bar Association Representative Nancy Cushion, and Associated Student Government Representative Joseph Pallotta.

Item No. 1 - Remarks of the President. Since President Muse was not in attendance, there were no remarks.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of October 5, 1989, as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle of October 20, 1989. The Chairman called for any corrections to the minutes. Dr. Don R. Gerlach inquired in regard to the action of electing Dr. June Burton as Council's representative to the Chancellor's Faculty Advisory Committee as reported on page 7 whether the reference "for this year" meant the calendar year or the academic year. His understanding was that Mr. James Nolte was unable to serve as the duly-elected alternate simply for this semester, and that would mean that Dr. Burton would only be needed for this calendar year.

The Chairman responded that since Dr. Burton had been elected as an alternate, if Mr. Nolte could serve in the spring, then clearly the alternate would not be needed. If he could not, then the alternate would be needed. He asked Mr. Nolte whether he would be able to serve next semester. Mr. Nolte replied that the schedule of meetings had not yet been set, so he would not know until December. The Chairman noted that since Dr. Burton had been elected as the alternate, she would serve as the representative whenever the other elected members could not.

Dr. David Buchthal pointed out that on page 19 of the minutes the word "withouts" had an "s" which should be struck out.

It was then moved and seconded that the minutes be approved as amended. Council voted its approval.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman noted that it was customary at the November Council meeting to distribute the overall statistics on faculty salaries for the current year for the University campus at Akron and the Wayne campus. President Muse would

also be sending a letter to all faculty here and on the Wayne College campus with this information. The information was then passed out to Council members (see Appendix A).

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

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on October 19. Provost Marini was absent with notice. As its first item of business, the Committee made some additional appointments to standing committees of Council. It then certified the Contract Professionals' election for the representatives to University Council and the Faculty Well-Being Committee. Although there had been a technical irregularity in the execution of the contract professional election procedures, the Committee thought that it did not negate the validity of the results.

The Committee then set the agenda for the November 2 meeting of Council. One item of New Business relating to the number representing a quorum for Council meetings was placed on the agenda, and an opportunity for the Ad Hoc Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance Committee to report directly to Council was added under Item 5 of the Agenda, which was retitled "Reports of the Committees" instead of "Reports of the Standing Committees."

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - The Chairman stated that the Committee had met on November 1 and continued discussion of the five-year plan updates which had been submitted by the colleges.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Assistant Provost Joseph Walton stated that the first item of business in his report was the approval of the degree candidates for the January commencement. The lists had been circulated to the departments, and copies were available at the meeting. He moved that the candidate list be approved, and this was seconded. Since there was no discussion, the Chairman called for a vote and Council gave its approval.

Dr. Walton then reported that the Committee had met on October 17. Following introductory remarks on General Studies, Dr. Marini asked members of APCC to review relevant materials and to be prepared to advise him about the topic at the next APCC meeting. He then turned the meeting over to his designate, Dr. Walton, who introduced the proposed subcommittee membership assignments. These were then discussed.

Three items were treated under old business. The first was the curriculum approval process. It was decided that this matter would be referred to the Curriculum Subcommittee for further consideration. Written comments from those who had experience with different curriculum review processes were welcome.

The second item of old business discussed was the 2.0 requirement

for admission to upper college. At the end of the May, 1989 meeting, the chairman of APCC had been asked to consult with the Provost regarding 1) the authority of APCC and University Council regarding G.P.A.'s for entrance to and exit from specific programs, and 2) University Council authority regarding department and/or college changes in required G.P.A.'s for program admission and degree requirements. Dr. Walton had spoken with Dr. Marini about these two matters, which would be discussed again at a future APCC meeting.

The third item of old business was curriculum proposal CT-89-25. This proposal had been tabled last May in order to give Dean Williams and Dean Long time to try and resolve the objections to it over the summer. Although the deans had met, resolution had not yet been made. They would continue their efforts, and more information would be presented to the Committee at the appropriate time.

Dean Walton asked the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee to seek the adoption of a permanent calendar for 1990-91 and a preliminary calendar for 1991-92. He also advised the Committee of a request from Dr. Gerlach, President Pro Tem of the Council, who asked that all University Council committees share any reports to be considered by Council in advance with the Executive Committee members.

At the end of Dr. Walton's report, Dr. Gerlach asked whether there was some question about Council's jurisdiction over matters of entrance to and exit from specific programs with reference to the 2.0 grade average. If there was, he wanted to remind the body that the Bylaws of Council said that we were empowered by the Board of Trustees to formulate suitable rules, requirements and procedures for admission, government, management, control of students' courses, etc. He thought that a suitable rule included grade point averages. Was there any doubt about that?

The Chairman replied that he thought that there was no doubt about the authority of Council to recommend as it wished in regard to such matters. However, there was the question of whether Council had historically wished to do so. Past practice had been for colleges to set those grade point averages for themselves and to forward the requests to the Provost's office. He then either approved those requirements for that college or he did not. Provosts previous to him had insisted on adjusting those entrance grade point averages only by college. They had not been willing to contemplate that a given department in a college might have a different standard than another department in the same college. He had followed this practice up until this point. In discussion with the deans recently, he had indicated that he saw no good reason for this and would in the future contemplate requests from departments, as long as they were endorsed by the dean. That was past practice, but there was nothing sacred about it. If Council chose to legislate or make recommendations in this area, it was quite within its mandate. However, Council might choose to let the colleges make those decisions.

Dr. Gerlach stated that Council ought to make up its mind as to

exactly what it wanted to do on this issue. He thought that Council ought to do it in keeping with the Bylaws and what the Board had empowered it to do. He did not think that Council could allow separate colleges and separate departments to go willy-nilly their own way without following an overall University policy.

The question was then raised about Council having dealt recently with the grade point average entrance requirement for the College of Business Administration. Dr. William Fleming stated that Council had considered that matter and approved it.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester asked a question relating to the list of degree candidates for the January commencement. There were two places where the degree Master of Science in Engineering was listed - once on page three along with the Engineering students, and then again on page six after the Master of Science (Polymer). He wondered whether the second degree should be Master of Science in Polymer Engineering.

A discussion of this question then ensued, and the conclusion was that while there were Polymer Engineering Master students, there was at the moment no such thing as a "Master of Science in Polymer Engineering" degree.

D. Athletics Committee - No report.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Mr. Art Pollock reported that the Committee had met on October 16 and elected him Chairman for the 89-90 academic year. The Committee expressed concern about the amount and quality of facilities planning information made available to faculty as well as to members of the administration starting with, but not confined to, department heads. It also expressed great concern about the lack of meaningful involvement of the CFP Committee in the facilities planning process, as well as the lack of involvement of many others in that planning process. The Committee also instructed the Chairman to obtain copies of the University's "six-year capital plan," at least in summary form, and OBR Space Utilization Guidelines, and rejected a motion to ask the Executive Committee of University Council to appoint a member of the Facilities Planning Department to sit on this committee. Finally, the Committee adopted a motion to invite representatives of the Facilities Planning Department to meet with the Committee whenever that was deemed prudent.

Dr. Dale Jackson noted that about two years ago the Committee had conducted a survey asking for comments about problems with classroom facilities and asking for suggestions for improvements. In view of some of the recent complaints made by some faculty members about some of the facilities which we have, he wondered whether the Committee would consider repeating that survey to see if the situation might be ameliorated.

Mr. Pollock replied that he would take Dr. Jackson's suggestion to the Committee.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Dr. Tom Miles, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on October 12 and 19, and on November 2. Two of the six grievances received by the Committee were assigned the file numbers 050-89 and 060-89. The Committee had completed its consideration of the grievances and had rejected the complaints.

Dr. Miles also brought to Council from the Committee two proposed amendments to the Faculty Manual section 3359-20-02 (5) regarding evaluations of department heads:

Amend 3359-20-02 (5) (a)

(a) 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; //////////////////////////////// DEPARTMENT HEADS ARE RESPONSIBLE TO THE DEANS OF THEIR COLLEGES AND TO THEIR DEPARTMENT FACULTY. They are the administrative....

Amend 3359-20-02 (5) (b) (iv):

(iv) The Dean shall assess annually the performance of department heads. At intervals not to exceed four years, or upon the special 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 interest of the department will be better served by a replacement because of a manifest lack of confidence in the department head....

Amend 3359-20-02 (5) (b) (vi):
deleting the first sentence and revising the second to read:

(vi) EACH COLLEGE DEAN SHALL CONDUCT SUBSTANTIVE REVIEWS OF APPROXIMATELY ONE-FOURTH OF THE DEPARTMENT HEADS EACH YEAR.

These were moved and seconded.

The Chairman pointed out that the slash marks which appeared in the amendment were strikeout marks striking out language which was being

deleted or substituted. The way this had been done made it impossible to see what language was being struck out. If there was a need for clarification, either he or the Committee chairman could clarify the language for Council members at the appropriate point in the discussion. Another possibility was to have this redone in the regular format and resubmit it, if members thought that they needed time to consider it that way.

This latter procedure, to in effect postpone discussion and have the proposed amendments redone in the regular format and recirculated in the usual way to see what language was being deleted, was moved and seconded. Council voted its approval.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - No report.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee - Dr. Robert Kent, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on October 23. Professor Norma Pearson, Chair of the ULLR Space Committee and Head of the Science and Technology Department of the ULLR, reported to the Committee on space needs for the University. She stated that acute space shortages in both library facilities were serious problems. She presented statistical data from Fall 1986 on the space problem in Bierce Library which suggested that it fell about 160,000 sq. ft. short of its space needs, with the most serious shortages being for stack space and reading and study space. The Science and Technology Library required at least an additional 22,000 sq. ft. These data were prepared by The University of Akron Planning Department and were based on OBR standards for college and university libraries.

Professor Pearson reported that some storage space for library materials might become available when the Polsky's building was renovated and when, or if, a regional storage facility was built in Rootstown. However, it would be at least several years before these storage spaces might be made available. Until then the ULLR would have to operate without adequate storage facilities, and the problem of inadequate space would become more critical as the Library's collection grew. (Indeed, more recent data for 1987 reported by the UA Planning Department suggested that Bierce Library lacked 227,000 sq. ft. of space and the Science and Technology Library lacked 29,000 sq. ft.

Finally, two of the Committee's subcommittees, Budget and Staffing/Personnel, presented preliminary report.

I. Reference Committee - No report.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - No report was presented at the meeting. However the Secretary later received a copy of a report of the Committee's October 30 meeting. It is included here as Appendix C.

K. Student Affairs Committee - No report.

L. Ad Hoc Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance Committee - Mrs.

Linda Weiner, the Chair, reported that the Committee was meeting regularly on Saturday mornings in Olin 362 and would next meet on November 4. It was concerned now with how best to utilize and present the data, which it had been gathering from other universities and from administrators and part-time faculty at this University. The Committee wanted to make itself available to all, so a memo would soon be sent out inviting anyone with something to say about part-time faculty rights and responsibilities to meet with it.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents. Dr. June Burton began her report by thanking Council for electing her to represent it at the FAC/COBOR and noted that she would attend the next regular meeting on December 5, when the group would host a retirement luncheon for Chancellor Coulter. From what she gathered from a variety of sources, the FAC had been operating in a state of disarray, but the new chancellor would clarify matters when that person took over in January.

Dr. Burton was slightly bothered by her recent discovery that on November 9-10 the FAC would be holding a second workshop at Roscoe Village. Representatives were supposed to take to the meeting the plans that they had been working on for the past year involving faculty in minority access and success on their respective campuses. Since there had been no plans left for her, she did not particularly regret the fact that she had a scheduling conflict on those days. On our campus, this issue was already handled administratively by people whose job description was to do this. If Council wanted to send an observer, it should select someone to go. She could not select someone because it would be inappropriate for anyone but this body to authorize a person to go. She reiterated that she would attend the regular December 5 meeting and all meetings after that.

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business. There was none.

Item No. 8 - New Business. The Chairman said that there was a proposed amendment to Council Bylaws, section 3359-10-05 Officers of Council, which would be a new section (G):

> THE QUORUM REQUIRED FOR 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 moved for Council's initial consideration of this amendment to the Bylaws, but begged Council's pardon for making a rather grievous error in suggesting where it should go in the Bylaws. On the Agenda, there was a reference to adding it to section 3359-10-05 under Officers of Council as a new section. He noted for Council's purposes in the future that it should read to replace item (E) in section 3359-10-07 under Meetings. This could be found on page 7 of the Bylaws. He then moved to replace that current section (E) with this new legislation, and this was seconded.

The Chairman commented that past practice had allowed discussion of these matters at the time of introduction, but actual voting would be postponed until the next meeting. Was there any such discussion?

Dr. Gerlach, as the introducer of the motion, wanted to explain his motivation. From experience in the recent past it appeared to him that it was not altogether advisable to follow the strict majority of the voting membership of Council for a quorum. The body might establish almost any number it wished as a quorum, but he thought that a majority was a little bit too large. He proposed that, given recent experience, Council reduce the number in effect by nine. The present majority was 41, and the effect of this amendment would be to cut that by nine to a lesser number.

Dean Claibourne Griffin wanted to speak against the amendment. He did not like the idea of redefining a quorum on the basis of attendance or other similar reasons. There was the possibility that ten years from now for some reason or other the Arts and Science representatives in this group could not attend and were absent. He would not want to be facing a new amendment saying that Arts and Sciences representatives won't be counted in determining a quorum. If the quorum number was too large - and he thought in Council maybe on three occasions in the last ten years there had been a problem in obtaining a quorum - then Council should change the number. However, it would be a bad precedent to do it by identifying specific individuals or groups.

Mr. James Neilson wanted to say that this new amendment would not be consistent with the definition of a quorum and that the majority should be representative. He thought that this was pinpointing the students on University Council, and, if the amendment were passed, it would not be an equal treatment of students. It would actually put the faculty higher than the students.

Since there was no further discussion of this matter, the Chairman noted that it would be taken up again at the next meeting.

Item No. 9 - Adjournment. The Chairman asked for a motion to adjourn. This was moved, seconded, and approved by Council. The meeting ended at 3:39 p.m.

APPENDIX A

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Main Campus

	Professors		Assoc. Profs.		Asst. Profs.		Instructors	
	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90
Minimum								
Salary	$31,300	$31,600	$26,025	$27,450	$24,000	$25,000	$23,742	$24,785
Comp.	$37,711	$38,660	$33,135	$35,919	$31,194	$31,486	$30,533	$30,848
Median								
Salary	$51,183	$52,305	$37,954	$39,612	$32,741	$33,625	$28,504	$30,230
Comp.	$62,098	$65,033	$47,206	$48,917	$41,393	$41,569	$36,448	$39,643
Average								
Salary	$52,132	$54,273	$39,236	$40,893	$34,217	$35,653	$28,356	$30,285
Comp.	$63,123	$66,738	$48,171	$51,200	$42,371	$45,149	$35,739	$39,141
Maximum								
Salary	$89,850	$95,150	$61,300	$65,500	$53,000	$55,200	$31,400	$46,500
Comp.	$107,794	$115,119	$73,768	$79,787	$65,023	$68,792	$39,320	$58,672

Wayne Campus

	Professors		Assoc. Profs.		Asst. Profs.		Instructors	
	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90	1988-89	1989-90
Minimum								
Salary	$36,000	$38,700	$28,900	$31,000	$25,000	$25,400	$22,500	$24,500
Comp.	$44,619	$48,886	$36,489	$40,095	$32,361	$31,950	$29,438	$32,936
Median								
Salary	$37,850	$40,600	$29,925	$33,000	$25,700	$27,800	$22,950	$24,600
Comp.	$46,747	$51,077	$37,674	$42,407	$32,801	$34,350	$29,216	$33,051
Average								
Salary	$37,850	$40,600	$30,038	$32,490	$26,486	$27,600	$23,600	$24,675
Comp.	$46,747	$51,077	$37,789	$41,794	$33,548	$35,689	$30,474	$33,142
Maximum								
Salary	$39,700	$42,500	$31,400	$33,800	$30,000	$29,200	$27,400	$25,000
Comp.	$48,875	$53,268	$39,320	$43,221	$37,764	$38,014	$35,160	$33,527

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE
Meeting of October 30, 1989

A meeting of the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee met on Monday, October 30, 1989 in the Conference Room of 138 Fir Hill Center. Members present were: Mrs. Ann Bolek, Dr. James Grover, Dr. Jon Hawes, Dr. Sebastian Kanakkanatt, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Daniel Sheffer, Mr. Dudley Turner, Mrs. Adele Webb, Dr. Mary Ellen Atwood, Dr. Keith Klafehn, Dr. David Stark, Dr. John Wodarski, Dr. Dolores Bower, Dr. Roger Durbin, Mr. Donald Harvey, Dr. Penny Marquette, and Dr. H. Roger Grant. Members absent with notice were Dean Patricia Carrell due to she is out of the country and Dr. Roger Creel.

Before the committee began reviewing the proposals, Dr. Wodarski stated that later on we would be discussing the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation that a faculty member can make up to 50 percent of their salary and receive a summer fellowship.

A question was raised regarding the total amount of money available and the total amount of the proposals that were submitted. Dr. Wodarski stated that he only wanted to fund proposals that were very good.

Dr. Wodarski stated that this program will be moving to fund people that will work for outside funding. Too many of these grants in the past have never gone outside.

It was also stated that these proposals were to be double-spaced so that it would be easier to read. It was never put into the guidelines. Dr. Wodarski assured the committee members that it will be put into the guidelines for next year.

There were 25 proposals submitted in the fall faculty research competition. All 25 were reviewed today for merit, using the scoring procedures used before with secret ballots, with 1 ranking a superior proposal, 2 ranking good, 3 average, 4 poor, and 5 an ineligible. It takes at least 3 votes of a 5 for a proposal to be considered an ineligible proposal.

After all 25 proposals were reviewed for merit and placed in rank order, budgetary considerations were made. After reviewing the proposals in rank order and making budgetary considerations, there were a total of 12 proposals that were funded, totalling $36,704.00.

There was a business meeting after reviewing the proposals. The Ad Hoc Committee recommended that faculty members receiving a summer fellowship should be able to receive up to 50% of their regular salary. There was one person that was opposed to this because of the summer proposals already being submitted and it would not be fair to those who did not

submit a summer proposal because of this. It was agreed that this would be done next year.

Dr. Wodarski was elected as Chairperson and he accepted. Dr. Isadore Newman was elected as Co-Chairperson and he accepted.

Dr. Penny Marquette raised a question about a policy on normal computer equipment. It was suggested that we have a list of departments that have computer equipment. Dr. Wodarski stated that he feels it is okay to use the Faculty Research Grant as a way to get equipment.

Dr. Wodarski thanked everyone for their hard work and for coming to the meeting.

The next Research (Faculty Projects) Committee meeting will be on Monday, November 13, 1989 at 8:30 a.m. in the Conference Room at 138 Fir Hill Center.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Bauer

FALL FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED 10/30/89

RG#	NAME AND DEPARTMENT	TITLE OF PROJECT	AMOUNT
1091	Dr. Celal Batur Mechanical Engineering	"Life Extending Design Through Artificial Intelligence"	$ 2,100
1092	Dr. Harry Chu Physics	"High Temperature Superconductivity in Semimetal Bismuth"	2,700
1093	Dr. Malik Elbuluk Electrical Engineering	"Design, Construction and Testing of a Current-Fed Series Resonant Converter"	2,600
1094	Dr. Virginia Fleming Home Economics and Family Ecology	"An Analysis of Learning Styles of Residence Hall Roommates with Roommate Changes, Grade Achievement and College Satisfaction"	3,300
1095	Dr. Robert Liang Civil Engineering Dr. Fred Choy Mechanical Engineering	"Nondestructive and Quantitative Evaluation of Crack Density in Concrete Pavements"	3,870
1096	Dr. Robert Mallik Physics	"Inelastic Electron Tunnelling Studies of Thin Metallic and Inorganic Films"	3,500
1097	Dr. Joseph Kennedy Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering	"Synthesis of Novel Polyisobutylene-Polyvinyl Methyl Ether Block Copolymers by Combining Living Polymerization Techniques"	4,000
1098	Dr. Barbara Moss Elementary Education	"An Examination of Whole Language Instruction in Middle Grade Classrooms"	3,684
1099	Dr. David Perry Chemistry	"Infrared Spectroscopy of Hydrogenated Fluorocarbon 134a"	4,000
1100	Dr. T.S. Srivatsan Mechanical Engineering Dr. Joseph Padovan Mechanical Engineering	"Cyclic Stress-Strain Response and Fatigue Fracture of Advanced Aluminum Alloys"	1,750
1101	Dr. T.S. Srivatsan Mechanical Engineering	"Microstructural Effects on Mechanical Response of Metal-Matrix Composites"	1,200

FALL FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED 10/30/89, Continued

1102	Dr. Chrys Wesdemiotis Chemistry	"Neutralization-Reionization Mass Spectrometry (NRMS)	4,000
		TOTAL	$36,704

DR. JOSEPH M. WALTON
OFF: SENIOR VP & PROVOST
BH 107

RECEIVED
NOV 2 0 1989
SR VP & PROVOST