

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

3-28-1990

Faculty Senate Chronicle March 28, 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.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Spring 1990 Faculty Research Grants	
Awarded 3/5/90.....	2
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council	
of 3/1/90.....	4
Appendix to the Minutes of the University Council	
Meeting of 3/1/90	
A. Minor Areas of Study - Additional Requirement.....	23
B. Report of the Akron Representative to the Faculty	
Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the	
Ohio Board of Regents.....	24
Curriculum Changes.....	27

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

SPRING 1990 FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED 3/5/90
Effective: 3/5/90 - 1/31/91

<u>RG#</u>	<u>NAME AND DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	
1115	Dr. Shelley Baranowski History	"The Sanctity of Rural Life: Agrarian Conservatism in Pomerania, 1918-1933"	\$ 3,030
1116	Dr. Kim Calvo Chemistry	"Cloning, Sequencing, and Overexpression of the nadC Gene from E.coli	3,644
1117	Drs. Frank Costa and Richard Klosterman, Urban Studies and Dr. Charles Monroe, Geography	"Analysis and Projection of Housing Trends for the Akron Metropolitan Area to the Year 2000"	3,800
1118	Dr. Scott Forbes Mechanical Engineering	"Schlieren Filtering Applied In-Line Particle Holography"	4,000
1119	Dr. Peter Henriksen Physics	"Electrical Characterization of Metal-Semiconductor Buried Interfaces"	2,895
1120	Dr. Cynthia Kalodner Psychology	"Subclinical Eating Disorders: A Structured Group Counseling Program"	2,660
1121	Dr. Sebastian Kanakkanatt Engineering & Science Technology	"Preparation and Characterization of a Novel Photochromic Polymer"	4,500
1122	Dr. Elizabeth Kinion Nursing	"A Pilot Study to Evaluate the Effects of A Sit and Get Fit Program of Care"	4,500
1123	Drs. S. Perosa and M. J. Zygmund Counseling and Special Education	"Family Communication Project"	4,000
1124	Dr. Helen Richter Chemistry	"Development and Characterization of Model Compounds for the Enzyme Catalase"	4,000

SPRING 1990 FACULTY RESEARCH GRANTS AWARDED 3/5/90, Continued

1125	Dr. Daniel Smith Chemistry	"Age-Dependent Decrease in Tissue Carnitine: Contributing Factors and Health-Related Impact"	4,000
1126	Dr. Isabelle Stombaugh Home Economics	"The Relationship of Fat Distribution Patterns and Energy Efficiency to Amenorrhea in Dancers"	3,110
1127	Dr. Dudley Turner Communication	"Intraorganizational Bargaining Strategy Use: A Comparative Study"	2,194
1128	Dr. Adele Webb Nursing	"Ethical Decision Making by Nurses in AIDS Situations"	4,037
1129	Dr. Christine Wynd Nursing	"Smoking Relapse Prevention: The Use of Relaxation Imagery for Stress Reduction"	<u>1,803</u>
		Total	\$ 52,173

**MINUTES OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING
March 1, 1990**

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, March 1, 1990 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-six of the 83 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Acting Dean Nancy Grant, Dean Nicholas Sylvester, Dr. Mary Ellen Atwood, Dr. David Bernstein, Dr. Alice Christie, Dr. Gary Frank, Dr. Avraam Isayev, Mr. Christopher Meyer, and Dr. Diana Vukovich. Absent without notice were Dr. Roger Creel, Dr. John Frederick, Dr. Nathan Ida, Dr. Paul Lam, Dr. Susan Speers, Dr. Dudley Turner, Associated Student Government Representative Edward Hopson and Non-Traditional Student Government Representative Kevin Grimes.

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

I wanted to report to you first of all on some matters that were recommended to me by this body. At our Board of Trustees meeting yesterday we presented to them two recommendations from the University Council, and both of those recommendations were approved. The first related to a requirement that each college dean conduct a substantive review of the department heads within the college within a four-year interval, and the second related to the process for consideration of appeals involving termination at the college level. Both of those were accepted by the Board. You recommended some additional changes to me that I have under consideration; I want to take a little more time to study those before making a final decision on that.

Secondly, as I expect most of you learned today Provost Marini has indicated a desire to return to full-time faculty status, and he plans to return to resume a teaching/research post in Public Administration next fall. I wanted to report to you briefly about the search process for the Senior Vice President and Provost. The Faculty Manual spells out very clearly what this process is. It involves each of the degree-granting colleges electing a representative on that committee, for the administrators to elect two representatives, and for the Associated Student Government to appoint two representatives. That body then elects its own chairperson and conducts a search, recommending three names to the President. I will be asking each of the deans to convene their faculties within the next couple of weeks to elect a representative and to send those names to me by the 16th of March. And with those names in hand, we'll get the committee underway.

I want to use this opportunity to express to Dr. Marini my very sincere appreciation for his leadership of this institution over

the past five years. As I indicated to the Board of Trustees yesterday, I feel that the institution has been strengthened in many significant ways because of the leadership he has provided; and I want him to know how much I appreciate his contributions to the institution. (INSERT - SEE FOLLOWING PAGE)

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of February 1, 1990, as printed in The University of Akron Chronicle of February 19, 1990. The Chairman asked Dr. Gary Oller, the Secretary of Council, whether there were any corrections. Dr. Oller noted that there were two which he wished to make. On the top of page seven, the paragraph that began "Mr. David Buchthal..." should have read "Dr. David Buchthal...." On page 18, in the second line of the last paragraph, "Marthin Luther King..." should have read "Martin Luther King...."

Since there were no additional corrections, Council voted on the minutes as amended, and they were approved.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman's remarks were as follows:

There are a number of things I'd like to report to you about. As we near the end of the year, we began, as all legislative bodies do, picking up some speed; and I'd like to remind you about some things - where we are on a couple of things that I know some people are curious about. I think you as a body are well-informed about them, but, still, perhaps a reminder would be helpful, and some of the information is new.

After consulting with the Advisory Committee for the University Honors Program and with other individuals who have been connected with the Honors Program, I have recommended - and the recommendation has been accepted - that Professor Robert Holland of the English Department serve as director of the University Honors Program. The title is Master of the University Honors Program, but the Advisory Committee has also forwarded to me a recommendation that the name be changed to Director. I haven't yet had a chance to ascertain exactly who named it in the first place and how we ought to go about changing the name, but all of that in due course. In any case, Professor Holland is with us today, and I wish him well in the Honors Program.

I wanted to tell you some things about consultation that had occurred and events that had occurred on the General Studies Advisory Council (GSAC). I would like to report first that Dr. Elaine Nichols, Associate Professor of Nursing, has been appointed Chair of the General Studies Advisory Council. This recommendation was forwarded to me by Dr. Roger Creel, formerly the Chair, on behalf of the General Studies Advisory Council. Second, I met with the General Studies Advisory Council on February 8. We reviewed the three documents which had been submitted to me concerning

general education, the documents which I had earlier discussed on two occasions with APCC. Those documents were the original Task Force Report, the recommendations of APCC on the Task Force Report - both of which documents came to this body some time ago, you may recall - and then the General Studies Advisory Council's own report of 1988. The General Studies Advisory Council and I agreed that the recommendations coming to me from that Council most recently, at the beginning of this year, had a problem, and it's a problem that I had discussed with APCC; and that is that those recommendations did not follow the charge of this body that the Council figure a way to implement the Task Force recommendations, but rather developed an alternative to the Task Force recommendations. And the General Studies Advisory Council has now agreed to take upon themselves the task that they were originally charged with and look for a way to implement the recommendations of the Task Force, which you had received and essentially asked be referred to them. So I think we're back on track there. We also agreed that some action could be taken at this point, and should be taken promptly. Let me run through those for you. The following decisions were reached, and I'll list them by subject area of the sections of the Task Force Report:

English Composition. I will move the existing 1100:111 and 1100:112 - that is, the English writing courses - from University College to the Department of English. I've already notified, a month ago, the head of the English Department that I would be doing that. I will probably prefer to consult with the University College Dean. She and I talked on the phone yesterday, and we may need to consult about some of these things. But it is my intention to do that, in any case. As you may know, Dean Grant was hospitalized - now she's home recuperating, but she will be recuperating for about another two weeks from surgery. But, in any case, I think those courses can be moved to the English Department. The discussions I've had with Dean Griffin and with the Department Head of the English Department assure me that they can be moved with the realization on the English Department's part of the responsibility they have to the General Studies obligation of those courses. Furthermore, I will ask the English Department to follow the guidance of the Task Force recommendation that two three-credit courses in college writing be designed to fulfill one portion of the composition requirement; this is in lieu of the present four-unit courses. I will also ask the English Department to study and make recommendations as to how an advanced, or upper-division, writing course could be developed.

Under Oral Communication, I will recommend moving the existing 1100:105 and 1100:106 courses from University College to the Department of Communication, following the same consultation with Dean Grant that I just indicated. The

Correction - insert @ p. 5, end of ¶ 1.

Dr. William McGucken had a question for the President regarding the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances which Council would be considering later in the meeting. He wondered whether the President had looked at it and was curious to know whether he had any reaction to some of the statements in it which had surprised him (McGucken). One statement was that part-time faculty

comprised 31 percent of the full-time faculty equivalence (F.T.E.), teaching 26 percent of total student hours and 80 percent of General Studies courses. There was also a graph in the report where comparisons were made between The University of Akron and other state institutions. It showed our University with the already mentioned 31 percent and the next institution which he suspected was Ohio State at 22 percent and the lowest at six percent. Those figures surprised him because if he had been asked about this he would have guessed that only five or 10 percent of our faculty were part-time. Did President Muse have any reaction to these figures?

The President replied that he had not seen the report and would be hesitant to react to it. Since he had not studied it, he also was not sure about the accuracy of the figures.



General Studies Advisory Council endorsed the Task Force recommendation that a fundamentals of speech course continue to be part of the General Studies curriculum. This is a matter in which last year's recommendations from the GSAC disagreed with the Task Force report; Council is now affirming the Task Force report, and I agree with that. The GSAC recommended that the Department of Communication study the Task Force Report and APCC comments, and recommend alternatives to the existing requirements or changes in them.

For Institutions, the GSAC was faced with competing and, in some ways, directly conflicting alternatives: (1) To eliminate the present Social Science division options and have only Institutions as it is as a General Education requirement; or, (2) to eliminate Institutions and have only Social Science options; or, (3) to retain Institutions but restructure the course into an "American Cultural Heritage" course, which was the recommendation of the Task Force. The GSAC agreed to study the requirement and the options to it.

Western Cultural Traditions - The GSAC concluded that the Task Force had not been critical of the content as much as the delivery of these courses; however, there were issues raised in the other reports about the ability of the course to continue to cover all the areas it has traditionally assumed responsibility for covering. The GSAC agreed to study both content and delivery. I myself would be comfortable transferring the Western Cult courses immediately to departments where they belong were it not for the fact that, until these issues are resolved, I'm not certain it is clear what department would want the responsibility or be willing to assume the responsibility.

Similarly with Eastern Civilizations, the GSAC agreed with all previous reports that a requirement of study of non-western cultures and civilizations should be a part of General Education requirements. The GSAC also agreed to study a change in the course title and concept to include a broader range of non-American cultures - for example, Latin America, Eastern Europe, Russia - to be possibly added as options to the present list. And there are groups of faculty presently working on developing such options. I agreed to take the necessary steps to carry out the administrative changes which the content changes might require at the time those content requirements are clear. As is obvious to you, it is a commitment I make on behalf of the office, not on behalf of myself personally.

Natural Sciences - The GSAC agreed to study a number of issues which the report had raised: What should the course requirements be? Do the requirements need to include a lab science? Should the students be required to take more than

one science? Should there be a newly-designed general "science and society" course?

In Mathematical Sciences, the GSAC agreed to study the nature and content of the requirement in quantitative reasoning and critical thinking.

Physical Education - The GSAC agreed with past reports that the present requirement is not satisfactory, but that there may be a place in the General Education curriculum for a course that stresses wellness and fitness, a one-unit course. No position was taken on that at the time; we can expect the GSAC to continue to study and to continue to report on it.

As you may know, at the time the General Studies Advisory Council was created it was created to be an ongoing group to monitor, over time, General Education. And much as we might prefer that all these changes be made at one fell swoop, I don't believe they can be.

Last item - University Orientation. I agreed with the GSAC to withhold any recommendation on making University Orientation a required General Education course until thorough study of the results of the present pilot program had been completed.

In summary, these are the actions which I agreed to take:

Immediate steps to move the English composition courses and the required fundamentals of speech courses from University College to English and Communication, respectively.

The GSAC will undertake course reviews in the Institutions/Social Science area, Western Cult area, Eastern Civ, Natural Sciences, and Physical Education.

Let me say that I know there's a lot of impatience on the campus about the revision of General Education and that this is our sixth year at it. And there's a lot of feeling that it's very clear what people need to learn and we ought simply to say that. Or, as one colleague came to me recently and said, he had consulted widely and he had figured out that what the campus really was waiting for now was for Marini to make up his mind what he wanted to happen. That's not the way curriculum is structured in American universities; that's not the way a General Education requirement ought to be promulgated. Harvard, as you may remember, took ten years to revise their General Education package and seem not to be satisfied with the one they have now. I see General Education as a continuing re-examination, not likely to be put to bed at any given moment. I do agree with our colleagues who are impatient, though, that some of these things should have been put to bed sooner. All I can say is there have been faculty groups at work on it; they've

been doing the best they could. They haven't always agreed, and it has taken time to sort out the disagreements. I think the major error that was made, and I'll assume responsibility for that, is that the people working on General Studies have been well aware of the problems and what they were working on, this body has been informed periodically, APCC has been involved periodically, but our colleagues who are involved in the instruction in General Studies haven't had current information about what was occurring. And that's partly because the GSAC decided last year that it would do its deliberations without hearings and without consulting other people, and it's partly for a variety of other reasons. But I think we will not finish General Education, but we will make the changes I've indicated. Perhaps we will change Institutions and Easter Civ and so on eventually; until we make those changes, we will continue with what we have.

There is another topic I want to talk to you about briefly, because it may be something you want to do something about someday. I recently got involved in a dilemma around the selection of a department head. Since Council has recently been figuring out how department heads are selected and reviewed and evaluated and the like, I think you need to know the interpretations that I offered the department that was having the problem. I think there's ample justification for these interpretations, but in case you should disagree with them, you need to know them so you could revise them sometime in the future. Specifically, I was asked to interpret the Faculty Manual with reference to the appointment of a department head. The Faculty Manual states: "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;..."

The Manual does not speak to proxies or absentee ballots. My interpretation for the department, since the Manual did not speak to it there or elsewhere, was that if a department chose to use proxies or absentee ballots, consistent with its own guidelines or governance understandings, I would not object to that. I don't think it's disallowed by the Manual.

When using fractions - we had a whole dilemma about that - I cited for them Robert's Rules, which says you always round up, you never round down (that is, if 10.66 is two-thirds of 16, then it takes 11 votes to make two-thirds of 16; but also, if 9.33 is two-thirds of 14, it takes 10 votes to make two-thirds). So, even though the divided-up colleague may be in a smaller amount than 50 percent, that colleague is counted as one in determining whether a majority exists or what the two-thirds is. You may want to someday change that; you have the authority to change this - you do not have to be governed by Robert's Rules, except you've said you'll be governed by them except when you say differently. So, if you don't like that interpretation, you could always say differently someday officially.

As I told the department, as I read the Manual, absent members of the faculty - and this particular department had two members of the faculty out of the country and wanted to know what to do about that - since again, as the Manual presently reads, those two have got to be counted in determining what two-thirds is. That, I think is a real flaw that you should pay some attention to. As I read the Manual, absent members of the faculty could be allowed to vote on the question, perhaps should be allowed to vote on the question since they're counted in determining the majority; but if they are going to vote, they probably should be given some information in advance in order to vote intelligently. The department was wondering whether to cable these people who were out of the country, asking them to vote for A or B; and I thought it might be difficult without their having the cv's and so on.

Anyway, those are interpretations and I'll see that they get in the minutes; and if this body wants to change them sometime in the future, it can.

One more item - S.B. 140 - has taken up a lot of our time, and I need to report the campus response to Senate Bill 140. This is a piece of legislation some of you know a great deal about. Senate Bill 140 is an Omnibus Education Reform Act which was passed in late Summer of 1989 by the Ohio General Assembly. The bill includes a number of provisions that apply to elementary and secondary schools (for example, the mandate that each school district develop a flag salute policy). Further, there are provisions that apply to Ohio's state colleges and universities (for example a mandate to review Ohio's master plan for higher education).

Various affected groups are studying specific parts of the bill. Dean Klingele and his faculty are studying and developing responses to some new requirements and possibilities in teacher certification.

One part of the bill, though, which has had significant implications both for secondary education as well as higher education is the mandated Post-Secondary Enrollment Options program. This legislation requires, in broad terms, that 11th and 12th grade Ohio public high school students be given the option of enrolling in a college or university, and completing coursework at the university which may then be used both to fulfill high school graduation requirements and to count as part of the student's college coursework.

(At this point, Dr. Don Gerlach muttered that this was outrageous.)

You've got to run for the Legislature, Don. I like to state publicly when I agree with Professor Gerlach. I agree - this is the worst piece of legislation I've ever encountered, and I used to

work in the legislative process - in Arizona, no less - and thought I'd seen everything.

The implications, educational and social, of such a plan are enormous, both for the school systems and the universities and for the students and their parents. There are also major financial issues involved, since the school districts are mandated to reimburse the universities for such coursework when it is taken to fulfill high school requirements. Finally, since the students will be away from their high school buildings to take college classes, there are extensive legal issues, especially in the liability area.

Because of the major change in education the bill represented, both the State Department of Education and the Ohio Board of Regents went to work this fall on implementation, and they did not always agree. They still do not always agree today. The State Department drafted a set of rules which finally reached the schools and campuses in December. The Board of Regents did not develop its policy statement until January.

President Muse, upon receipt of the State Department of Education's draft rules, knew that a campus policy would have to be adopted quickly, since school districts were under a March 1 deadline to inform their pupils and parents about the program. Accordingly, the President in December appointed a Task Force to develop an interim campus policy. The President recognized that a fully-developed policy must include substantial faculty input. The Task Force has generated data and has produced an interim campus policy. At an IUC Provost's meeting on February 19, I learned that this is what most of our fellow state universities have done also.

The interim policy was necessary so that our Admissions Office could begin processing the applications of high school students to our campus and so we could notify the high schools in time for them to meet their mandated deadline. Our interim policy strictly limits the program to College Prep students and other exceptional students. That, by the way, is not necessarily the full intent of the legislation, but we have the right to make a more limited response than the more ambitious drafter of the legislation might have anticipated. Our interim policy attempts to preserve our existing special high school program. It incorporates fully the Board of Regents policy statement, especially its emphasis on assuring that high school students have a full college experience.

The President now has asked that University Council study the legislation which mandated our policy and study the interim policy we have in place for this year, and to make recommendations for a University policy both at the Akron and Wayne campuses. Accordingly, if that hasn't confused you too much - and if it has confused you too much, we can take that out of the minutes and act on it in the future - if a member of Council will so move, I'd like

to see the body refer the interim policy to APCC for study and a recommendation.

Dr. Gerlach so moved, and this was seconded. Council then voted its approval.

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

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Gerlach, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on the 15th of February, had set the agenda, and had offered some advice based on inquiries from several people about the handling of business for University Council.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - The Chairman reported that the Committee had met on February 15 and discussed strategic planning budgeting, and planning and long-range plans.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee - Associate Provost Joseph Walton reported that the Committee had met on February 20 and had discussed and approved several recommendations which were circulated to the members of Council. The first was an addition to the requirements for minors. Specifically it was that the student had to carry at least nine credits at the University of Akron in courses approved by the faculty granting the minor. Written permission of the dean and the head of the department which granted the minor would be required for an exception. The rationale for this was that several students had requested that they be allowed to transfer the minor requirements in their entirety, and the intent of this addition was to insure that a minimum number of credits would be taken at the University of Akron. Dr. Walton then presented this addition as a motion, which was seconded by Mr. James Inman.

Since there was no discussion, the Chairman called for a vote, and the motion carried (see Appendix A).

The second recommendation from APCC was a set of six curriculum changes that were approved unanimously by both the Curriculum Subcommittee and APCC. These were CT-90-3, 4, 5, 9, 13, and 15. There were no outstanding objections and he moved that they be approved by Council. This was again seconded by Mr. Inman.

There being no discussion, a vote was taken and all the proposals were approved (see Curriculum Changes).

D. Athletics Committee - Mr. David Brink reported that the Committee met on February 20. Roxanne Price, the Coordinator of Academic Advising Services for Student Athletes, met with it and described her responsibilities. Among other things, she told the Committee how she met with prospective recruits to describe the

University Programs, how she advised student athletes in the University College, and how she monitored the progress of student athletes. Jim Dennison reported that during the fall semester 90 student athletes had achieved a grade point average of 3.0 or better, and that 56 had been named to a Dean's List. David Jamison reviewed his summary of the 1990 NCAA convention, which he shared with University Council last month. Mr. Dennison finally reported to the Committee that at the end of the first six months of the fiscal year, the Athletics Department budget had a favorable variance of \$40,000.

Dean Wallace Williams had a question regarding the grade point average statistics mentioned in the report.

Mr. Brink replied that this information was kept but he did not have it with him. He would be happy to get it and share it with Council at a later date.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Mr. Arthur Pollock reported that the Committee met on February 5 and reviewed the results of the "Survey of Campus Space and Facilities." Several ideas were discussed:

- create a sign-off list for each project to include the department, college, and the Campus Facilities Planning Committee of University Council.
- the need to get into the long range planning process, that is, projects three to five years from now.
- the need to outline the procedure to be followed with the facilities planning department.
- have an open meeting for department heads and facilities planning department officials to discuss concerns and share information.
- seek a more detailed statement from department heads as to their concerns about space, safety, etc.

Concern was also raised about safety in Guzzetta Hall based on a letter received from a faculty member.

Mr. Pollock summarized the consensus of the Committee in regard to the survey. First of all a full report of the survey would be given at this University Council meeting. He had distributed a copy of the tabulations but had made an executive decision not to distribute copies of all the comments which came from the department heads about all the questions in the survey. His reasoning was that the department heads had not been told that anything which they said would be distributed to the entire campus. However, the Committee might instruct him that he was in error in making this decision, in which case he would make this information available at the next meeting. In the meantime, he would be happy to answer any questions regarding the survey.

Mr. Pollock indicated that a general interpretation of the results of the survey suggested that at the department head level there was a feeling of frustration about the lack of information on facilities planning, space allocation decisions and so forth. They seemed to think that their deans or immediate superiors were aware of their needs, but they were uncertain as to what happened after it got past the decanal level. There was some positive response to their meeting with the CFPC, but they also seemed to think that this probably would not be very fruitful. This might relate to the belief that it was pretty much a cosmetic committee, which was a concern of the Committee itself.

Other recommendations from the Committee in regard to the survey included facilitating communication between department heads and the planning department by holding an open meeting (something which the Committee was actively pursuing), inviting Roger Ryan and Phil Bartlett to the Committee's next meeting to discuss the space allocation process, meeting with the University Safety Officer about the concerns in Guzzetta Hall, and investigating funding sources in addition to state appropriated money.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Dr. Tom Miles reported that the Committee had met on February 8, 15, and 22. Two grievances were received and were assigned numbers 020 and 040. The Committee completed its consideration of these grievances and rejected the complaints.

The Chairman commented on a discussion which he had with Dr. Miles in which he (the Chairman) expressed the view that the faculty and the University were not well informed about the total number of grievances which came along and how they were disposed of. There was the impression on campus that there were a ton of grievances, that the committee was backed up for about four years, and that nobody was getting timely justice or any justice. He had been informed by Dr. Miles that the Committee had always followed the reporting approach stipulated in the Manual. The Manual stated that after every grievance was concluded there would be a general - and it was very structured - report to Council. It consisted of a paragraph in which you just filled in the blanks. The Chairman thought that in addition to this perhaps the Committee could also report to Council in summary fashion how things had gone. This was one of a few changes which he and Dr. Miles had discussed which either the Committee or Council might wish to treat.

Since the Chairman did not think that he was restricted by the Manual, for Council's information he stated that last year there were six grievances filed, that five of those were dismissed after investigation for lack of cause or conclusion against the grievant, and that one such case was still undergoing hopeful conciliation. He thought that the Committee's work was moving along better than people thought, and that given the number of decisions made, the number of grievances was not as large as people might think. When one considered that six came before the Committee in one year and that five were in its determination without merit warranting action, he thought that one could

have some degree of confidence in its work. He asked Dr. Miles for any corrections to what he had just stated and noted that perhaps in the future Council might prevail upon the Committee to report beyond the minimal requirements stipulated in the Manual.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - There was no report.

Dr. Gerlach asked whether it was possible for Council to consider an item of business for assignment to the Faculty Well-Being Committee. He moved to introduce this on behalf of several constituents of his in Buchtel College and wanted to propose this item in the form of a resolution which read as follows:

Whereas salary increments are designed to reward the faculty for teaching, scholarly activities, and University and community service, and to encourage them in the performance of various academic responsibilities; and

Whereas some faculty members have questioned the fairness of the current system of assigning salary increases solely for what is called "merit"; and

Whereas the perception of unfairness and inequity is destructive of both morale and productivity; therefore,

Be it resolved that the Faculty Well-Being Committee be directed:

to study the methods of, and criteria for, allocating faculty salary increases at other institutions of higher learning in Ohio;

to ascertain whether other Ohio colleges and universities distribute increases for merit, or on the basis of cost of living ("across the board") considerations, or by a combination of these bases; and, finally,

to report its findings and any recommendations to the University Council at its May 1990 meeting.

I move the adoption of that resolution.

This motion was seconded by Dr. Frank Griffin. Since there was no discussion, Council voted and the motion was passed.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee - Dr. William Fleming reported that the Committee had been meeting over the past several months for the purpose of collecting data and so forth and would have a report ready for the next meeting.

I. Reference Committee - Mr. Michael Jalbert reported that the Committee had met and addressed two issues. The first concerned a direction given to it by Council at the last session regarding the

placement of the Faculty Athletics Representative to the NCAA on the Athletics Committee. In this regard the pertinent section of the Council Bylaws with the necessary amendment had been handed out and this would be moved later in the meeting. The second issue was the review of the Faculty Manual which Council would take up under Unfinished Business later.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) - No report.

K. Student Affairs Committee - No report.

L. Ad Hoc Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievance Committee - Mrs. Linda Weiner stated that their report had been distributed to Council members, and its recommendations would be taken up under New Business.

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 presented her report (for the full text of Dr. Burton's report, see Appendix B).

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business. The first item of Unfinished Business was the revision of the Faculty Manual. Mr. Jalbert commented that a number of changes had been made. A lot of them represented organizational changes given to the Committee by higher-ups; others were changes in language which attempted to clarify or make better sense. Changes suggested by faculty since the last Council meeting had also been discussed, and these were included in the additional handout which was passed around at the beginning of this meeting. He would be happy to field any questions.

Dr. Gerlach had a number of questions. On page 38, he was puzzled by the provision that was to be inserted in the newly-numbered item (f) - change (e) to (f) - on full-time appointments. He might be a dunderhead on this, but he wanted to know how faculty improvement program leaves could count for the probationary period for tenure, which was the proposed insertion here. How could one get a faculty improvement leave before seven years of service at this university, during which seven years the question of tenure was decided?

Dr. Faith Helmick pointed out that faculty members might be appointed as instructors, thus not having tenure, and be eligible for faculty improvement leave according to the regulations after seven years of service. So it was possible to be eligible for faculty improvement leave and not get to be tenured.

Dr. Gerlach replied that he understood and asked the Chairman whether this meant that such instructors who were not qualified for tenure unless they were promoted to assistant professor could be promoted to assistant professor, too.

The Chairman answered that this was correct and that another

possibility might be that the same individual might be appointed to a tenure-track appointment.

For his next question, Dr. Gerlach turned to page 43, where in the middle of the page the Committee had decided to strike out "therefore" spelled with an "e" on the end, and replace it with "thereof." He thought that the proper word here should be "therefor" spelled without an "e" on the end. He did not know how far Council wanted to follow his quibble on this, but this was a small matter.

He had a more substantial question regarding pages 74-75. These covered descriptions of certain faculty and staff organizations, and the Committee proposed to strike out detailed reference about memberships and so on for both the ^{AMERICAN} Association of University Professors and the Ohio Education-National Education Association. He very much wanted to object to those being stricken out. The Manual should be as informative as possible, and this information had long served in its position here. He hoped that it would not be lost in the future.

Mr. Jalbert replied that the Committee thought that these might not be the only organizations with voluntary memberships that were concerned with University policy and welfare, and it also thought that the listing of their regulations or requirements for membership might not be up-to-date. It was not the responsibility of the Committee to check on that information, and it was thought that just listing the organizations was sufficient rather than possibly providing conflicting and inaccurate information.

The Chairman told Dr. Gerlach that if he wished to make an amendment in regard to this, it would be entirely appropriate.

Dr. Gerlach stated that if there were errors in the information, it would be up to those respective organizations to furnish corrections. It should not be Council's business to assume that there might be an error and therefore strike them. He moved that these items be retained and not stricken, and this was seconded.

Dr. McGucken knew that the AAUP Chapter did in fact exist on campus, but he wondered whether the chapter of the Ohio Education Association still did. Mr. Jalbert replied that it was the Committee's understanding that it did, but there was a question in terms of active membership at this time.

Dean Claibourne Griffin wondered, if we were covering all the bases, whether the Teamsters should be added here. There was no question of its being active. The Chairman responded that perhaps the question of adding additional organizations should be held until the question of whether or not to delete this language had been settled.

Dr. Fleming thought that the use of the terms "such as" - "or" provided for the AAUP being used as an example, but was in no way exclusive. The language could be retained as it was without Council going to great lengths to see if there were other organizations which

wanted to be recognized.

Dr. Jacqueline Anglin commented that it was the Committee's intent to unclutter the Manual at this point by removing the rules and regulations for membership. It also did not think that it was in a position to determine whether an organization was in fact concerned with University policy or welfare without making some subjective judgment there.

Dr. Gerlach replied that he had suspected this, but he liked the clutter. He also thought that it could be reasonably argued that these two examples, at least, were well-established and responsible kinds of organizations dealing with the profession in the broadest sense of the word, and we ought not to simply cut them out of this kind of provision.

The Chairman noted that no one was talking about dropping the mention of them but rather the details of membership. Since there were no further comments, a vote was taken and the motion not to strike was defeated.

A discussion followed regarding the addition of other organizations to the Manual at this point. The Chairman raised the question of whether or not the Committee had reflected at all on the possible labor relations implications and Unfair Labor Relations Act and thought that somebody ought to look into it. Mr. Pollock moved that the International Brotherhood of Teamsters be included here and this was seconded. There was some question regarding its exact title, but Dr. Fleming pointed out that the Committee could be instructed to ascertain this and insert it.

Returning to the Chairman's earlier question, Dr. Buchthal wondered whether someone, possibly from the Law School, would be willing to comment on the legality of including some organization that might now or at some future point be involved in collective bargaining.

Dr. Helmick suggested that it was not legal for Council to do so. The Chairman noted that there was an organization listed here that was involved in collective bargaining, and the Labor Relations Act would suggest that all such organizations be given similar treatment. Dr. Helmick thought that this was true.

Dr. Gerlach opposed the motion because he did not think that it was necessary for Council to do this. To the best of his knowledge there had been no request from anyone from that organization for its listing. He found the suggestion of the Dean of the Buchtel College droll and perhaps a bit mischievous. Since we were told that the purpose here was to unclutter the Manual to reduce its size, he proposed that it not be enlarged by adding this item.

Dr. John Bee made the distinction that the two organizations listed here were in fact faculty organizations that either presently or at one time had an interest in the possibility of representing the University

faculty in labor negotiations. He saw the third organization, in fact, as a labor organization, not a faculty organization which had an interest in somehow or other associating itself with the faculty, and on that substantive reason just under the heading under the letter (A), "Faculty Organizations Concerned with University Policy and Welfare," he did not think it belonged. Unless there was a legal reason to keep it in, he would be opposed to inserting it.

Dr. Fleming reminded Council of his earlier statement regarding the words "such as" which made whatever organizations mentioned there simply exemplary, not exclusive. One could stop with AAUP and OEA-NEA, and that would not preclude any other organization at another time from acting on campus or not. The language would be permissive, not exclusive.

Mr. James Nolte moved to table the action until a response could be gotten from the Reference Committee at the next meeting as to what other organizations might exist and what would be perfectly legal. However, this was not seconded and Dr. Bee said that he thought that in any case where Council was in conflict with the law, the law would supercede the Manual. Just purely on its substantive merits, he wanted to see Council vote against this; and then if it had to be overruled, be overruled on legal grounds, but not otherwise.

Council then voted on the motion and it was defeated.

Dr. Lawrence Focht had a question regarding page 41 and the definition of "academic vacations." Section 3359-20-033 (B)(1) stated that faculty members on a nine months' appointment were expected to be on duty through Spring Commencement and were entitled to all academic vacations during that period (fall and spring semesters). Did this mean until completion of all Commencements, since the Law Commencement occurred one week before all the rest? What were "academic vacations?"

The Chairman said that since he had never had one, he could offer no definition.

Dr. Gerlach thought that academic vacations were clearly identified on the calendar which was adopted. The Chairman agreed that this was probably what was intended.

Mr. Inman noted that on page 113, (D)(2), it read "If the faculty member's proposal is not approved, specific reasons for the disapproval shall be given in writing to the applicant by the President and Provost. Given the fact that in (D)(1) and (E) "Senior Vice President and" had been stricken before, "Provost," was not that what was intended here as well? Mr. Jalbert³⁴ that it should read "by the Provost" and that "Senior Vice President" should be stricken. This was moved by Mr. Inman and seconded. Council then voted its approval.

Dr. Gerlach referred Council to page 84, (E)(1)(b), where there was an effort again by the Committee to remove some words. They wanted to

strike out the words "a transcript of the candidate's record" and to replace that with a reference to "A TRANSCRIPT" sent to the Admissions office. He thought that this language should be left alone because the word "transcript" simply meant copy, and you had to indicate of what it was a copy. There could be transcripts of any kind of document and the original language made it clear - "of the candidate's record." He moved that these words not be stricken but retained because they meant what we meant them to say and were absolutely clear. This was seconded.

Dr. Fleming wondered whether the objection would be ameliorated by offering "academic" in front of "transcript" and by striking the rest of the sentence - "a copy of the ACADEMIC transcript." Dr. Gerlach thought that this was a possibility since the transcript had to be described in some way as to what it was.

Dean Griffin noted that describing it was rather belaboring the obvious. If an applicant for admission to the University was not bright enough to give us a transcript of his high school record, he probably did not deserve to be admitted. He preferred to see it stand as it was and did not think that absolutely everything in the world needed to be spelled out.

The Chairman then called for a vote on the motion and it was defeated.

Dr. Fleming then moved to insert the words "an academic" before the word "transcript" and to leave the rest of the language as it was. This was seconded by Dr. Gerlach. The Chairman then called for a vote and the motion was passed.

Dean Wallace Williams had a question regarding p. 14, (10)(B). It referred to an annual report being submitted to the President, whereas all the previous paragraphs referred to reporting to the Provost. Why was this? The Chairman remembered that the Manual used to say that all annual reports made by those who reported to the Provost would go to the Provost. He did not know of any particular reason why this person (Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies) should submit an annual report directly to the President. It was probably an oversight.

Mr. Jalbert stated that this job description had come from the Board of Trustees to the Reference Committee. Dr. Helmick added that she did believe that it was an oversight and should be corrected to read as did the other descriptions.

Associate Provost Hilton Bonniwell then moved to substitute the word "Provost" for the word "President" in the fifth line of paragraph (B) on page 14. Mr. Inman noted that in the last line of this paragraph "Senior Vice President and Provost" should read merely "Provost" to be consistent with the practice elsewhere in the Manual. These two points became part of one motion, which was seconded.

A discussion of the two parts of this motion then occurred. Council members noted other instances on page 14 where the words "Senior Vice President and Provost" occurred. Dr. Bee suggested that Council interpret the previous change (relating to page 113) as an instruction that all references to the Senior Vice President and Provost be abbreviated to Provost and this would obviate the need to act individually on each one in the document. Dr. Helmick apologized and wanted to point out that the phrase "submit an annual report to the President" was consistent with the other officers. Council might want to change this, but if you checked back, deans of degree-granting colleges also had that same phrase. Procedurally the reports came to the Provost and were then forwarded to the President. Therefore, to continue consistency with the other sections in the Manual, she suggested that Council vote against this motion.

Council then voted on the motion and it was defeated.

Dr. Buchthal pointed out that on page 20, (F)(2), the title of the officer being discussed read "Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services for Human Services." One of those descriptions either "for Administrative Services" or "for Human Services" should be stricken.

Dr. Helmick noted that the office of Assistant Vice President for Administrative Services no longer existed. However, the new language describing the new position of Assistant Vice President for Human ~~Services~~ had not yet been approved by the Board (although the appointment had been). This whole section could be stricken since the old position no longer existed, and the new language for the new position was not yet available.

After a bit of discussion, Dr. Bruce Simmons moved that the whole of section 2 on page 20 be deleted and this was seconded. Council then voted its approval.

Council next voted on the entire package of changes to the Faculty Manual as recommended by the Reference Committee, and it was passed.

Some discussion then ensued regarding the proposed amendment to Council Bylaws regarding the addition of the University representative to the NCAA to the Athletics Committee. The correct procedure was that this had to be filed with the Secretary of Council at least two full academic weeks before the meeting and placed on the agenda. The Chairman instructed the Secretary to have this done for the next meeting of Council in April.

Item No. 8 - New Business. The only item of new business was a report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances. Mrs. Weiner stated that her report was ready and that she had recommendations to be discussed and voted on. However, in light of the lateness of the hour, she thought that perhaps Council ought to

March 28, 1990

Page 22

postpone this until the next meeting and take it up as the first item under Unfinished Business. Mr. Inman seconded this.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

Item No. 9 - Adjournment. A motion for adjournment was made and seconded. Council approved, and the meeting ended at 4:46 p.m.

APPENDIX A

Minor Areas of Study

REQUIREMENTS

The University of Akron has approved minor fields of study that may be placed on a student's record when all requirements have been completed.

The following rules apply to all minors:

- The student must complete at least 18 credits.
- At least six of the 18 credits must be at the 300/400 level except where the department does not offer 300/400-level courses.
- A minimum grade-point average of 2.00 in each minor is required.
- A minor may be designated at any time during the student's career up to and including the time the degree clearance is processed.
- A minor will be placed on the student's record only at the time the student receives a baccalaureate degree and only on application.
- Courses for a minor may not be taken credit/noncredit. All credits must be earned (bypassed credit may not be used).
- **THE STUDENT MUST EARN AT LEAST NINE CREDITS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON IN COURSES APPROVED BY THE FACULTY GRANTING THE MINOR. WRITTEN PERMISSION OF THE DEAN AND THE HEAD OF THE DEPARTMENT WHICH GRANTS THE MINOR IS REQUIRED FOR ANY EXCEPTION.**

APPENDIX B

Report of the Akron Representative to the
Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor
of the Ohio Board of Regents

We met February 27 at Ohio State University Union. The meeting was well-attended and dramatically different from the previous one that provided a forum for two male power brokers to vent their frustrations as their careers ended with their ERIPing out of the hot seat, so to speak.

Part of this meeting was devoted to heated debate over the purpose of these meetings and about what role the faculty representatives are going to play under this Chancellor. The Ohio State people who run the meetings have been setting the agenda. Tuesday's agenda allowed for reports from Elaine Hairston and Ann Moore (the Acting Chancellor and Vice Chancellor), but not really for any faculty advice or new business. This was slugged out in the Chancellor's presence, and agendas for March, April and May were loosely set so as to allow for feedback from those present who drove up to six hours back and forth to the meeting. The Chancellor promised to try in the future to send us written information in advance of the meetings so that we could come armed with advice from the faculties we represent, but she said that the Legislature is moving so rapidly on S.B. 140 that it's hard to keep ahead of a group like ours that only meets monthly.

Let me move on to the Chancellor and Vice Chancellors' reports. Hairston spent about 30 minutes reviewing the history of the OBR since its creation in 1963. Its role is an evolving one. Presently it has turned its attention to the quality of what we do.

Then she spoke for another half hour on the three things the OBR has on its agenda that are new and, therefore, require advice from faculty:

- 1) Articulation between 2- and 4-year institutions. This is an increasing problem since the population of Ohio is so mobile, the non-traditional student has become the norm, and students need more flexibility. A first draft of this controversial document exists, but a second draft will be attempted on March 9. This is a Senate Bill 268 project.
- 2) Ohio Senate Bill 140--Educ. Omnibus Bill--created two commissions. One of these, the Educational Improvement Commission, is supposed to identify excellent programs. Despite the fire, the OBR must make a presentation to the E.I.C. on March 6. What they will be told is that unidimensional means of evaluation is a fallacy, that simply counting things won't do. To enable the Faculty Advisory Committee to understand what she plans to tell the E.I.C., we were sent a copy of a FIPSE-funded project, directed by Hairston,

containing the details of the cubic model for assessing undergraduate education. Besides statistical data about the institutional context and environment, it includes an "Academic Culture" dynamic, characteristic of the best undergraduate programs in nine different disciplines at eight public institutions in Ohio. (Akron wasn't in this.) The "Academic Culture" of a program is qualitative and is the basis for a new State-funded program entitled Undergraduate Education Enhancement Program, an incentive-based assessment strategy. The Academic Culture dynamic that characterizes excellent undergraduate programs includes seven intangibles:

- 1) coherence/synergism (for example, communication and respect among faculty and students across various disciplines, as well as between disciplines and general education and collegial faculty)
- 2) vitality/enthusiasm (for example, teaching with passion, lively and confident students, high faculty morale)
- 3) diversity/community (for example, faculty include a rich variety of subdisciplines, teaching styles; divergent views and contributions to the program are sought, supported and respected)
- 4) self-reflection/self-assessment (for example, long-range and strategic planning actually leading to individual and program improvement)
- 5) involvement/engagement (for example, many joint projects within the university, active participation in national organizations)
- 6) high expectation/rejection of mediocrity: profound prospect of and anticipation for the future; encouragement of high ideals and striving for one's best (for example, special opportunities and support offered for development of faculty; rigorous degree requirements, honors program and other attempts at reaching perfection and a tradition of excellence)
- 7) challenging, questioning attitude/active intellectual curiosity (for example, research and teaching at the cutting edge of theory and technology; desire and flexibility to investigate, experiment and change; risk taking)

So OBR will urge the Legislature to keep a broad focus on the Ohio universities and to realize that in order to improve undergraduate education, academic culture has to be nurtured. I think if Hairston becomes Chancellor permanently, she'll push academic culture on those who want more State grant money.

- 3) The third project on the OBR current agenda also originates in

Senate Bill 140. This is the Post-Secondary Enrollment Options Program, which permits superior high school students to take college courses during their junior and senior years of high school, with the high schools paying a daily or hourly rate to the colleges for teaching their pupils for them. An amendment is now in the legislative process which would delay the start for a year and which provides more of a contextual statement. The program must start "small and low," she said. These courses must be regular college courses containing empty seats for academically ready, mature youngsters whose parents are willing to subject them to existing textbooks and subject matter treatment. Colleges have the right to set admittance standards and high schools will only pay for courses that match the high school courses for which they are substituted from their curriculum. Since OBR fell \$11 million short for funding regular college students, there's no way it can subsidize this program enough to allow it to become large. Colleges will only recover part of the cost (the tuition). [As an aside, OSU has acted on this opportunity quickly by drafting guidelines for what will be called the Ohio State Academy, to attract the best high school students in the state before they are lured elsewhere.]

After lunch, where we grazed for a modest price, Ann Moore spoke for an hour about the current status of the Articulation Study Commission mentioned earlier by Chancellor Hairston. This provides for the transfer of courses by "transfer modules" instead of course by course. The goals are to treat transfer and native students alike and to encourage students to graduate, not to set admission standards for universities. "Transfer modules" are not yet defined, but they will be defined by stated learning expectations. Whatever achieves these learning expectations will become a module. A two-step appeals process at the local/institutional level and the State level will be established, although the latter is still up in the air because OBR doesn't want to get involved. The document's language is "heavy and academise," containing many thorny issues. Nevertheless, it must be finished by June, 1990. Two big issues to settle are the transfer of technical courses and general education curriculum. OBR doesn't want curriculum rules put into permanent law because taking control of curriculum away from the faculty violates some universities' charters.

Moore asked the Faculty Advisory Committee for input on articulation problems, so I must gather your thoughts and send them to the FAC representative from OSU-Lima by March 16. I need horror stories about the problems of specific students trying to transfer and copies of existing articulation agreements and/or documents. It may be that a committee of University Council might like to review this to provide some guidance for me, provided they can meet promptly to beat my March 16 deadline.

June Burton

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).

BUCHTEL COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

AS-90-1

Department of Biology

Title	3100:431/531	<u>Bacterial Physiology.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u>
Credits		<u>General Microbial Physiology.</u> 2 credits.
Prerequisite		Prerequisites: 3100:331 or permission. Physiology of
Description		microscopic eucaryotes archaebacteria, and eubacteria.
Number	3100:353	<u>General Entomology.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u>
Prerequisite	3100:451/551	<u>General Entomology.</u> 4 credits.
Description		Prerequisites: 3100:112, 217. Structure, physiology life cycles, economic importance and characteristics of orders and major families of insects. Laboratories parallel the lectures.
	3100:351	<u>Invertebrate Zoology.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u>
	3100:453/553	<u>Invertebrate Zoology.</u> 4 credits.
		Prerequisites: 3100:112, 217. Invertebrate groups, their classification, functional morphology, adaptive radiation and life history. A phylogenetic approach is used. Laboratories parallel the lectures.
	3100:355	<u>Parasitology.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u>
	3100:454/554	<u>Parasitology.</u> 4 credits.
		Prerequisites: 3100:112, 3150:201. Principles of parasitism; host parasite interactions; important human and veterinary parasitic diseases; and control measures. Laboratories parallel the lectures.
Description	3100:428/528	<u>Biology of Behavior.</u> 2 credits.
		Prerequisites: 211, 217 and 316. <u>TO</u> Biological basis of behavior: ethological theory, function, causation, evolution, and adaptiveness of behavior. (May be taken without 429/529 - Biology of Behavior Laboratory.)

Add 3980:714 Seminar in Policy Analysis and Evaluation. 3 credits.
Prerequisite: permission. In depth review and critique of major intellectual traditions, concepts and theories underlying policy analysis and evaluation in the United States.

3100:421/521 Tropical Field Biology. 4 credits.
Prerequisites: 3100:111/112 or equivalent. Ecology of coral reefs, tide pools, mangroves, intertidal zones, terrestrial flora and fauna, island biogeography. The course will be taught at a field station in the tropics.

AS-90-3

Department of History

Title 3400:201 United States History to the Civil War. 4 credits. TO
Description Unites States History to 1877. 4 credits.
Historical survey from the Age of Discovery and North American colonization through the creation of the United States to the Civil War and Reconstruction.

3400:202 Unites States History Since the Civil War. 4 credits. TO
United States History Since 1877. 4 credits. Survey of United States history from the end of Federal Reconstruction to the present.

AS-90-6

Department of Political Science

Number 3700:200 Comparative Politics. 4 credits. TO
3700:300 Comparative Politics. 4 credits.

Title 3700:472/572 Political Parties and Interest Group: Organization
Description and Management. 3 credits. TO
American Interest Groups. 3 credits. Prerequisites: six credits of political science or permission. Reading and research on the development, structure and function of interest groups in the United States.

Number 3700:340 American Political Parties and Interest Groups. 3 credits.
Title 3700:473/573 TO American Political Parties. 3 credits. Prerequisites:
Description six credits of political science or permission. Reading and research on the development, structure and function of parties in the United States.

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE

CT-90-3

Allied Health Technology Division

Prerequisite site	2790:122	<u>Respiratory Care Patient.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisite: 121, 2780:106 (or equivalent). Corequisite: 2780:107 (or equivalent).
	2790:131	<u>Clinical Applications I.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisite: 121, 2780:106. Corequisite: 2780:107.
	2790:132	<u>Clinical Applications II.</u> 2 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisite: 122, 131, 141, 2780:107 (or equivalent).
	2790:201	<u>Anatomy and Physiology of Cardiopulmonary Systems.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisite: 2780:107 (or equivalent).

CT-90-4

Allied Health Technology Division

Revise Medical Assisting Technology Program as follows:

Add	2540:129 2040:244	<u>Information/Records Management.</u> 3 credits. <u>Death and Dying.</u> 2 credits.
Drop	2540:150 2740:250 2840:100	<u>Beginning Keyboarding.</u> 3 credits. <u>Medical Assisting Specialties.</u> 3 credits. <u>Basic Chemistry.</u> 3 credits.
Prerequisite site	2740:235	<u>Medical Assisting Technology II.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisite: 135.
	2740:240	<u>Medical Machine Transcription.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisites: 120; 2540:151.
	2740:241	<u>Medical Records.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisites: 120; 2540:130.

CT-90-5

Business Technology Divison

Revise the minor in Marketing and Sales Technology to keep the required hours above 18 as follows:

Required:

2520:103	Principles of Advertising	3
2520:106	Visual Promotion	3
2520:202	Retailing Fundamentals	3
2520:211	Math of Retail Merchandising	3
2520:212	Principles of Sales	3
		<u>15 hours</u>

and any two of the following:

2520:215	Advertising Projects	2
2520:217	Merchandising Projects	2
2520:219	Sales Projects	2
2520:221	AAF Ad Campaign - I	2
2520:222	AAF Ad Campaign - II	2
2520:234	Humor in Advertising	2
		<u>4 hours</u>

Total 19 hours

CT-90-6

Business Technology Divison

Prerequi- 2440:125 Lotus 1-2-3. 2 credits. TO
site Prerequisite: none.

CT-90-8

Engineering and Science Technology

Prerequi- 2880:241 Introduction to Quality Assurance.
site 3 credits. TO
Prerequisite: 100 and 2030:152

CT-90-9

Engineering and Science Technology

Revise Bachelor of Science in Automated Manufacturing Technology as follows:

Drop:	2030:334	Mathematics for Technical Applications	3
	3470:251	Discriptive Statistics	1
	3470:252	Distributions	1
	4450:206	Fortran (Eng/Sci)	2

Add:	2030:356	Mathematics for Engineering Technology II	3
	2030:345	Basic Techniques for Data Analysis	2
	2820:210	Fortran for Technologists	2

Total Program Credit Hours Required: 132

CT-90-10

Engineering and Science Technology

Add elective to Mechanical Technology as follows:

Add	2920:470	<u>Introductory Plastics Design and Processing.</u> 3 credits. Prerequisites: 142, 201, and 2840:101 (or permission). Introduction to structure and properties of polymers, selection based on properties and cost, design of products and tools, basic principles of the major processes.
-----	----------	--

CT-90-12

Engineering and Science Technology

Title	2940:122	<u>Technical Graphics.</u> 3 credits <u>TO</u>
Description		<u>Technical Drawing II.</u> 3 credits. Prerequisite: 2940:121. Sections and conventions; dimensioning; allowances and tolerances; threads and fasteners; descriptive geometry; intersections; developments; computer applications.

CT-90-13

Public Service Technology: Education Technology - Library Technician Option

Revise the program to add as a required course the following:

Add	2540:141	<u>PC Word Processing for Non-Majors.</u> 2 credits. Prerequisites: 150 or 140 or permission. Introduction to word processing software for nonoffice administration majors. Training on personal computers for personal and business communication using various word processing software.
-----	----------	---

Total Required Credit Hours TO 57-58

Total Elective Credit Hours TO 6-7

ST-90-15

Associate Studies

Revise the Commercial Art Program to add as required the following:

Add 2440:120 Computer and Software Fundamentals. 2 credits.
Prerequisite: none. General overview of data processing techniques providing fundamentals necessary for subsequent computer-oriented courses.

Total Required Credit Hours: TO 50

Total Elective Credit Hours: TO 14

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

EN-90-2

All Departments

<p>Prerequisite Description</p>	<p>4200:898</p>	<p><u>Preliminary Research</u>. 1-15 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> Approval of Dissertation Director. Preliminary investigations prior to the submission of a Dissertation Proposal to the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee.</p>
	<p>4200:899</p>	<p><u>Doctoral Dissertation</u>. 1-15 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> Acceptance of Research Proposal by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee and approval of the Dissertation Director. Original research by the doctoral student.</p>
	<p>4300:898</p>	<p><u>Preliminary Research</u>. 1-15 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> Approval of Dissertation Director. Preliminary investigations prior to the submission of a Dissertation Proposal to the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee.</p>
	<p>4300:899</p>	<p><u>Doctoral Dissertation</u>. 1-15 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> Acceptance of Research Proposal by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee and approval of the Dissertation Director. Original research by the doctoral student.</p>
	<p>4600:898</p>	<p><u>Preliminary Research</u>. 1-15 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> Approval of Dissertation Director. Preliminary investigations prior to the submission of a Dissertation Proposal to the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee.</p>
	<p>4600:899</p>	<p><u>Doctoral Dissertation</u>. 1-15 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>Prerequisite:</u> Acceptance of Research Proposal by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee and approval of the Dissertation Director. Original research by the doctoral student.</p>

- 4400:898 Preliminary Research. 1-15 credits. TO Prerequisite: Approval of Dissertation Director. Preliminary investigations prior to submission of a Dissertation Proposal to the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee.
- 4400:899 Doctoral Dissertation. 1-15 credits. TO Prerequisite: Acceptance of Research Proposal by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee and approval of the Dissertation Director. Original research by the doctoral student.
- 4800:898 Preliminary Research. 1-15 credits. TO Prerequisite: Approval of the Dissertation Director. Preliminary investigations prior to the submission of a Dissertation Proposal to the Interdisciplinary Doctoral committee.
- 4800:899 Doctoral Dissertation. 1-15 credits. TO Prerequisite: Acceptance of Research Proposal by the Interdisciplinary Doctoral Committee and approval of the Dissertation Director. Original research by the doctoral student.

EN-90-4

Department of Civil Engineering

- | | |
|--|--|
| Number 43009:423/523
Prerequisite 4300:627
site
Description | <u>Water Pollution Principles.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u>
<u>Water Pollution Principles.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisite: 32
or permission. Principles of water chemistry, microbiology,
and chemical reaction engineering as applied to
understanding and solving environmental problems. |
|--|--|

EN-90-8

Department of Biomedical Engineering

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Add 4800:634 | <u>Medical Imaging Devices.</u> 3 credits. Prerequisite: none.
Imaging modalities including radiation, magnetic resonance,
and sound. The formation of images. Specific devices
including computer tomography, magnetic resonance,
ultrasound, gamma cameras and PET. |
| 4800:638 | <u>Image Processing for Biomedical Data.</u> 3 credits.
Prerequisite: none. Image sampling, quantization, and
transforms. Enhancements including smoothing and
sharpening. Restoration using inverse and Wiener filters.
Edge detection and thresholding with region growing for
segmentation. |
| Drop 4800:633 | <u>Biological Signal and Image Processing.</u> 3 credits. |
| 4800:637 | <u>Image Formation and Processing in Biomedicine.</u> 3 credits. |

COLLEGE OF FINE AND APPLIED ARTS

FAA-90-1

School of Home Economics and Family Ecology

Add 7400:488/588 Practicum in Dietetics. 1-3 credits. Prerequisite: approval of advisor/instructor. Practical experience in application of the principles of nutrition.

FAA-90-7

Department of Dance

Description 7920:222 Ballet Technique II. 5 credits. (May be repeated for a total of 20 credits.) Prerequisite: permission. TO Continuation of 122, expanding theory on vocabulary, structure, placement. Concurrent enrollment in pointe/men's class recommended.

FAA-90-8

Department of Dance

Add 7920:141 Pointe I. 2 credits. (May be repeated for a total of six credits.) Prerequisite: permission. Reinforcement of selection principles for pointe shoes, proper holding of foot muscularly and control of heel while ascending and descending from pointe.

FAA-90-9

Department of Dance

Add 7920:241 Pointe II. 2 credits. (May be repeated for a total of six credits.) Prerequisite: permission. Continuation of 141. Continued development of strength, coordination and endurance of holding foot muscularly. Further development and emphasis on principles of weight transfer.

FAA-90-10

Department of Dance

Add 7920:341 Pointe III. 2 credits. (May be repeated for a total of six credits.) Prerequisite: permission. Continuation of 241. Advancement, development and application of principles of classical ballet technique through work on small variations, codas, enchainements and tours de force exercises.

FAA-90-11

Department of Dance

Add 7920:334

Pas de Deux I. 2 credits. (May be repeated for a total of six credits.) Prerequisites: permission; concurrent enrollment in a pointe class. Female students must be concurrently enrolled in pointe class. Provides student with the beginning understanding and practice of pas de deux.

FAA-90-12

Department of Dance

Add 7920:434

Pas de Deux II. 2 credits. (May be repeated for a total of six credits.) Prerequisites: 334, permission; concurrent enrollment in a pointe class. Female students must be concurrently enrolled in pointe class. Provides the student with advanced understanding and practice of pas de deux.

FAA-90-17

Department of Dance

Description 7920:322

Ballet Technique II. 5 credits.
Prerequisite: permission. TO Continuation of 222, emphasis on technique, style and line. Concurrent enrollment in pointe/men's class recommended.

FAA-90-18

Department of Dance

Add 7920:342

Men's Class. 2 credits. (May be repeated for a total of eight credits.) Prerequisites: 122, permission. A classical ballet class focusing on tour de force and virtuoso movements specific to the male dancer.

FAA-90-19

Department of Dance

Description 7920:422

Ballet Technique IV. 5 credits. (May be repeated for a total of 20 credits.) Prerequisite: permission. TO Continuation of 322, professional level of technique. Concurrent enrollment in pointe/men's class recommended.

FAA-90-20

Department of Dance

Add 7920:497

Independent Study in Dance. 1-3 credits. (May be repeated for a total of 4 credits.) Prerequisite: permission and prearrangement with instructor. Individual creative project, research or readings in dance with faculty advisor.

FAA-90-21

Department of Dance

Add 7920:498

Senior Honors Project in Dance. 1-3 credits. (May be repeated for a total of 6 credits.) Prerequisites: senior standing in Honors Program and approval of department preceptor. Creative project or research supervised by dance preceptor.

COLLEGE OF NURSING

NU-90-4

College of Nursing

Title 8200:603

Theoretical Basis for Family Health Nursing. TO
Theoretical Basis for Nursing. 3 credits.

8200:619

Family Health Appraisal. TO
Nursing Assessment of Families. 3 credits.

8200:622

Family Health Nursing I. TO
Family Nursing I. 4 credits.

8200:623

Family Health Nursing II. TO
Family Nursing II. 4 credits.

8200:624

Nursing of Families with Children. TO
Nursing of Families with Growing Children. 3 credits.

8200:628

Health Perspective of the Expanding Family. TO
Nursing of Expanding Families. 3 credits.

8200:685

Family Health Nursing Leadership Seminar: Education. TO
Leadership Seminar: Education. 3 credits.

8200:686

Family Health Nursing Leadership Practicum: Education TO
Leadership Practicum: Education. 3 credits.

8200:687

Family Health Nursing Leadership Seminar: Administration. TO
Leadership Seminar: Administration. 3 credits.

- 8200:688 Family Health Nursing Leadership Practicum: Administration
TO Leadership Practicum: Administration. 3 credits.
- 8200:680 Family Health Nursing Leadership Seminar: Clinical Nurse
Specialization TO
Leadership Seminar: Clinical Nurse Specialization. 3
credits.
- 8200:681 Family Health Nursing Leadership Practicum: Clinical Nurse
Specialization. TO
Leadership Practicum: Clinical Nurse Specialization.
3 credits.
- 8200:699 Thesis Research. TO
Thesis/Non Thesis Research. 1-4 credits.
- NU-90-5
College of Nursing
- Prerequisite 8200:603 Theoretical Basis for Nursing. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisite: acceptance in the Graduate Nursing Program.
- 8200:629 Financial Management for Nursing Administration. 3 credits.
TO Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, 622 or special
permission.
- 8200:630 Human Resources in Nursing Settings. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619; concurrent with 622.
- 8200:635 Organizational Behavior in Nursing Settings. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, and 622.
- 8200:673 Nursing of Families with Older Members. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, and 622.
- 8200:624 Nursing of Families with Children. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, 622; concurrent with 680
or 685.
- 8200:625 Teaching Strategies in Nursing Education. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, 622.
- 8200:626 Nursing of Families with Adult Members. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, 622.
- 8200:826 Nursing of Expanding Families. 3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 618, 619, 622.
- 8200:680 Leadership Seminar: Clinical Nurse Specialization.
3 credits. TO
Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, 622.

	8200:685	<u>Leadership Seminar: Education.</u> 3 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisites: 603, 613, 619, 622.
Prerequisite Description	8200:622	<u>Family Nursing I.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u> Prerequisites: 603 and 619. Theory and practice of family nursing focusing on concepts, theories and practice relative to families within the environment.

NU-90-6

College of Nursing

On page 49 of the Graduate Bulletin and page 99 of the Graduate Bulletin the last paragraph of the philosophy contains Family Nursing. That paragraph should read:

Nursing education at the master's level builds upon baccalaureate nursing preparation and is a foundation for doctoral study. Graduate education provides advanced learning to prepare specialists, educators and administrators in the practice of nursing. College of Nursing graduate students analyze and use a variety of theoretical formulations and research findings in advanced practice as well as plan and conduct research with guidance. The students develop expertise through self-direction, peer relations, personal valuing and faculty modeling and facilitation.

Add on page 49, under admission - a GRE with a minimum score of 1200.

On page 50 - 4800:697 Physiological Systems should be added to the Education plan of study.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

UC-90-1

Department of English Composition - General Studies

Title	1100:111	<u>English Composition.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>English Composition I.</u> 4 credits.
	1100:112	<u>English Composition.</u> 4 credits. <u>TO</u> <u>English Composition II.</u> 4 credits.

UC-90-3

Department of General Studies

Add	1100:182	<u>Varsity Riflery.</u> 1 credit. Prerequisite: none. Acquisition of skills and knowledge of riflery. Intercollegiate competition in riflery.
-----	----------	---

UC-90-5

Institute for Life-Span Development and Gerontology

Prerequisite- 1850:450
site
tion

Interdisciplinary Seminar in Life-Span Development and Gerontology. 2 credits. TO

Prerequisite: permission. An introduction to the interdisciplinary study of gerontology including discussion of dimensions of aging, historical framework of aging in America, demographics, service system & current issues.