

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

11-1-1990

Faculty Senate Chronicle November 1, 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.



1990-91, No. 3 36 pages

November 29, 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of 11/1/90	2
Appendix to Minutes of the University Council meeting of 11/1/90	
A. Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee for November 1, 1990.....	26
B. Faculty Research Awards.....	34
C. Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.....	35

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 1, 1990

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Chairman, Interim Senior Vice President and Provost, Dr. Marion Ruebel, at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, November 1, 1990 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-one of the 84 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dr. Jackie Anglin, Mr. William Becker, Dr. John Bee, Dr. June Burton, Dr. Roger Durbin, Dr. Kathleen Endres, Dean William Klingele, Mrs. Rose Kleidon, Dean Isaac Hunt, Dr. Robert Holland, Dean Claibourne Griffin, Mr. Roger Ryan, Dean Wallace Williams, and Dr. Edwin Wilson. Absent without notice were Mr. Tom Andes, (Mr. Clifford Billions), (Dr. Bridgie Ford) Ms. Carol Olson, and Dr. Nathan Ida. Two members from the Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences and two Nontraditional Student Government representatives were still to be named.

absent w/notice

she did attend mtng.

Item No. 1 - Remarks of the President. After requesting that Council members move to the front of the room, the Chairman introduced President Muse whose remarks were as follows:

I want to first report to you on the Provost Search process. As you may know, the deadline for applications and nominations was yesterday. There are currently 95 candidates for the position. Some late nominations were received, in fact some as late as yesterday and those persons have not yet confirmed whether or not they wish to be a candidate. We anticipate that some will and that the final list of candidates will exceed 100. The screening of candidates is to begin next week and, hopefully, will be completed by the end of the fall semester. Dr. George Knepper, who is the chairman of that committee, has told me that he plans to send a letter to all of the faculty next week describing the current status of the search and outlining the procedures and timetable that is to be followed for the remainder of that process.

Dr. Don Gerlach stated that in view of the President's remarks about searches for a Provost and a replacement for Dr. Jenkins, he felt compelled to ask what happened in terms of the recent news concerning Mr. Ott. What about the principles of equal opportunity and an open nationwide search for a director of a center, such as was announced? He also wanted to know whether the request for the creation of this Center for Urban Education had arisen in the College of Education. According to the Faculty Manual and the Regulations of the Board of Trustees, it was the college faculty which was to prepare and recommend to University Council on such matters as curricula, departmental and division changes, etc. He assumed that something like this Center for Urban Education would fall into this category, and therefore Council should have had some

say in its creation. Was the College of Education faculty involved in this and if so, why was it not brought before Council?

President Muse responded that the proposal had originated in the College of Education. As far as the requirements which were relative to the consideration of the creation of Centers, Institutes, etc., things were unclear. There were a number of these across campus, and perhaps there ought to be a clearer process by which they were proposed, evaluated, and approved. As he read the regulations, the process was not clear, but in this case, it seemed appropriate to take the proposal to the Trustees. In terms of the selection of a Director for that Center, the nature of the funding for it was sufficiently restrictive that a search was not appropriate.

Dr. C. Frank Griffin wanted to know what would happen after the initial funding had been used up.

The President replied that by the end of the period for which funding was available from external sources, the College of Education would have had sufficient time to look for and find a source for continuing funding for that Center. He thought that there were some sources which, if pursued, would offer a good chance of success. In the meantime, we had the funding available to launch the Center, to get the programs within the College of Education established, and it looked to him as though it was a good opportunity for the University.

In a follow-up question, Dr. Gerlach commented that, on the basis of his inquiries which might have resulted in misinformation, he understood that the faculty of the College of Education had not had anything to do with this at all. Did they have any deliberative role in this, or had it emanated from the Dean of the College?

The President stated that he had not been party to what kind of discussions had taken place within the College of Education. He had received a proposal from the Dean of that College, who was the authorized agent to transmit proposed actions of this sort.

Item No. 2 - Consideration of the Minutes of the University Council meetings of October 4, 1990 as printed in the University of Akron Chronicle on October 30, 1990. There was some confusion because the Chronicle had just appeared that afternoon, and some members had received their copies and others had not. Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary, noted that he had a cleverly written apology prepared because he had not expected the minutes to be available until after the meeting. Since all members had not yet had a chance to read the minutes, acceptance was postponed until the next meeting of Council.

President informed Council that \$100,000 was added to the library's budget.

Item No. 3 - Remarks of the Presiding Officer. The Chairman said that since Council had last met, two faculty members had passed away, Mr. Charles Salem who was a professor in the Community and Technical College, and Dr. Thomas Ditzel, who was an Associate Professor in the Department of Communications. He called upon Dean Frederick Sturm who presented the following resolution in honor of Mr. Salem.

Be it resolved that...we, the members of University Council, with the faculty and administration of The University of Akron, deeply mourn the untimely death of our colleague Charles T. Salem and express our sincere condolences and sorrow to his family and friends.

Charlie came to The University of Akron in 1965 after receiving a Master of Arts in English from John Carroll University. He was one of the first faculty members in the then-new Community and Technical College, and he became the first coordinator of the English Area of the Division of Associate Studies. After three years as Director of Admissions (1967-1970), Charlie, knowing he was more teacher than administrator, returned to the C&T College to teach Human Relations, Technology and Human Values, and English. From 1981 to 1984 he was coordinator of the Social Sciences area of the Division of Associate Studies. His intellectual interest and expertise in the subject of human relations led to his appointment to and chairmanship of the City of Akron Human and Community Relations Commission.

Besides teaching, Charlie loved music. He played drums in a faculty combo in the '60's and then taught himself to play piano. Charlie's music influenced his poetry: his published collection of poems is titled "Songs for the Chocolate Grandmother." In the '70's he began writing music and performing on and off campus. Charlie played for his students and in many other ways used music to communicate.

Perhaps more than anything else, Charlie was immensely likable. His students and his fellow faculty members treasured his openness, creativity, and caring friendship. All of us who knew Charlie will miss him. We take comfort in knowing that he did as much as any of us can hope for: he enriched the lives of his students, his friends, and his family. It is with sorrow that we say good-bye to Charlie Salem.

Mr. David Jamison then presented the following resolution in honor of Dr. Thomas Ditzel.

Whereas, Dr. Tom Ditzel faithfully and loyally served The University of Akron for thirteen years; and

Whereas, Dr. Ditzel's unfailing warmth, cordiality, and support have earned both the esteem and affection of all his colleagues; and,

Whereas, Dr. Ditzel's special commitment to his classes, his interest in and devotion to his students and his infectious enthusiasm for teaching and learning have affected the lives of all his students; and

Whereas, his death leaves all the university community deeply saddened; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the University Council expresses its gratitude for Dr. Ditzel's outstanding service and contribution to The University of Akron and conveys its deepest sympathies and condolences to Dr. Ditzel's family for the loss we all share.

The Chairman thanked both presenters and requested that Council stand for a moment of silence.

The Chairman then announced that according to custom at the November meeting, the overall statistics on faculty salaries for the current year for both the Akron and Wayne campuses had been distributed. President Muse would be sending these to all faculty.

Dr. Griffin wondered whether these were all 9-month salaries. The Chairman was not sure, but Vice President Faith Helmick stated that they were.

Item No. 4 - Special Announcements. Dr. Dale Jackson wanted to seek clarification on the matter discussed earlier with the President. Rather than let rumors continue, he wondered whether the Dean of Education could explain how the faculty in that college were involved in the recommendation for the Center in Urban Education and its director.

Since Dean William Klingele was not in attendance, the Chairman said that he could ask him to speak to this at a later date.

The Chairman noted that under Item No. 5 of today's agenda, the business of the Ad Hoc committees listed as "L" and "M" had been completed last month and therefore these committees should not have appeared on the agenda.

Item No. 5 - Reports of Committees.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on October 10. It first validated the 1990 special election of Mr. Thomas Andes to replace Mr. Forrest Smith as the Wayne College representative to University Council for 1990-1992. It next made committee assignments for the student representatives to Council. It also decided to inform Associated Student Government President William Haak that there were still spaces available on some committees for students and that these students did not have to be Council members. If there were any interested students, they should contact the Executive Committee.

The Committee also made additional faculty assignments to the Library and Learning Resource Committee of Council, and it then set the agenda for today's Council meeting.

Finally, the Committee again discussed an issue which it had presented to Council at the last meeting - the handling of motions made by Committee Chairs during their reports to Council. Since there had been no additional feedback from Council members, the Committee proposed to follow this policy. All motions coming from Committee reports would be placed at the end of the agenda under New Business to be taken up by Council in the order in which they were presented, unless the Chairs could justify that their motions needed to be dealt with immediately, not later. If Council then approved of the Chairman's justification, a motion would be required to suspend the rules relating to the priority of business. Approval of this motion would require a two-thirds majority of the body.

Dr. Gerlach stated that the just-mentioned policy was a proposal, and he moved that Council consider it under New Business. This was seconded, and Council voted its approval.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - The Chairman said that there was no report.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Associate Provost Joseph Walton first presented to Council the tentative list of prospective graduates for January 1991 for its approval. This was moved and seconded, and Council voted its approval.

Dr. Walton then presented a series of recommendations for Council's approval. The first was a group of policy changes for the Graduate School. They had all been approved by APCC and he recommended adoption with an effective date of Fall Semester 1991. The four recommendations were as follows:

1. APCC recommends the approval of the Residence Requirement, which was approved by Graduate Council on February 20, 1990.
2. APCC recommends the approval of the Credit/No Credit for Thesis and Dissertation Hours proposal, which was approved by Graduate Council on April 3, 1990.
3. APCC recommend the approval of the Graduate Probation and Dismissal Policy, which was approved in amended form by Graduate Council on May 1, 1990 and amended by the APCC Policy and Calendar Subcommittee on October 11, 1990.
4. APCC recommends the approval of the Grades Proposal, approved by Graduate Council on March 6, 1990.

(For the attachments to these recommendations, see Appendices A, 1-4)

Mr. James Inman requested that recommendation 3 be removed from the package and considered separately. Dr. Walton then amended his proposal and moved that Council approve Items 1, 2, and 4. This was seconded, and Council voted its approval.

Dr. Walton then moved the approval of Item 3, a Graduate Probation and Dismissal Policy which read as follows:

Any student whose grade-point average falls below 3.00 is no longer in good standing in the Graduate School and will be placed on probation. Students who do not return to good standing within one calendar year from the time probation begins will be dismissed from the Graduate School.

This was seconded.

Mr. Inman apologized to Council because he had a number of issues which he wished to raise regarding this proposed new policy. The first one was why it was being considered at all, since it had already been published in the University Bulletin for this academic year. Somehow the University Council had been bypassed on this, and somebody ought to recognize that Council made these policies, and it should not be inserted in the Bulletin otherwise. Assuming that because it had not been approved by Council, it was null and void, he wanted to argue against the entire matter. First, the present system had been working well for over a decade. It had a great deal of flexibility to it. If someone were not performing well academically, then that student would be reviewed by an academic advisor and if he had less than a 3-point at the graduate level, he could not register anymore. The computer would block him from registration and he would have to go to his advisor, who would discuss his situation and decide whether or not that student ought to be dismissed or allowed to continue. Then that advisor would have to write a recommendation to the Graduate Dean who would have the opportunity to say no to the advisor. She could execute her authority to dismiss. This was a flexible system because it treated each individual as an individual and provided plenty of opportunity to do what was correct.

Mr Inman continued that the proposed new policy had no such flexibility. It was a strict rule and would breed unfairness and inequity in regards to students. For example, under the proposed policy it stated that after two semesters with less than a 3-point, you were automatically dismissed. Therefore if you had a part-time student (and part-time students made up a major part of the body of graduate students) who may have gotten a "C" his first semester here, improved to a "B" the next semester, and achieved an "A-" his third semester, he still would have less than a 3-point for two consecutive semesters. He would then have to be dismissed. This was not correct, and Mr. Inman wanted to argue that the whole proposal be struck down. He concluded by noting that this policy would have an adverse impact on minorities which we had spent considerable monies to recruit. It was an ill-advised policy and should be rejected.

Dean Patricia Carrell wanted to clarify that the proposed policy had gotten into the Bulletin through an error. It had inadvertently been sent in without her knowledge, and the Graduate School was not using it. In regard to Mr. Inman's statement that the old policy was working, in the year in which she had been here, she had yet to receive one recommendation from any program for the dismissal of any student. So in a little over a year, no students had been dismissed from graduate programs, yet there were many who were in great difficulty. The proposed policy had been approved not only by the Student Policy Committee of the Graduate Council, but by the full Graduate Council and also by a meeting of the Graduate Faculty last spring. It clearly had the endorsement of the Graduate Faculty of this institution.

Mr. Inman replied that the College of Business Administration had dismissed students over the past decade. He himself had participated in some of those dismissals. He agreed that probably over the past year or so, there might not have been any dismissals. Instead there had been students who had left. With the element of flexibility, since there was no mandatory rule to academically dismiss them and put that on their transcript, he had permitted them to leave without the formal academic dismissal.

Dr. David Buchthal commented that when this was discussed in APCC, one of the concerns was that this proposal would allow computers to automatically dismiss students who did not meet the GPA average at two semesters without any human intervention. There seemed to be no appeals processes associated with the policy. Would Dean Carrell care to speak to this issue?

Dean Carrell replied that since every policy was appealable, it was thought that there was no need to specify that an appeal could be made. It was certainly her assumption that if a case could be made against dismissal, it would definitely be considered.

Mr. Inman then submitted that there was no need for the proposed policy.

Dr. Jackson moved to refer this item back to Academic Policies for further discussion. Dr. Alan Noble seconded this and pointed out that there was no need to rush this. We had been operating under the old rules so we might as well use them for another year. There was no great necessity to make a change without considering it carefully.

Dr. Gerlach did not know if it was exactly wise to refer this back to the APCC. That was not going to solve the problem. He thought that it ought to be referred back to the Graduate Council for its reconsideration. The APCC could really only act as a kind of mediator, and since the Dean of the Graduate School was here, she could very well express to Graduate Council the concern expressed here and see whether it wanted to consider further revision. That would be more direct and expeditious.

Dean Carrell replied that this had been taken back to the Graduate Council at its October 22 meeting after she had met with the APCC and received from it the proposed changes in the language that it was recommending. At that time, the Graduate Council had rediscussed the issue and voted again unanimously to support the policy. The Graduate Faculty, and especially those on the Council, did feel the need to have some mechanism for removal of students who were in difficulty.

Mr. Inman suspected that the people who were on the Graduate Council were faculty who did not participate in making academic decisions. Many times the advising affected what their decisions would be. Perhaps they were not fully informed.

Council then voted on the motion to refer the policy back to APCC for further thought and study and it was approved.

Dr. Walton then proceeded to the next item for recommendation which was adoption of the 1991-92 Academic Calendar. APCC also recommended that the preliminary calendar for 1992-93 be studied and recommended for adoption in the Spring Semester of 1991. The rationale was that several issues of the academic calendar could be dealt with in the spring when APCC was not under pressure to adopt a calendar immediately. (For the 1991-92 Academic Calendar, see Appendix A,5). This was seconded by Dr. Buchthal.

When Dean Carrell wondered why classes would be starting so late in the Fall semester, Dr. Walton asked Ms. Joyce Mirman, the Chair of the Policy Committee, to explain.

Ms. Mirman explained that the Policy Committee had sent this calendar to faculty for reactions a year ago. The version which Council was being asked to approve incorporated all of the requests made by any faculty or administrators on the campus. There had been a lot of discussion about starting classes on Monday and then losing the following Monday (Labor Day in the Fall; Martin Luther King Day in the Spring). There had been some discussion on when the breaks came in and the dates for graduation. Some people wanted Spring Break moved and that caused the calendar to need adjustment in another direction. After everything was finished, the committee was able to incorporate all requests by starting after Labor Day and after Martin Luther King Day which took care of the problem of starting classes on a Monday and then losing the next one. She wondered whether all or any of this made any sense. The same schedule could not be set for the 1992-93 academic year because it would mean holding classes until Christmas.

It was noted that in the proposed 1991-92 calendar, grades would be due on Christmas Eve.

Dr. Lawrence Focht moved to amend the calendar by moving the whole Spring Semester up by one week. This would start the semester on January 14 and all the other dates would be moved up and then both graduations could be held on May 16. Since there was no second, this motion died.

Council then voted its approval of the calendar.

Dr. Walton then presented the final item of his report regarding a proposal to detach Founder's Day from its current association with May Day and the Faculty Retirement Luncheon. APCC did not approve this proposal and he therefore placed it before University Council for any formal action that it wished to take.

Dr. Gerlach pointed out that Council had already resolved this issue. The calendar for next year had just been adopted and established Founder's Day on May 1 with May Day. Therefore, that vote, unless Council wanted to reconsider the action, meant that we had said no to the Founder's Day Committee that wanted to make this separation. No further action was necessary unless someone wanted to tinker with what we had.

D. Athletics Committee - Dr. Oller read the following report from Mrs. Irene Glanville, the Chair of the Committee:

Two policy manuals have been developed and distributed by the Athletics Department. As a result, several items have been planned for future discussion. These manuals should permit committee members to better fulfill their charge:

- A. "The Guide to Intercollegiate Athletic Policy at The University of Akron" - this contains the most common questions regarding athletic policy, academics, financial aid and drug testing. Each student athlete was given a copy. Athletic committee members also have a copy.
- B. "Policies and Procedures of the University of Akron Athletics Department" - a comprehensive collection of policies/procedures regarding all aspects of athletics at the University of Akron. Copies have been issued to the President, Provost, all members of the Athletics Department (coaches, secretaries, staff) and members of the Athletics Committee.

2. Mike Green, nationally known consultant on alcohol and drug abuse has presented an educational program for the University athletes. The program has been well received. On November 12, 1990 Sudden Sam McDowell, former major league pitcher, will also speak on the topic. This program is open to the campus.

3. The committee is trying to increase participation in meeting this academic year so that it can better represent faculty interests.

4. The next meeting is scheduled for November 12, 1990, 1-2 p.m. Please forward to me any topics which you like addressed at future meetings.

The following items are on the November agenda:

- A. Report of athlete's Spring 1990 GPA, by sport (comparison with previous semesters)
- B. NCAA proposed legislation for Division I
- C. Title IX, rules and regulations
- D. Update on the Fall sports seasons

Dr. Gerlach then asked whether it was appropriate to ask for or propose a particular item of business for this committee. When the Chairman replied that it was, Dr. Gerlach moved that the Athletics Committee be instructed to examine the Athletics Program budget and present the report of appropriations and expenditures to this Council by February next. This was seconded by Mr. Inman and Council voted its approval.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Dr. Oller read a report from Dr. Harvey Sterns, the newly elected Chairman of the Committee. He requested that all correspondence, requests for information, and suggestions, be directed to him, care of the Institute for Life-Span Development and Gerontology, Simmons Hall 179. The Committee had not yet formally met but would be meeting this month.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Mr. David Brink, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on October 15, 22, and 29. A grievance had been received and assigned file number 30-91. In response to Council's instructions which were given out at the October meeting, the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee reworked the report that had been presented last spring along with Mr. Inman's motion of last month and offered the following resolution for adoption of University Council:

Whereas instructors are members of the regular faculty (Faculty Manual 3359-20-03, p.28 of the new paging); and,

Whereas instructors are not excluded from promotion procedures (Faculty Manual 3359-20-037, p. 49); and,

Whereas there is historical precedent at The University of Akron for the promotion of instructors to professorial rank, and

Whereas some instructors currently employed by The University of Akron may have been appointed with the expectation that promotion to assistant professor was possible;

It is the opinion of University Council that, unless the Faculty Manual is amended according to proper and accepted procedure to state otherwise, instructors are eligible for promotion to professorial rank following departmental and college guidelines for such promotion.

This was moved and seconded.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester reacted to this motion by reiterating what he had stated at the last meeting of Council when this issue was discussed. He was opposed to allowing promotion from a non-tenure-track position to a tenure-track position without an appropriate EEO search. He agreed that presently there was no policy against this and that this kind of promotion had been done before, but that did not mean that it should be continued when it wasn't right.

When Dean Russell Petersen asked Dean Sylvester for a clarification, Dean Sylvester stated that the position of instructor was not a tenure-track position whereas, the assistant professor position was. What was being discussed here was permitting promotion from a non-tenure track to a tenure-track without going through the appropriate EEO search process. That was the way he viewed it.

Dr. Jackson said that the matter up for discussion involved a promotion. The position which Dean Sylvester was taking here was that every time an Instructor wanted a promotion, he would essentially be fired and then be part of the applicant pool for a national search for the elevated position. If that policy came in across the board, nobody would want a promotion. The way we were dealing with this now did not conflict with Federal or State laws.

Dr. Buchthal commented that he was not aware that instructors could be hired without an EEO-approved search. Therefore since they were hired through an EEO-approved search, there was no problem with them being promoted to jobs for which they were qualified. Otherwise you would be telling these people that they were hired as instructors and they would continue to be so from now to eternity.

Dr. Gerlach agreed and added that since the ranks were clearly designated by the Regulations of the Board of Trustees and in the Faculty Manual, the only little distinction that was made between the instructors and the other ranks was that the instructors were not tenured but could become eligible for tenure if they were promoted. He also reminded Council that according to the principles of the American Association of University Professors, an instructor having completed seven years service in rank has de facto tenure. If one wanted to dispute that, a legal case could be made but he would not risk it himself.

Dean Carrell noted that when she had asked the question at last month's meeting about whether EEO searches were, in fact, conducted for all these instructor positions, the response was yes and no. Sometimes they were and sometimes they were not. How were we to distinguish?

In response to Dean Sylvester's request for clarification from the Provost's office on this, the Chairman replied that there had not been any clear-cut policy, one way or the other, on the search.

Dr. Helmick attempted to make a clarification on the search aspect. When people were referring to an EEO-approved search, what she thought that they were really referring to was a full national search. The Affirmative Action Office might approve the search that was less than that under certain conditions. For example, the loss of a faculty member due to an untimely death where a replacement must be found right away. Normally these types of replacements were approved on a temporary basis so that the instructors were either visiting for someone who was ill or on leave or were temporary appointments for a short period of time.

However, when a full search was run, being national or whatever, for a regular position, then those instructors were expected to be considered for reappointment and all the other processes that went with a regular appointment.

Dr. Buchthal asked whether those appointed on a short-term or term basis were actually called instructors, or were they visiting or adjunct instructors.

Dr. Helmick replied that this was one of the areas which caused confusion because in the past there had not always been consistency in the use of titles. She suggested that one solution to this problem in the future might be to call those on temporary appointments "visiting instructors." This definition of "visiting" seemed to accord well with the fact that these people were temporary replacements for someone on leave or in an emergency situation. It did not confuse it with instructors who were on regular appointments.

In response to Dean Petersen's question regarding the use of the term "adjunct," Dr. Helmick said that at The University of Akron, the term "visitor" did not mean visiting from somewhere, but it meant visiting to here. Hence anyone here on a temporary basis would be visiting. The term "adjunct" had been used primarily for people who had full-time employment elsewhere and were attached to us normally at no salary.

Dean Sylvester thought that this discussion made his point. We were very careful and conscientious about tenure-track people but not at the instructor level. This was why he was arguing against this. If we were conscientious at the instructor level and we did a careful search and did differentiate between visiting and non-visiting instructors, there would be no reason to argue. However, he was convinced that we had not done it right and still might not in the future. This was why he was speaking against the resolution.

Mr. Inman emphasized that this did not deal with the inequities that now presently existed. You had to do something about what was here and now. There had been instructors who had been hired and had been here for many years. Many of them had been hired in a time when the University was willing to say that instructors were promotable. To institute a new policy and

retroactively apply it to those instructors and say that they could not apply for promotion without a national search was unfair to them.

Dean Sylvester replied that he was not suggesting anything of the kind. What he was saying was let's decide what we were going to do in the future and do it properly.

The Chairman thought that a policy statement should be prepared in the Provost's Office as to what we would do in the future and this Committee could look at it.

Mr. Inman noted that this was exactly what this resolution was saying. It was presenting its judgement on the matter to the Provost's Office so that the administration could make a clear statement on this and to put on record that the policy operating in the past few years which denied instructors promotions even though they had been passed by their departments or colleges was inappropriate. Council was asking that this be straightened out, and this was why he thought we ought to vote on this right now.

Dr. Jackson then called the question on this motion.

The Chairman reiterated that his office would come up with a policy statement on this matter which would be presented next month. Dean Carrell requested that it include, either in the policy statement or the procedures, that there was an expectation about the search for the instructor position that it would be a full national search, as opposed to perhaps regional or local to fill a position.

Council then voted its approval of the resolution.

Dr. Gerlach then moved that the Reference Committee take this material and make certain that it be placed at an appropriate place in the Faculty Manual. This was seconded and Council voted its approval.

Dr. William McGucken reminded Council that at the last meeting, there had been a recommendation passed that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee would appoint a subcommittee to look at the review of department heads. What had the Committee done in regards to this recommendation?

Mr. Brink replied that nothing had been done for two reasons. First the Committee's time had been taken up with a number of grievances which it had assumed had precedence. Second he had been waiting for the minutes of the meeting to be exactly clear on what the Committee had been assigned to do.

Dr. McGucken wanted to make a suggestion to Council. He first gave some background on this issue. Back in February, Council had passed a recommendation in regards to the review of department heads. It went to the President, and at the May meeting he told Council that there were aspects of the recommendation which he

could not support. He intended to make these known in writing to Provost Marini in order that the Executive Committee and Council could review the matter. Council saw this letter in August, and at the September meeting he (McGucken) had asked the President whether he would be willing to work with a small group of interested faculty to iron out the problems. When the President agreed, he had written a letter to the Executive Committee asking it to appoint this committee of interested people. The Executive Committee had declined to do this because the whole issue was going to be discussed at the October meeting. At that meeting, Dr. John Bee had made a motion which Council had passed and which he had interpreted to mean that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee would create this committee. So far this had not happened and his recommendation to Council would be that an ad hoc committee be formed to deal with this issue. He had looked back at the minutes of Council in regard to the original discussion of this issue and come up with the names of some Council members who were interested in the matter and would serve - Dr. Noble, Dr. Gerlach, Dr. Jackson, Dr. Frank Griffin, Dr. Christie, and himself. He moved this and it was seconded by Dr. Gerlach.

The Chairman wanted to know how this would differ from the charge that the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee had right now.

Dr. McGucken replied that suggested ad hoc committee was willing and ready to act right away, while the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee seemed to be very busy. This would expedite the business.

Dr. Helmick remembered that when this had been discussed back in February, a number of deans had opposed the motion before Council. She wanted to suggest that if this ad hoc Committee were to be set up, it should have an academic dean added to it. Mr. Inman noted that the composition of the committee seemed heavily weighted in Arts and Sciences. While he loved Arts and Sciences, he thought that it might be advantageous to have the committee write a letter to each college inviting it to send a representative to that group.

Dr. Gerlach then proposed that he withdraw his name as a member of the proposed committee and offered Dean Petersen as a substitute.

Dean Petersen said that he would be happy to serve, but he found Dr. McGucken's motion a little unusual since there already was a committee charged with this task. He thought that Council ought to stay within the existing structure and charge the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee to expedite this task.

The Chairman agreed that he was not sure that this was within the purview of the Council when there was a structure in place already. If the Committee was busy, it would just have to work harder or longer.

Dr. McGucken said that he would be willing to withdraw his motion if the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee would get on with the business. Since Dr. Gerlach, the seconder, did not necessary consent to the withdrawal, he asked for unanimous consent from the whole house to remove the motion from the floor. That consent was then given.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Dr. Oller read a report from Mr. Paul Richert, the Chairman, which stated that the Committee had met on October 12, 1990 and talked with Vice-President Helmick concerning faculty benefits. It was learned that the disability benefit for new hires would be revamped and that the definition of dependence for dependent tuition and fee remission would follow our existing policy. The University would not be adopting the more restrictive federal tax definition of dependence. The Committee was currently preparing the salary data on merit and across-the-board pay raises for presentation at the next December meeting.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee - No report.

I. Reference Committee - No report.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Vice President John Wodarski reported that the Committee had met on October 29 and awarded 11 Faculty Research Grants from the 18 applications. The Committee would be meeting again in about two weeks to review 38 proposals for summer fellowships. At its October 29 meeting, the Committee also unanimously approved the following two motions:

1. The University should set up a separate mechanism to fund computers for faculty. This fund would pay for personal computers and other computers necessary for research. It was the committee's feeling that faculty should not have to go to the small grants committee or other outside agencies to ask for their computer equipment.
2. The committee voted to ask the Administration to give the faculty small grants committee an additional \$100,000 to maintain the increased research momentum on campus. This money should not be derived solely from indirect cost return that is inadequate due to expenditures in legal fees, the Graduate School, Research Services operations and the administration of Selection Excellence programs. These additional funds should be utilized to foster research in the social sciences and humanities.

(For the Faculty Research Awards, see Appendix B).

K. Student Affairs Committee - Dr. Robert Dubick, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had met on October 17. He reviewed with the members the responsibilities of the Committee and described in detail the subcommittees. The members then divided themselves into the two subcommittees, namely the Extracurricular Activities Subcommittee and the Awards, Scholarships, Grants and Loans Subcommittee. The remainder of the meeting was devoted to a

discussion of a proposal to move the commencement ceremony to the Sunday following final exams. As it now stood, Commencement was held 2-3 weeks after final exams. In order to accomplish this earlier graduation, diploma holders would be handed out at the ceremony and the diplomas would be distributed at a later date. This would alleviate complaints from students who have had to return to campus for the ceremonies and also perhaps enable more faculty to attend the ceremony. It would also eliminate the need for the University Registrar to contact students immediately prior to the ceremony to inform them that they had not met requirements and would not be able to participate.

The Student Affairs fully supported the recommendation for an earlier commencement date.

After the report, Dr. Dubick elaborated a bit on the possibilities for an earlier Spring commencement and stated that a motion with a specific date would be forthcoming at the next meeting.

Dr. Gerlach reminded Council that the change would have to go through the APCC before it reached the body and then asked a question about the anonymous system which had been devised by the Associated Student Government regarding student grievances against faculty. Could Dean Dubick tell Council whether this was in place or not, and if it was, why should it exist without Council's approval?

Dean Dubick responded that the original system had been stopped because of problems with confidentiality. The procedure had since been adjusted, and he asked William Haak, ASG President, to further elaborate.

Mr. Haak stated that the policy which was in place now was a student government policy which meant that it did not have to be approved by Council. As Dean Dubick had said, the original policy had been suspended last spring because of faculty complaints and legal problems. Over the summer, a new policy was drawn up which was subsequently approved by Legal Affairs and was completely legal under the Ohio Revised Code, Personal Information Systems Section. Under the new policy, if a certain number of students from a given section should complain about a faculty member, then the ASG would talk to the students involved and try to seek some kind of solution to the problem. Anonymity was not guaranteed since that was the problem legally under the old policy. If a faculty member wished to see the claims filed against him, he had a right to do so under the Ohio Revised Code.

Dr. Gerlach said that this answered his question, but he disputed the point that University Council did not have anything to say about such matters.

After some further discussion about procedures for changing graduation dates and possible proposals, Dean Dubick stated that it would be better to wait a month and present a resolution at the next meeting.

L. General Studies Advisory Council - No Report.

Dr. Gerlach noted that Council had not yet formally discharged the Ad Hoc Committee on Part-Time Faculty Rights and Grievances and the Ad Hoc Committee on Clarification and Modification of Regulations and Faculty Manual. He now so moved that Council do so and that Council also thank them for their service. This was seconded and Council voted its approval.

Item No. 6 - Report of the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents.

Dr. Oller noted that Dr. Burton was unable to attend the meeting, but she had given him her report. Since he could not possibly deliver it in her inimitable style, he wanted to present just one aspect of it because it related to something Council had passed at its last meeting. Chancellor Hairston said that the faculty exchange and tuition exchange were good ideas, especially for Northeastern Ohio. However, she did not see this as an OBR matter, but something that the Inter-University Council of University Presidents should take up as well as the Northeast Ohio Provosts' Committee. Hairston mentioned Cleveland State, Akron, and Youngstown as schools that might benefit from tuition exchanges. She thought that it might help black faculty and Nursing faculty to get terminal degrees in their own teaching fields instead of taking doctorates at their own institutions in fields which they did not teach.

Dr. Burton also asked Dr. Oller to mention that she would be meeting with Provost Ruebel on November 5 to discuss with him her preparations for the next FAC meeting on the 7th and to review with him all her notes from which the foregoing points had been taken. (For the full report, see Appendix C).

Item No. 7 - Unfinished Business. The Chairman then turned to an amendment proposed at the last meeting to Council Bylaws, Section 3359-10-03 Composition of the Council, D, which read as follows:

Eight NINETEEN student representatives comprising four FIFTEEN students from the undergraduate day enrollment selected in such manner as determined by Associated Student Government, two evening NONTRADITIONAL students selected in such manner as determined by the Evening Student-Council NONTRADITIONAL STUDENT GOVERNMENT, one student selected from the Graduate Student Council in a manner agreeable to such Council, and one student selected from the Student Bar Association in a manner agreeable to such Association.

Since the matter had been laid over one month according to the Bylaws, it could now be removed from the table for discussion and approval. A motion to remove it from the table was made, seconded, and approved by Council.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to deal with a procedural matter before beginning the discussion and moved that when voting on this amendment that a secret ballot be taken. This was seconded and Council voted its approval.

Mr. Haak asked for permission to address Council from the podium, and the Chairman granted his request. Mr. Haak began by noting that the students at the University of Akron had long been criticized as being disinterested in anything which the institution had to offer beyond the book-and-lecture education which was symbolized by the degree received at commencement. Students who fit into this category were missing out on the greater good which could come from involving themselves in their education in ways that could not be measured by a GPA. The greater good which he envisioned was something that appeared to have been missing from this institution for much longer than any Council members had been around. It was a feeling about this institution which transcended teaching and retiring, learning and graduating, and moving on. It was a feeling which needed to return quickly even before one more person could leave. Simply put, this greater good, this feeling, was a sense of pride in this institution. The lack of this sense of pride had earned us the dubious nickname APATHY U. Although many had tried to address this problem of apathy, no solution had yet been generated. Questions such as how to fill the Rubber Bowl, how to involve commuter students in the many facets of campus life available, and how to mold those same commuter students with those in the residence halls into one cohesive body of future alumni still remained.

Mr. Haak stated that the answer to these questions presented itself to him through a simple analogy involving a hotel room. Anyone who has stayed in hotels knew that in those situations the most meticulous housekeeper or most honest citizen turned into a "let-the-maid-do-it-slob-in-the-suitcase-stuffing towel thief." The reason for this change was inherent in the innkeeper/boarder relationship. The lack of ownership resulted in an "I don't care attitude." Unfortunately, this lack of ownership was also present in the student situation at our University. The vast majority of students here behaved as the boarder in his example might. They came and went, never letting their vision stray far from their ultimate goal of graduation, and perhaps they viewed the campus only as a convenient gathering of classrooms. They left the campus largely unchanged and in return the campus left them largely unchanged as well. The situation did not have to be this way, but it would continue as long as the students here saw this campus as a means to an end, instead of an end in itself.

The way to change the situation was to give the students that sense of ownership which had been missing for too long. This was precisely why this amendment had been presented. The time had finally come for the student body, through their elected representatives, to share accountability for and indeed shape the policy making which took place in Council. It was to be hoped that all Council members, regardless of their constituencies, could see that it was only common sense for the largest group on campus to

have more than a token representation on what was meant to be an all-University legislative body. It was Mr. Haak's fervent hope that each member would weigh this proposal carefully, and he urged all to vote in favor of it and give the student body here the opportunity to take an equal part with the faculty and administration in responsibility for the effective government of our University.

Dr. Gerlach responded that the students having an equal part with the faculty was an interesting concept, but one which ran headlong against the whole establishment of the University as it was reflected first in the Council Bylaws. In the Bylaws, Council was referred to as the legislative body of the faculty - not of the students nor of anybody else. Subsequently, amendments were passed to provide for some student representation in Council. If Council were to follow the argument of participation based on size there would be no end to what it might be asked to do to enlarge the body so that 74 percent of the claimed population of the University community would have commensurate representation. He thought that everyone would recognize this as largely folly.

In regard to the record of student participation in Council, Dr. Gerlach could only say that in all his years as a representative on Council and in various committees of the University, he had not seen any particular evidence that when given the opportunity that they participated. He did not recall ever having heard any word spoken by them in the way of advice or of crucial information to any point relating to Council business. This might be a good learning experience for them, but that was not the purpose of this Council. If he had his way, there would be no students on Council at all because they had their own student associated government to conduct their own affairs. Also Council was already rather large in size, and this proposed addition would only make it more unwieldy.

The student representatives had presented members with data relating to their responsible attendance at meetings for the year 1989-90. Dr. Gerlach, however, wanted to remind Council that in the previous year, 1988-89, Council had held nine regular meetings and attempted a tenth special meeting. The record of those eight students had to be part of the historical record also:

September:	5	out	of	8	absent	
October:	3	"	"	"	"	
November:	4	"	"	"	"	
December:	6	"	"	"	"	
February:	6	"	"	"	"	
February:	7	"	"	"	"	(this was a second special meeting)
March:	6	"	"	"	"	
April:	7	"	"	"	"	
May:	6	"	"	"	"	

A special meeting on March 9 had been called, but it could not be held for lack of a quorum. All of the students were absent

and any one of them would have enabled Council to achieve a quorum. This was not a very good record, but it correlated with what he had said about his own personal experience, not only on Council, but with other committees. He could only repeat that in that experience he had never witnessed any student offering any particular advice or information that had any particular merit or added substantially to what was being dealt with.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to conclude with an off-hand statement, which he did not want taken the wrong way and which did sound a little bit strong, but which bore thought. As one of his good colleagues had stated concerning this proposal "the keepers of the zoo do not need the animals telling them how to manage the zoo."

Mr Samir Yebaile replied that, speaking only for himself and not for the other student representatives, he found that last comment rather unnerving, and he resented it. On the question of accountability, he wanted Council to know that in the past the students had been not been accountable to anyone but themselves. This was the first year that all the students representatives were accountable to the President of the Associated Student Government. They also were all members of the Executive Committee of ASG and had to attend regular weekly meetings. The student representatives were all members of the University Council committees and were required to attend their meetings. As a member of the Student Affairs Committee, he had attended its first meeting and given as much input as he could from the student viewpoint. He concluded by emphasizing that student representative attendance would no longer be a problem because of their accountability to the ASG President.

Dr. Focht stated that he opposed the amendment because he thought that the Council was too large already, and adding eleven new members would make it even more difficult to conduct business. Also there were some 4,000 graduate students and according to the students' argument about size relating to representation, they too were under-represented.

Mr. Inman wanted to commend the student representatives for coming to Council and trying to reduce apathy. He thought that Mr. Haak's remarks were well stated although he did not necessarily agree that apathy could easily be eliminated merely by increasing the number of student representatives on this body. Also a more modest increase in number would have swayed his vote, but he could not support an increase of the magnitude suggested here.

Dean Petersen thought that this proposal was going to be voted down, and he did not want the students to get the wrong message. This sort of issue was one that students regularly faced, and he remembered that when he had been a student, he had been president of his student body association and that they had put themselves on committees. Looking back on it, he thought that this kind of forum was not the place to be effective and accomplish what they wanted to accomplish. This was a faculty body, and there needed to be a senior faculty governance body in this University. It was a somewhat compounded body as it was because of administrative

representation and other kinds of things which he found rather unusual. To further cloud it with addition student representation would probably reduce its effectiveness even more. There had to be other mechanisms whereby students could play an important role in the life of the University. One of the problems with bodies like Council for students was that they were not places where students could be very effective in getting their views heard, and so people gradually lost interest in participation. He thought that the University ought to try to create mechanisms whereby we could find a better vehicle for involving students in the governance of the University and a forum in which they can function effectively and not concentrate on this as the vehicle to get the job done. He agreed with Mr. Inman in supporting the presentation made. The concerns of the students were valid, and we ought to try to address them.

Dean Dubick also wanted to support the student leadership's efforts to gain a greater voice. What the students were saying now was that they thought that they had no voice, and he would very much like to hear what mechanisms might be possible to give them that voice.

A Council member then noted that a possible mechanism would be community government rather than simply a faculty government. The latter might be required for certain types of business that needed to be conducted. What was being said here today was that a larger community was not being addressed or adequately represented. Perhaps a community government with representation from faculty, staff, and students all working together for the betterment of the community was the answer.

Mr. Inman thought that the students were presently being represented and that if they had needs, those could be presented to Council. They could as a student group make their own proposals to this body. They did not need nineteen people to sit here to express those views. Also as a member of the Executive Committee he had asked it to contact student groups and tell them that there were some Council committees without student representation and that these representatives did not have to be Council members. They could increase their participation through that mechanism.

Mr. Haak noted that he had received notification about this from the Executive Committee and that the deadline for a response was November 5.

Mr. Mark DeVinney, an ASG Senator, asked for and received from Council permission to speak. He wanted Council members to understand that the eleven additional student representatives would all also be ASG Senators. Therefore they were students legislators who would understand legislative procedures and would not be thrown onto Council with no prior experience. They had a working rapport with the student community. He also wanted to address a few things which Dr. Gerlach had said. This was a faculty body, but there also was a large administrative and staff representation. Also it did not address only faculty concerns. For example, a calendar for

the next year had just been passed and this affected the entire University. Shouldn't the students have more than a few votes on that issue? On the issue of accountability, he reiterated what Mr. Yebaile had said and noted that there were some representatives who had been removed by ASG for non-attendance of Council meetings. The statement that students had never said anything of merit was very opinionated, and analogy of animals and zoo keepers was very thoughtless. This was especially true since in some instances we were teaching these animals in order that they could come back to the zoo and teach as well.

The Chairman agreed that there was a better analogy than the one Dr. Gerlach had used.

Dean Petersen noted that there was little doubt that the students were the ones who had a long-term interest in this school. In that sense, they were tied to the University of Akron for the rest of their lives. He thought the majority of the people in Council and the faculty as a whole believed that the students had an important and long-term stake in the University. What people were trying to say here was that there were better, more effective ways to deal with having involvement in the governance of the University. He liked the idea of a Community governing body. Perhaps some sort of task force or ad hoc committee ought to be appointed to study this issue and make recommendations to the President regarding how we might address this need.

Since there was no further discussion, the Chairman stated that it was time for the vote. Mr. David Jamison, the parliamentarian, asked the Chairman to make a clarification on what vote would be necessary to pass this motion. University Council Bylaws specified that it took a majority of the voting membership of University Council to pass a Bylaw amendment. The problem was that although in theory there were 80 members of Council, four seats were presently unfilled (two non-tradition students; two Arts and Sciences). Was the majority to be 41 (of 80) or 39 (of 76)? After a brief discussion, the Chairman ruled that 39 affirmative votes would pass the motion.

A secret ballot was then taken, and the motion was defeated by a vote of 43 (NO) to 10 (YES).

Item No. 8 - New Business. Council then returned to the proposal made by the Executive Committee during its report relating to motions coming out of Committee reports. It was that "All motions coming from Committee reports would be placed at the end of the agenda under New Business to be taken up by Council in the order in which they were presented, unless the Chairmen could justify that their motions needed to be dealt with immediately, not later. If Council then approved of the Chairman's justification, a motion would be required to suspend the rules relating to the priority of business. Approval of this motion would require a two-thirds majority of the body." This was moved and seconded by Dr. Helmick.

Dr. Gerlach stated that one aspect of the motion bothered him, and that was the inclusion of a rule that would involve a suspension of the rules which would require a two-thirds vote of Council. He thought that it would be better if Council would just follow the majority vote principle. This was moved and seconded.

Dr. Walton wanted all matters coming from APCC to be exempt from this procedure so that he would not have to request a suspension of the rules each time his report was made and there were matters which needed to be dealt with immediately.

In order to make things clear, it was decided to vote on Dr. Gerlach's amendment first and then proceed to Dr. Walton's proposed exemption for APCC. Council then voted its approval of Dr. Gerlach's amendment of a simple majority.

Dr. Walton then moved that the main motion be amended to say that the APCC action items which would come as a part of the report of the APCC be given an exception or exemption from the proposed rule. They would all be acted upon at the time of the report. This was seconded.

Dr. Helmick wanted to speak against the amendment. She could understand making an exception for curriculum proposal because there was some time in getting curriculum proposals through. Other items from that committee often were significant (like the dismissal policy for graduate school) and ought to be placed on the agenda so people would have advance time to study them before the discussion. Therefore she would not be in favor of exempting all action items that APCC would bring to Council.

Mr. Inman agreed and pointed out that the Executive Committee's idea here was that the Chair of the relevant committee could present arguments as to why to suspend the rules. He thought that Dr. Walton would be able to do this very capably for those items which required it. Otherwise the items should go at the end of the agenda.

Dr. Walton replied with two points. One was that even those non-curricular items in his report were items of policy or related to the calendar and there were deadlines in order for them to be published in the Bulletin. The other was that if he had each time to ask for a suspension of the rules, it would eat up additional time getting those materials through, and he thought that we killed enough time in Council as it was.

Council then voted on Dr. Walton's motion and the amendment was defeated. Therefore all APCC items including curriculum proposals would fall under the proposed new rule.

Dr. Oller then reread the main motion with Dr. Gerlach's amendment for a simple majority rather than two-thirds vote, and the motion was approved by Council.

Mr. Terry Haas then moved that the Chairman form an ad hoc committee to study the issue of greater student involvement in University governance as well as the possibility of a different governing body which would include both students and faculty. This was seconded.

Mr. Yebaile spoke in favor of the motion and noted that despite the outcome of the vote earlier, he thought that he had heard a number of Council members suggest that something like this should be done.

Council then voted on Mr. Haas' motion and gave its approval.

Item No. 9 - Adjournment. It was moved that Council adjourn and this was seconded. Council then voted its approval and the meeting ended at 4:55 p.m.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

October 17, 1990

TO: Executive Committee and
Members of University Council

FROM: Joseph M. Walton *JMW* Associate Provost
for Academic Services

SUBJECT: Report of the Academic Policies, Curriculum, and
Calendar Committee for November 1, 1990

The Academic Policies, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee met on Tuesday, October 16, 1990 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of the Gardner Student Center. As a result of that meeting the following items are presented to University Council for action:

1. APCC recommends the approval of the Residence Requirement, which was approved by Graduate Council on February 20, 1990. (Attachment #1)
2. APCC recommends the approval of the Credit/No Credit for Thesis and Dissertation Hours proposal, which was approved by Graduate Council on April 3, 1990. (Attachment #2)
3. APCC recommends the approval of the Graduate Probation and Dismissal Policy, which was approved in amended form by Graduate Council on May 1, 1990 and amended by the APCC Policy and Calendar Subcommittee on October 11, 1990. (Attachment #3)
4. APCC recommends the approval of the Grades Proposal, approved by Graduate Council on March 6, 1990. (Attachment #4)

ALL RECOMMENDED CHANGES LISTED ABOVE ARE TO BE EFFECTIVE WITH THE BEGINNING OF THE FALL SEMESTER, 1991.

Executive Committee and
Members of University Council
October 17, 1990
Page 2

5. APCC recommends adoption of the 1991-92 Academic Calendar. APCC also recommends that the Preliminary Calendar for 1992-93 be studied and recommended for adoption in the spring semester of 1991. The rationale is that there are several issues surrounding the development of the calendar that could be dealt with in the spring when APCC is not under pressure to adopt a calendar immediately to meet a deadline. (Attachment #5)
6. APCC did not approve the recommendation to detach Founder's Day from its current association with May Day and the Faculty Retirement Luncheon. I, therefore, place this agenda item before University Council for its formal action. (Attachment #6)

Attachments

Residence Requirement

approved by Graduate Council, February 20, 1990

A doctoral student may meet the degree requirements of the Graduate School and department by full-time study or a combination of full- and part-time study.

The minimum residence requirement for a doctoral candidate in all programs is at least two consecutive semesters of full-time study and involvement in departmental activities. Full-time study is defined as 9-15 semester credits, except for graduate teaching and research assistants for whom full-time study is specified by the assistantship agreements. ~~No student holding a full-time job is considered as fulfilling the residence requirement.~~ The summer sessions may count as one semester, provided that the candidate is enrolled for a minimum of 10 consecutive weeks of full-time study and for a minimum of six semester credits per five-week session. ~~Programs vary in their requirements beyond the minimum, e.g., credits or courses to be completed, proper time to fulfill the residence requirement and acceptability of part-time employment.~~ Individual programs may have additional residence requirements such as credits or courses to be completed, proper time to fulfill the residence requirement, and the extent to which a resident may hold outside employment.

Before a doctoral student begins residency, the student's adviser and the student shall prepare a statement indicating the manner in which the residence requirement will be met. Any special conditions must be detailed and will require the approval of the student's committee, the departmental faculty members approved to direct doctoral dissertations, the collegiate dean, and the dean of The Graduate School.

Credit/No Credit for Thesis and Dissertation Hours

approved by Graduate Council April 3, 1990

All hours of thesis, dissertation or preliminary research credit shall be taken CR/NCR.

(Since 1985 the following has been the policy: "Thesis, dissertation and preliminary research hours are to be given credit/non-credit grades, except for the first six hours in master's thesis and the first twelve hours in doctoral dissertations, for which letter grades are to be awarded. These letter grades are not to be assigned until the student has completed the thesis, dissertation or degree program." See Appendix to Minutes of University Council, April 4, 1985. Prior to 1985, thesis, dissertation and research courses carried only letter grades, regardless of the number of hours.)

Probation and Dismissal Policy

Approved by Graduate Council, March 6, 1990

Any student whose grade-point average falls below 3.00 is no longer in good standing in the Graduate and ~~considered~~ will be placed on probation. Students who do not return to good standing within two consecutive semesters will be dismissed from the Graduate School.

Amendment approved by Graduate Council, May 1, 1990

Any student whose grade-point average falls below 3.00 is no longer in good standing in the Graduate School and will be placed on probation. Students who do not return to good standing within two consecutive semesters or within the attempting of 15 additional credits will be dismissed from the Graduate School.

Amendment approved by the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee
October 11, 1990

Any student whose grade-point average falls below 3.00 is no longer in good standing in the Graduate School and will be placed on probation. Students who do not return to good standing ~~within two consecutive semesters or within the attempting of 15 additional credits~~ within one calendar year from the time probation begins will be dismissed from the Graduate School.

APPENDIX A,4**Grades**

Approved by Graduate Council, March 6, 1990

A student admitted to graduate study under any status at the University is expected to maintain a minimum 3.00 grade point average (A = 4.00) at all times. A minimum 3.00 grade-point average is required for graduation. No more than six semester credits of "C+", "C", and "C-" may be counted toward a degree. Grades of "D+", "D", and "D-" are treated as "F" grades. No grades below "C-" may be counted toward a degree.

Approved by the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee on October 11, 1990.

stone
POLICY
grades

APPENDIX A, 5**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON - ACADEMIC CALENDAR**

	<u>1991-92</u>	<u>Preliminary 1992-93</u>
FALL SEMESTER		
Day and Evening		
Classes Begin	Tues.....September 3	Mon.....August 31
*Labor Day	Mon.....September 2	Mon.....September 7
(Day and Evening)		
Veterans Day	Mon.....November 11	Wed.....November 11
(Classes Held, Staff Holiday)		
**Thanksgiving Break	Thurs-Sat..November 28-30	Thurs-Sat..November 26-28
Classes Resume	Mon.....December 2	Mon.....November 30
Final Instructional		
Day	Sat.....December 14	Sat.....December 12
Final Examination		
Period	Mon-Sat..December 16-21	Mon-Sat..December 14-19
Spring Intersession	Mon.....January 6 thru	Mon.....January 4 thru
	Fri.....January 17	Fri.....January 15
	Sun.....January 12	Sun.....January 10
Commencement		
SPRING SEMESTER		
*Martin Luther King Day	Mon.....January 20	Mon.....January 18
Day and Evening		
Classes Begin	Tues.....January 21	Tues.....January 19
Spring Break	Mon-Sat..March 23-28	Mon-Sat..March 22-27
Founders Day	Fri.....May 1	Fri.....April 30
***May Day	Fri.....May 1	Fri.....April 30
Final Instructional		
Day	Sat.....May 9	Sat.....May 8
Final Examination		
Period	Mon-Sat..May 11-16	Mon-Sat..May 10-15
Summer Intersession	Mon.....May 18 thru	Mon.....May 17 thru
	Fri.....June 12	Fri.....June 11
Commencement for		
Law School	Sat.....May 23	Sat.....May 22
Commencement	Sat.....May 30	Sat.....May 29
SUMMER SESSION I		
First 5 and 8 Week		
Session Begin	Mon.....June 15	Mon.....June 14
*Independence Day	Fri.....July 3 (in lieu of July 4)	Mon.....July 5 (in lieu of July 4)
First 5-Week		
Session Ends	Fri.....July 17	Fri.....July 16
SUMMER SESSION II		
Second 5-Week		
Session Begins	Mon.....July 20	Mon.....July 19
8-Week Session Ends	Fri.....August 7	Fri.....August 6
Second 5-Week		
Session Ends	Fri.....August 21	Fri.....August 20
FALL SEMESTER BEGINS	Mon.....August 31	Mon.....August 30

*Classes cancelled

**Classes cancelled from the Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 7 a.m.

***Classes cancelled from noon to 5:00 p.m.

DATE: July 12, 1990

TO: Dr. Marion Kuebel, Interim Provost

FROM: George W. Knepper, Chair *GWK*
Founder's Day Committee

SUBJECT: Change in date of Founder's Day

In response to suggestions from a variety of sources, Founder's Day may be detached from its current association with May Day and the Faculty Retirement Luncheon.

We propose to hold a special Founder's Day ceremony, featuring a speaker and the traditional wreath ceremony, and to schedule it for an appropriate afternoon early in the Spring term, 1991. Classes would not be affected. No classes would be canceled or inconvenience

Several years ago University Council, through its Calendar Committee, combined Founder's Day and May Day to eliminate class cancellations for Founder's Day activities.

The Founder's Day Committee requests that you inform University Council of this impending change. We anticipate no negative feedback from Council, so we shall proceed with plans for a separate Founder's Day program unless University Council registers an objection to it.

Thanks for your consideration of this matter.

cc: President W. V. Muse
Dr. Karla Mugler

RECEIVED

JUL 17 1990

SR. VP & PROVOST

APPENDIX B

Fall 1990 Faculty Research Grants
Awarded 10/29/90
Effective 11/1/90 through 1/31/92

<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME AND DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1130	Dr. Wm. Brian Arbuckle Civil Engineering	"UNIFAC Interaction Parameters for Environmental Applications"	\$ 4,130
1131	Drs. C. Batur & G. Bibel Mechanical Engineering	"Determination of Fractal Measure by Image Processing and Application to Crystal Growth"	2,750
1132	Dr. Ronald Eby Polymer Science	"Molecular Modeling of An Order- Disorder Transformation"	4,113
1133	Dr. Ray Fatemi Biomedical Engineering	"A Preliminary Investigation into the Role of Hemodynamics in the Mechanism of Atherosclerotic Stenosis Progression"	4,415
1134	Dr. Richard Gigliotti Sociology	"Adaptation to College by Adults (Age 28+)"	4,075
1135	Dr. Lu-Kwang Ju Chemical Engineering	"A Novel Emulsion Technology for Enhancing Production and Cell Cultivation in Viscous Fermentations"	4,442
1136	Dr. Helen Qammar Chemical Engineering	"Adaptive Control of Chaotic Systems"	3,399
1137	Dr. Allen Sehn Civil Engineering	"Experimental Investigation of the Lateral Effective Stress in Partially Saturated Soils During Multiple Load-Unload Cycles"	4,500
1138	Dr. Hui-Qian Tan Mathematical Sciences	"Software Automation for Advanced Parallel Computers"	4,500
1139	Dr. Claire Tessier Chemistry	"Models for Fischer-Tropsch Catalysts"	4,220
1140	Dr. Chrys Wesdemiotis Chemistry	"The Study of Transient Molecules in Atmospheric and Interstellar Chemistry via Mass Spectrometry"	4,100
TOTAL			\$44,644

FAC to Chancellor of Ohio Board of Regents
Report
November 1, 1990

The FAC met with Chancellor Elaine Hairston and vice Chancellor Matt Filipic on October 4th at the OSU Union. I took copious notes from which I am going to pull out a few points that I hope will be of interest locally.

1. Hairston & Filipic both stressed the fact that student fees are too high in Ohio. Ohio has the 6th highest fees in the U.S. Ours are 54% above the national average. The net average fee in Ohio is over \$2,000 compared to only \$1,300 nationally.
2. The focus of the budget for the next biennium is on access and retention. Ohio is 20% below the national average in the number of adults with college degrees so future emphasis will be on getting more students enrolled and then retaining them until they graduate. Ohio's per capita income is 5-6% below the national average.
3. "Freshman Foothold" is a new program that would provide 1/2 of money for freshmen to enter. Since OBR is projecting a 11 1/2% enrollment increase in the next biennium, this freshman access issue is a \$320 million question. If it is approved, students with family income below \$30,000 would get 1/2 their tuition paid, then aid would feather out above \$30,000 income to smaller fractions. Students taking any major would be eligible seventy percent of all freshman would benefit. It is scheduled for the second year of the biennium so there could be a Sophomore Foothold in the succeeding biennium.
4. Hairston said that faculty exchange and tuition exchange are a good idea, especially for N.E. Ohio. She doesn't see this as an OBR matter, however, but as something the Inter-University Council of University Pres. should take up as well as the NE Ohio Provosts. She mentioned Cleveland State, Akron & Youngstown as schools that might benefit from tuition exchange. She thought it might help Black faculty and nursing faculty to get terminal degrees in their own teaching fields instead of taking doctorates at their own institutions in fields they don't teach.
5. Hairston said she assigned Gary Walters to handle the Articulation & Transfer Policy. She said she told him to gloss it and to schedule training sessions on how to use it. His phone # is 466-6000.

6. ERIPS were discussed. KSU just implemented a continuous ERIP for 5 years, but without part time teaching. At OSU, where the ERIP window is closing, you can't teach after ERIP. At Toledo, where the ERIP is continuous, 98 superannuates are teaching but since July 1st, superannuate teaching at Toledo has been limited to a maximum of 7 years.
7. In the budget, Academic Challenge 4th Round figures are deliberately confusing in order to hide the amounts in subsidies from the Legislature!
8. Ohio Instructional Grants will be based less on need. Income below \$27,000 would qualify a student for a partial grant and below \$10,000 for full grants.
9. National Merit Scholarships would be funded. These have never been before. Toledo has 65 National Merit Scholars. Bowling Green has the rest.
10. Single Parent Grants could be used for part-time study (O.I.Gs are for full time only.)
11. There will be major policy changes in the Instructional Subsidy.
 1. Graduate students will be subsidized for an additional 60 qtr. hrs (max will go from 200 qts. hrs. to 260 qtr. hrs.
 2. Underfunding due to "historical enrollment" will be changed. The buffering will be reduced in order to encourage institutions to grow. The junior colleges are growing like crazy & they should get more money to support their growth.
 3. "Stay Power" will be a new program one percent of the instructional subsidy or \$50,000 minimum, whichever is greater, will be funded for Retention.

For the November 7th meeting each Rep. is supposed to bring 45 copies of a summary of information to the Chancellor about our retention efforts (with emphasis on assessment of success). She wants us to tell her how the money ought to be handled for Stay Power. Dr. Burton will meet with Provost Ruebel on Nov. 5 to get prepared for the FAC meeting on the 7th and to review with him all her notes from which the foregoing points have been taken.

The Dec. mtg., which has been moved to Dec. 11, will be on the Subsidy Formula & presented by Matt Filipic, the Vice Chancellor for Finance.

Jane Burton