

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

12-5-1991

Faculty Senate Chronicle December 5, 1991

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.



Rana

1991-92, No. 4

26 Pages

January 22, 1992

*
* **REMINDER TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS- -The Febru-** *
* **ary 6, 1992 University Council Meeting will be held in** *
* **the Goodyear Auditorium of the Polymer Science Building.** *
* **WATCH FOR THE SIGNS!!** *
*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the meeting of University Council of December 5, 1991	1
Appendix to the minutes of the meeting of University Council of December 5, 1991	15
A. APCC Report of December 5, 1991	15
A,1. Suggested Admission Policy (APCC)	16
A,2. Academic Calendar, 1992-93; Preliminary 1993-94	17
B. Report of the Faculty Athletic Representative	18
C. Fall 1991 Faculty Research Grants	20
D. Report of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents	22
E. APCC Meeting Schedules, Spring, 1992	24
F. Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies	25
G. Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Fine and Applied Arts	26

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



6

6



6

6



Minutes of University Council Meeting
of December 5, 1991

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the Presiding Officer, Senior Vice President and Provost, Mark S. Auburn, at 3:03 p.m. on Thursday, December 5, 1991, in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty-two of the 84 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dr. Eric Birdsall, Dean Patricia Carrell, Dr. Martha Collins, Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, Dean Claibourne Griffin, Dr. Keith Klafehn, Dean William Klingele, Ms. Carol Olson, Mr. Roger Ryan, and Mr. Timothy Sheridan. Those absent without notice were Dr. Darlene Ahnberg, Dr. Diana Chlebek, Dr. Roger Durbin, Dr. Avraam Isayev, Dr. Martha Leyden, Mr. Dale Lynk, Mr. Joseph Marth, Mr. Dan Martin, Mr. George Pope, Ms. Elizabeth Reilly, Mr. Richard Shanklin, and Mr. Samir Yeballe.

ITEM NO. 1 - REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT. Dr. Auburn introduced President William V. Muse whose remarks were as follows:

First of all I want to extend to all of you my best wishes for a happy holiday season. I wanted to also report to you, although I suspect at this juncture, it is very old news, but the Board of Trustees at their meeting yesterday did approve a 2 percent across-the-board increase in salaries for all of our employees who were hired by the University prior to June 30, 1991. For those of you who were at the Board Meeting, and I think there were a few of you who were, you will know that it was not an easy sell. The Board had a number of questions, and there is quite a bit of concern about the state's economy and its impact on funding for higher education. We expect to learn later this month, I believe on the 20th, when the Board of Regents meets as to our final appropriation for this year, and we are anticipating that we will get as much as an additional \$1 million from a special redistribution of monies that had been allocated elsewhere in the budget. If we attain that it will still leave us approximately \$1 million less than we received last year in terms of our state appropriation. There's also a good probability that we will have a cut in our appropriation on or before March 1. There is an automatic trigger built into the appropriations bill if the state's receipts from taxes are \$150 million less than has been budgeted, and that is the way the state's economy is going at this point. It looks as though that will be triggered and that will take back from us most of the additional money that should be appropriated. But even in spite of the uncertainty and in spite of the difficult times, it was our strong feeling that we needed to invest in our most important resource, our faculty and staff, and I am pleased that the Board did agree with that recommendation.

I also wanted to report to you that the salary allocation committee continues to meet, and I believe that it is scheduled to conclude its work sometime later this month and to present to me their recommendations. Once I have those I'll be happy to share them with you for your input. I don't have anything else to report. I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Ms. Peggy Richards, Part-Time Faculty representative, stated that she had received numerous phone calls from her constituents who were upset not only because they had not been considered for the two percent raise but also because of the statement that the Trustees had voted for the increase for full-time faculty, administrators, and all staff "to make an investment in our most valuable resources." In the Akron Beacon Journal today, President Muse was quoted as saying, "our most important asset is our faculty. We need to let the faculty and staff know they are important." The same article stated that "the increases begin in January but do not apply to part-time faculty or anyone hired after June 31." She reminded Dr. Muse that last May, University Council had supported part-time faculty, who teach 80 percent of the General College courses, as being a valuable asset to the University. How were the part-time faculty supposed to go into a classroom and hold their heads up and say "we are here to teach you, but we are not a valuable asset?"

(sic)

President Muse replied that this was an important and very relevant question. It had not been his intention to separate people into important and unimportant categories based upon the percentage of time they worked here. A priority decision had been made in terms of the use of scarce resources in this particular case. It was important and time to consider the compensation rates for part-time faculty with the annual adjustment process for raises for full-time employees. However, these compensation rates and adjustments to them ought to be made when appropriate, independent of the annual increase process. It might not be limited to two percent. It might need to be increased much more or perhaps not at all. The compensation rates for part-time faculty based on a per-credit-hour basis were rates that ought to be competitive with other schools where part-time faculty were hired, and we ought to be prepared to make adjustments in those rates when an assessment of the market told us we should. He was certainly prepared to do this, but those adjustments should be made independent of the annual process for full-time employees.

When Ms. Richards asked the President when he planned to do the next assessment, he replied that he was certainly prepared to have the compensation for part-time faculty studied, but he could not tell when he would have an answer or when an adjustment might be made - potentially perhaps prior to next fall, or the next fiscal year.

Ms. Richards commented that according to the Office of Budget Management it would only cost the University \$50,083 for a two percent increase to part-time faculty. The total cost for a year would be \$100,166.

The President responded that he could not verify those numbers, but he reiterated that he thought that it would be disadvantageous over a period of time for the compensation rates for the part-time faculty to be tied to the annual increase process. It was important to look at the issue of equity in the marketplace. To his knowledge this had not been done in some time. There had been a payment schedule and some annual adjustments had been made to it, but he had heard that in some cases there was the feeling that those were not competitive. He did not know whether or not they were. It would take some analysis to determine that.

Ms. Jeanne Hinderegger, Part-Time Faculty Representative to the Faculty Well-Being Committee, asked whether Dr. Muse knew how the part-time salaries compared with those at other universities. When he replied that he did not and this was precisely the kind of study which needed to be made, she replied that a survey had been done last year for the Faculty Well-Being Committee and that we were eighth lowest out of nine. When he asked to see a copy, both Ms. Hinderegger and Ms. Richards reminded him that the data had been presented to Council and appeared in the May *Chronicle* of 1991 along with Council's resolution regarding higher pay for part-time faculty. He then stated that with this data, perhaps additional surveys would not be necessary.

Mr. Terry Haas had a question regarding parking at special events on campus, particularly the basketball games at JAR Arena. Parking Services were now charging people \$2 to park in lots around the Arena including students who had already paid for parking permits. These lots were blocked off and fees charged as early as 5:45 for a 7:30 game. Why were students who were nighttime commuters on campus and had already paid a parking fee at the beginning of the semester being charged the \$2 fee?

The President replied that this was the same policy followed at EJ Thomas Hall where the parking deck and some of the surface parking lots were used for special events. There were other lots available at those times for students and other individuals who had parking permits. It might not be the same lot that one would normally park in, but there were some other lots available. He recommended addressing the question to Mr. Roger Ryan in terms of what Parking Services was doing on this.

ITEM NO. 2 - CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEETING OF NOVEMBER 7, 1991 AS PRINTED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON CHRONICLE OF NOVEMBER 22, 1991. Dr. Gary Oller, the Secretary, had one minor correction to note in the attendance list. Dr. Keith Klafehn had been listed as absent without notice, but he had attended the meeting. Dr. Oller also commented that a member of Council had pointed out to him that in the last *Chronicle*, he had consistently used the term "Chairman" to refer to male heads of committees and the term "Chair" to refer to female heads of committees. The member found this gender differentiation insulting.

Dr. Oller stated that he now realized that this was a gender distinction, an egregious use of language, and grossly insulting. He wanted to avoid giving such offense in the future, but he was in a quandary about which of several options to employ as a generic term for all situations. The term "Chair" was one which was most often used, but that always struck him as referring to a human being as an inanimate object. "Chairperson" was also a possibility, but this, for some people, might present a gender distinction as it has that pesky "son" at the end. "Chairhuman" presented the same problem. One of his colleagues had suggested that one way out might be to use a term which he was partial to, "Meethead." Given the seriousness of this issue and not wanting to waste any more of Council's time, he would opt for the inanimate piece of furniture, and henceforth in the minutes all heads of Council committees would be called "Chairs".

A member of Council noted that on page 5 under E, second line, "written reports had been past out..." "past" should be "passed."

Dr. Auburn then called for a motion to approve the minutes as amended. This was moved and seconded.

Dr. Don R. Gerlach wondered whether the secretary was going to correct the minutes and remove all the offensive words. He personally regretted that the secretary had submitted to this current lunacy. Should he ever be mentioned as the head of a committee, he hoped that the secretary would not refer to him other than as chairman, for he was not a piece of furniture and certainly did not have four legs. He thought that this was a ridiculous example of carrying feminist agitations to extremes, imposing politically correct jargon which was to him oppressive, officious, and disgusting, and it was contrary to the proper use of and respect for the English language whose standards any university was duty-bound to uphold. He asked that this be noted in the future in the case that he should become a committee chairman.

There was no further discussion, and the minutes were approved as amended.

ITEM NO. 3 - REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Dr. Auburn wanted to remind Council that its next meeting on February 6, 1992 would be in the Goodyear Auditorium of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering Building. Additional reminders would be sent out.

ITEM NO. 4 - SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS. Ms. Richards wanted the opportunity to present a proposal to Council regarding Part-Time Faculty. After consulting with the Parliamentarian, Mr. David Jamison, Dr. Auburn said that a member of Council could ask to suspend the rules to allow for the presentation. Ms. Richards so moved and this was seconded by Dean Isaac Hunt. A vote was taken, and there were 34 in favor of suspension and 19 against. The motion did not carry, since it required a two-thirds majority of those voting.

ITEM NO. 5 - REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

A. Executive Committee - Dr. Oller, the Secretary, reported that the Committee met on November 14 with all in attendance except the Provost. It first discussed University Council's move to the Goodyear Auditorium of the Polymer Science Building in the spring. A question was raised regarding whether or not there were writing boards attached to the seats in the room. This was later checked, and there were none. (At this point, Dr. Auburn said that lapboards would be provided.)

The Committee next discussed the appointment of Ms. Marybeth Mersky as an Evening School representative to Council. At Council's last meeting, Dr. Oller had reported that a question had been raised about the way in which these representatives were selected. The *Bylaws* stated that they were to be chosen by the Evening School Council, but since that organization no longer existed, for the past several years they had been chosen by Alpha Sigma Lambda, the non-traditional student scholastic honorary. This issue, along with a request from ASG President Tom Smith that ASG oversee the selection, was referred last month to the Student Affairs Committee for a review and recommendation. However, until that committee made a report or recommendation on which Council could act, the Executive Committee decided to confirm Ms. Mersky as an interim evening student representative. It did this because, first the Council *Bylaws* no longer reflected accurately the present situation regarding students on this campus, especially in regard to such terminology as Traditional/Non-traditional and Day/Evening. Secondly, it was Council's intent that this group of students have representation on Council, and since there was a strong concern in the student body for adequate representation on Council, the Committee did not want to diminish their numbers in this body by taking away the position until the issue of selection was settled.

The Committee then discussed the appropriateness of Dean Tom Vukovich's appointment as a member of the General Studies Advisory Council. It was decided that, according to the guidelines for membership, Dean Vukovich could serve on the Council in an advisory capacity, but not as a full voting member.

Finally, the Committee set the agenda for today's meeting which included the addition of a report from Mr. David Jamison as the Faculty Representative to the NCAA.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee - Dr. Auburn reported that the Committee had met on November 24 and had discussed its particular role as an advisory committee and as a group of elected faculty. The Committee informed him that it had not met in some time, mainly since the activity of SPARC had become central to so much on campus. The Committee asked the Executive Committee to consider its charge given the existence of SPARC and given the fact that five members of the APPC were also members of SPARC. Dr. Auburn reported to APPC on the activities of SPARC and promised to convene it again early in the spring semester to give a further report on what was happening there.

C. Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee - Dr. John Bee reported for Dr. Joseph Walton, Chair, and hoped that Council members had a copy of Dr. Walton's written report (see Appendix A). APCC had met on November 12 and December 3. The information was received that the Curriculum Subcommittee had investigated the revised General Studies program, had heard information from several guests, and was working on the final report which it anticipated would be forthcoming later in the spring. The APCC also accepted the recommendations of the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee on the two items listed in the report, one, a suggested admission policy for The University of Akron, and two, a proposed permanent calendar for 1992-93 and a proposed preliminary calendar for 1993-94. Both these items were

appended as Attachments 1 and 2 to the present report. Dr. Bee noted that the APCC also received a proposal to change the Graduate School Policy on transfer of academic credit. The proposal was referred to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee for consideration.

Dr. Bee then moved to suspend the rules in order to consider the calendar proposals (See Appendix A,2) now instead of waiting until later in the meeting under New Business. This was seconded, and Council voted its approval. Dr. Bee then moved approval of the proposed 1992-93 and preliminary 93-94 calendars.

Mr. Elton Glaser noted that a new holiday was included in the 92-93 calendar, President's Day. He knew that this had come out of a proposal from ASG, and he wanted to hear the rationale presented to this body. He also pointed out two things. First, for those teachers who had a M-W-F schedule in the spring semester of '93, there would be two Mondays missed (Martin Luther King Day, President's Day) and a Friday afternoon (May Day). This would seriously alter available time of instruction for some teachers. Second, President's Day was listed as a holiday on the 1992-93 calendar but not on the Preliminary 1993-94 calendar. Why?

Mr. Terry Haas rose to answer Mr. Glaser's questions. First, the ASG thought that President's Day was an important holiday and it was wrong that the University did nothing to recognize it. There were three other federal holidays which the University recognized as important and cancelled classes. He and others, as students and Americans, hoped that the faculty and administrations of this campus would agree that President's Day was one of the most noteworthy holidays and should be recognized in such a manner as the other three. The second question related to the problem the addition of this holiday would raise to M-W-F schedules. This had been heavily debated in committee, and he was sure that it would be again today. The third question was why the holiday was not listed in the preliminary 1993-94 calendar. This was because there was a pending proposal in the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee which would give a formula for obtaining the proper full number of instructional days each year by changing the beginning and ending dates of each semester. Because of the urgency in approving the '92-93 calendar, it was decided to go ahead and add the President's Day holiday to it, but for future calendars to wait until the proposed formula was discussed in committee.

Dr. C. Frank Griffin stated that the addition of another Monday holiday would adversely affect science courses with laboratories. It would mean eliminating essentially one-seventh of the course for laboratories that meet specifically on Mondays. In light of that he moved to strike President's Day as a day in which classes were cancelled. This was seconded.

Speaking against the amendment, Mr. Haas thought that this was an instructional problem which professors might be able to work on in their syllabi. It did not and should not reflect the dismissal of a holiday of such importance as President's Day.

Mr. Tom Smith, noting that he was wearing red, white, and blue, pointed out that this University currently does not honor Veteran's Day or President's Day in a manner that most colleges and universities do. Most of those in Ohio cancel classes on one of those two days, and for the day they did not, they offered some sort of official recognition at another time during the academic year. He was uncertain as to whether this was the holiday given on the day before Christmas, but he wondered how much people think about either Veteran's Day or President's Day on Christmas Eve. This was not just a question of getting a day off, but of celebrating a day which our national government had recognized as a federal holiday. He understood that teaching was the primary focus of the institution and that cancelling classes might have a somewhat negative effect, but this needed to be contrasted with part of our mission which was to celebrate days in which this nation had produced great leaders. President's Day was one of those days. The

question here was one of proper celebration, and it was something that not only students, but also considerable amounts of faculty, staff, and administrators were concerned about. As far as losing additional instructional days, Mr. Smith stated that in the spring semester, there were more instructional days than in the fall semester so that cancelling classes on President's Day would still not bring the number of instructional days in the spring semester down to the level that currently exists in the fall.

Mr. Glaser thought that if the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee was working out a formula for subsequent years to start the semester at a different time to account for holidays within the semester, perhaps it would be better to put off granting President's Day as a holiday until that formula was arrived at. Also he had never had a student who had complained to him about President's Day or even seemed to know when it was. What he suspected was the case here was not that we were not celebrating President's Day but that we were celebrating Martin Luther King Day, and this would be a way of evening the score. He hoped that he was wrong on that suspicion.

Mr. Haas said that in his short time at the University he had seen things put off again and again. This could be dealt with in the future, but it could also later be conveniently dropped from the minds of the members of Council when people like himself were no longer around to remind them.

Dr. Gerlach said "may it never be said that I've never supported something that the students have sponsored," and rose to oppose the amendment to strike President's Day. He said that a year ago he had gotten himself into some terrible trouble, and now perhaps he could salvage things. Making President's Day a holiday for the spring '93 semester could be treated as a trial balloon. He had said to Mr. Haas in the subcommittee that if the students really wanted to make something of the day, it would be up to them to come forward with a specific program. However, they should not invite the political scientists to anything but instead ask historians who knew about Washington and Lincoln. As a teacher of American History, it would be remiss of him not to support this patriotic gesture. Finally, after some thirty years of teaching, he was convinced that classroom exercises, as important as they were, were not the only dimension of coursework at the University. It was now up to the students. Let them have this opportunity. If things worked out, the holiday could be put on subsequent calendars. If they did not work out, Council could drop it.

Dr. David Buchthal mentioned that a great many classes on campus met on M-W-F. In the fall semester, Labor Day (a Monday) and Thanksgiving Friday were lost, so two of the three days of that week were gone. In the spring semester with the addition of President's Day, two Mondays and a Friday afternoon class would be lost, and that was a full week of a M-W-F class. In committee the suggestion had been made to move back the beginning of the spring semester to include the days that would be missed by starting on Wednesday. This would not help the labs because they would not have that Monday to make up the loss. Another possibility was to extend the calendar one day into final exam week. He hoped that the Policy Subcommittee would consider this or other alternatives, but until it did he intended to support the amendment to delete President's Day as a holiday with cancelled classes.

Since there was no further discussion, Dr. Auburn called for a vote, and the result was a tie, 28 for, 28 against. The Chair then voted no, and the amendment was defeated.

Dr. Allen Noble, in view of the newfound interest in American History, was surprised that someone had not proposed that in the fall semester classes be cancelled on the 12th of October which seemed to have some historical significance. Dr. Auburn added that it was mostly of geographical significance with which Dr. Noble agreed.

Dr. Auburn then called for a vote on the main motion, and Council approved the calendar.

D. Athletics Committee - Dr. Joseph Latona, Chair, reported that the Committee met on November 14 and heard from Joe Dunn, Director of Sports Marketing commenting on the topic of student body commitment. Mr. Dunn reviewed 7 target groups for the marketing/promotion campaign. The main areas of concentration were students and alumni. Among the promotions being tried were: full-color trading cards of basketball players; free transportation to and from the Rubber Bowl; Freshman "Pig Out," and tent parties for football; "Sixth Man" T-shirts and seats in the "Zip Zoo" area for basketball; and free admittance for students to all athletic events. Members of the Committee asked how they could promote attendance, and Mr. Dunn stated that group outings have proven to be great crowd builders. He asked for suggestions on how to reach the commuter students and some were offered by members.

The next topic was a survey of classes that was conducted by the Athletic Committee regarding the topic of student body commitment at athletic events. Committee members noted that students commented that the Rubber Bowl was too far away. Perhaps there should be a football facility on campus. There was a lack of area athletes which did have some negative effect in terms of attendance on the part of football fans. Perhaps concentration on citizens of the area, as well as students and alumni, for the marketing of football and basketball was needed. Lowering visiting student ticket prices, tailgate parties and bus services needed improvement. There were also comments regarding Saturday afternoon starting times. Perhaps a 4 p.m. starting time would be appropriate. Surveys of graduate students, although quite selective, seemed to indicate that they preferred evening games.

There was also the topic of the NCAA proposed legislation which Mr. Jamison would be commenting on next for Council. At the meeting, he presented the proposed legislation to be considered at the NCAA convention in January and briefly explained the position of the Faculty Athletic Representatives regarding particular proposals and their purposes. Mr. Rob Fournier distributed an academic breakdown by class and the basic freshman eligibility requirements as contained in NCAA Bylaw 14.3. If any member of Council wanted to have that information, please call Mr. Fournier. At the next meeting of the Committee on December 12, discussion of the NCAA legislation by Mr. Fournier, Mr. Jim Dennison, and Mr. Jamison would continue. Budget concerns would also be addressed. That budget comparison would be pre-1-AA budget in terms of athletics and post-1-AA. Another important issue to be discussed was the role of the Athletic Task Force, reported on by Mr. Dennison. Dr. Latona concluded by stating that if there were any other topics which Council members wanted the Committee to address, please let him know.

Dr. Auburn then asked Council for permission to allow Mr. David Jamison, Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA, to present a report to the body, and Council gave its approval.

Mr. Jamison handed out a summary of just a few of the proposals out of the 153 which would be voted on at the NCAA convention in January (see Appendix B). The most controversial proposal would most likely be the proposition concerning 1-AAA Football. The propositions listed in the summary were those on which the Faculty Representatives Association took a position at its meeting in Kansas City in the fall. Mr. Jamison stressed that the faculty representatives were concerned about academic success and graduation of student athletes. There are two approaches to those goals. One is to bring in students who are better prepared for the college experience and therefore would succeed. Second is assisting those students once in school and assuring that they make satisfactory progress toward a specific degree program. To be a student athlete and receive an athletic scholarship, they now had to meet certain criteria, and the first four proposals dealt with that.

Currently, to be eligible for an athletic scholarship and for practice and competition, all incoming freshman must complete 11 core courses in high school, have a 2.0 average in the core courses, and score a 17 on the ACT. Proposition 14 would raise the number of core courses to 13, adding courses in English, Math, or Science. This was supported by the Faculty Athletic Representatives as a better indicator at the high school level of potential success in college. Proposition 15 raises the minimum average from 2.0 to 2.5, and this was supported by the Faculty Reps. Proposition 16 established a scale of eligibility criteria rather than simply a base level of 2.0 and 17 on the ACT. Both predictors would be looked at, and the better one did on GPA, the less one would have to look at ACT scores and vice versa. Proposition 17 was another version of this approach, but was not supported by the Faculty Reps because they thought that the floor was set too low.

Proposition 19 dealt with the loophole that presently existed for students who transferred in the middle of the year (January). Their certification was not based on what they did during that first spring semester. Under this new proposition, it would be. Proposition 20 stated that 75 percent of the hours required to remain eligible must be taken during the regular school year. Too many students were loading up in summer school.

The next five propositions dealt with satisfactory progress, the other major initiative of the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representatives to try and steer student athletes toward a degree. There were a variety of approaches here. Propositions 22 and 23 said that if students did not maintain a certain grade-point average, they would not be eligible for practice and competition. The Faculty Athletic Representatives opposed this because merely setting minimum GPAs would allow some institutions to find ways to insure that students met those averages. The same was true of Propositions 24 and 25 which required a minimum number of credits. Certain institutions could find ways of insuring that the minimum number was attained. The Faculty Athletic Representatives favored Proposition 21 which stated that students had to meet a percentage of the degree requirements in the specific degrees which they were pursuing. At the start of the third year, students would have to have 25 percent of their degree requirements met, and at the start of the fourth, 50 percent, and at the the start of the fifth, 75 percent. Also students had to achieve a percentage of their GPA required to graduate. Ninety-five percent of the GPA required to graduate had to be achieved by the start of the third year.

Proposition 26 would mandate that 2-year college transfers who were initially ineligible and went to a junior college where they did participate in sports, would be ineligible for one-year at the four-year school of transfer. At the moment, students can transfer into the four year school and play that year. This proposition, favored by the Faculty Athletic Representatives, would give them a year to adjust and keep them from playing right away.

Finally Proposition 65 would take the upper limit off scholarships in Division 1-A Football, from 25/95 to 21/X. The representatives opposed this because it reduce competitive opportunities.

Mr Jamison concluded by stating that he would report to Council in February on the results of the January NCAA Convention.

Dr. Lawrence Focht wanted to know how Mr. Jamison had acquired his position as faculty athletic representative to the NCAA. Mr. Jamison replied that it was a presidential appointment. The NCAA requires Faculty Athletic Representative have a full-time faculty or administrative position and not be affiliated with athletics.

Dean Vukovich wondered what the numbers 11 through 14 represented in Proposition 17. Mr. Jamison responded that it was the number of core courses taken in the high school.

Dean Hunt asked about Proposition 20 in relation to a heavy schedule for team players. Mr. Jamison answered that this would have the biggest impact on the basketball players because of their practice schedule. To deal with this, they would probably have to take more classes in the fall semester.

Dr. Buchthal inquired whether the proposal for a 20 hour a week maximum practice period had been passed and implemented. Mr. Jamison responded that it had.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee - Dr. Harvey Sterns, Chair, reported that the Committee had met that morning with Mr. Bobby Criminger, Associate Vice President of Administrative Services and Physical Facilities representing Mr. Ryan. The Committee focussed its attention on the status of East Hall. Mr. Criminger gave a brief analysis of the immediate and long-term repairs needed to keep the building in use. It was pointed out that previous approaches to maintaining the building were based on the assumption that it would be torn down. Repairs to the roof and front porch were estimated to be less than \$50,000 with emergency patching at about \$5,000 to \$10,000. There was asbestos flooring that needed to be removed, but this cost would be incurred whether the building was used or torn down since the asbestos had to be removed in any case. A major issue in the child care area was that there was no fire suppression system in that area of the building. This situation had been a problem for a decade. The cost to tear down the building was approximately \$100,000.

After extensive discussion, the following motion was passed unanimously: "It is recommended that East Hall be maintained in usable and safe condition (meeting Ohio code) for a period of one year after the completion of Polsky's. Re-evaluation of the building for tear down should take place at that time. Existing units would be kept in the building."

The Committee thought that the campus community needed to be aware of the severe dilemma that we had for funding repairs, departmental moves, etc. One proposed move, just for a temporary placement for one year on this campus, was over \$60,000. The continued use of East Hall until funding for a library addition was secured made the most sense to the committee. Committee members who had reviewed the space found that it was as good or better than other space on campus. It was also pointed out that problems and leak damage was not just an issue for old buildings but an issue for at least two major new buildings built in 1976 and 1983 on this campus. The real issue was whether or not space supported instructional use, and the Committee reaffirmed its priority that space was to be given to academic units for space assignments.

Dr. Jacqueline Anglin wondered whether there had been some consideration of moving the Nursery Center to the Girl Scout Building which had been purchased through the Endowment Program. Dr. Sterns thought that the Provost would be better able to answer that question, but his understanding was that the deal for that building had not yet been completed.

Dr. Auburn stated that this was correct. The owners of the building were seeking other space, and until they had secured it, the contract which the University had negotiated with them did not go into effect. The last he had heard was that a summer 1992 occupancy was a possibility.

Dr. Sterns said that the real issue was that the Child Care Center was needed until new space was assigned, and also for a very small amount of money, the University could continue to keep five classrooms operational as well as a number of different units in the building. East Hall was not as bad an environment as one might be led to believe. For those people who had any interest in keeping and maintaining older buildings, this building had not yet lived its full, useful life. It made no sense whatsoever to remove it from

campus usage until Polsky's area was available for use. Although the University had made promises to the Board of Regents that certain buildings would come down and it was important those obligations be met, the Committee did not think that it was yet time.

Dr. Gerlach wondered whether the Committee wanted Council to approve the motion which Dr. Sterns had read regarding East Hall. When asked by Dr. Auburn whether he wished Council to consider this, Dr. Sterns asked that the rules be suspended so that the motion could be considered now. A vote was taken, and Council gave its approval.

With a slight correction from Dean Vukovich, Dr. Sterns reread the motion as follows: "It is recommended that East Hall be maintained in usable, safe condition (that is, meet Ohio code) for a period of one year after the completion of Polsky's. Re-evaluation of the building for tear down should take place at that time."

Since there was no discussion, Dr. Auburn called for a vote, and Council gave its approval.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee - Mr. David Brink, Chair, reported that the Committee met on November 8 and 11. A grievance was received by the Committee and assigned file number 40-91. The Committee had conducted a comprehensive review and had submitted a report to the President.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee - Mr. Paul Richert, Chair, reported that the Committee had recently met to discuss the proposed changes in the University Sexual Harassment Policy. It was seeking advice and counsel from the University legal department and the Affirmative Action officer before presenting a report back to Council.

H. University Libraries Committee - Although Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, Chair, was not present and there was no report, Mr. Glaser wanted to ask a question. Earlier this afternoon, a colleague expressed concern to him because the card catalogue was being abolished and sold off. She was upset because not all of the books in the card catalogue were yet in the computer system. To prove it she had given him a notice for books that were due soon, one of which had only a card number and beneath that in capital letters "TITLE NOT IN DATABASE." Apparently one could not access the computer looking for that title and find that it was in the Library. Was the card catalogue going to be abolished immediately?

Dr. Auburn asked Dean Delmus Williams whether he would care to make his inaugural address to Council concerning this question.

Dean Williams said that the short answer was yes. He noted that he was responding with all the assurance of four days seniority and that David Brink could perhaps help out with some of the history of the issue. What had happened was that several years ago when the computerized system was brought up, the Library made a decision to stop entering records into the card catalogue so the card catalogue was probably a hundred to one hundred fifty-thousand titles short of being a complete record of the catalogue. For a period of time (four or five years), the card catalogue had been kept as a backup of the system to insure that the system functioned properly during break in. However, it was now to the point that the backup was incomplete enough that it was considered to be a misleading, outdated tool, especially for people who were not used to library procedures or employing the computer catalogue. The decision then had been made to disassemble or dispose of the card catalogue cards. Today's reaction must have been triggered by a memo which had just been circulated inviting people to buy portions of the card catalogue for the price of the cards.

Mr. Glaser wondered at what time would all of the books in the Library be in the computer catalogue. He was worried about a gap into which some books might disappear.

Dean Williams responded that it was his impression that everything in the card catalogue should also be in the computer. Mr. Brink thought that this was correct, but as with any system, one never reaches 100 percent certainty.

Dr. Gerlach wanted to know who exactly had decided this action, and was the Library Committee involved in the decision making process. He was inclined later in the discussion to make a motion that Council ought to have the Library Committee take this under advisement and bring to it a report and recommendation because he did not think that the Dean or the Associate Dean of the University Library or anybody else over there ought to make this kind of decision unilaterally.

It was the consensus of members of the Library Committee that this matter had not been discussed at its meetings.

Dr. Gerlach then moved to suspend the rules in order to make a motion to have the Library Committee deal with this. Council voted its approval.

Dr. Gerlach then moved that Council order, for the time being, the preservation of the library card catalogue until the Council can act upon information and recommendations from the Library Committee. After this was seconded, he gave as support for this the fact that a sizable part of the collection had not yet been recorded in the computer. Even if it were, what harm was there in retaining this card catalogue for a little longer - at least, until he retired. It was also worth saving as a backup against those malfunctioning computers which are so often "down."

Dr. Auburn then asked Dr. Gerlach whether it would hasten his retirement if the card catalogue were abolished. When the laughter subsided, Dr. Gerlach responded that it would not, but a retirement incentive program would.

Dr. Buchthal pointed out that the book that Mr. Glaser had used as an example had been flagged by the computer. It was in the computer, but not in a form from which one could read the title. This was a problem of software and database entry rather than one of cataloguing. Now whether there are other books that are not in the computer in form or another was another question and this did make it worthwhile to support Dr. Gerlach's motion.

Mr. John Kline, a part-time faculty member and full-time library staff member in the catalogue department, asked for permission to speak which Council granted. He thought that he could ease some fears by noting that any book that had been catalogued throughout the history of Bierce Library was also listed by call number in a second card catalogue in the catalogue department. Although this was not accessible to the public, it did serve as a backup. He also stated that the library leadership wanted to remove the old card catalogue to have additional space for more computer terminals and other electronic sources (CD ROMs, etc.) which could serve people faster with the information needed for research. This was related to the problem of space in the Library with which Council was familiar. He assured Council that if problems in finding things arose, the staff in cataloguing would be glad to help.

Professor Noble had several observations. The only reason that Mr. Glaser's example was in the computer was because someone had checked it out. That was when it had been entered into the system. The books that were on the shelf and not in the computer system would not be so easily traced. Secondly, it was a fine thing to have a second backup card catalogue system, but if one could not use it, it really did

not provide much of a service to patrons of the Library. Finally, the most important issue was that the University Libraries Committee of Council had not been consulted at all about a move which affected, at least theoretically, every faculty member on campus. This was one of those times when we ought to insist that these kinds of decisions follow a path through a committee of University Council so that faculty could be assured that a number of individuals had considered the problem and Council could accept the recommendation of the Library Committee on its behalf.

Dean Nicholas Sylvester thought that perhaps the second backup card catalogue should be moved out so that faculty could use it.

Dean Williams commented that this second system was essentially a mechanism for the physical inventory of the collection and was very important as a separate record. He had no objection to taking this to the University Libraries Committee and thought it an appropriate action.

Dr. Auburn then asked Dr. Gerlach to read his motion which was as follows: "That the University Council order the preservation of the library card catalogue until Council can act upon information and recommendations from the Library Committee." Since there was no further discussion, Council voted its approval.

I. Reference Committee - Dr. Faith Helmick, Chair, had no report.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee - Dr. Dan Sheffer, Chair, reported that the Committee met on November 11 to review and rank the 30 proposals submitted for the Fall 1991 competition. The proposals were ranked, and 18 were funded totaling \$66,699.10 (For a list of the funded proposals, see Appendix C). The Committee would be meeting on December 9 to review 45 Summer Fellowships and 6 International Summer Fellowship applications.

K. Student Affairs Committee - Dr. Robert Dubick, Chair, stated that there was no report.

L. General Studies Advisory Council - No report.

M. Ad Hoc Committee on University Governance - No report.

ITEM NO. 6 - THE REPORT OF THE AKRON REPRESENTATIVE ON THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS. Dr. June Burton gave her report (See Appendix D).

ITEM NO. 7 - UNFINISHED BUSINESS. Dr. Auburn reminded Council that at its November meeting it voted to postpone consideration of the proposed amendment to the *Faculty Manual* which was presented by the Distinguished Review Committee on behalf of President Muse. Dr. William McGucken stated that the motion was still on the floor and he urged the body to vote it down for the reasons that he gave at the last meeting and which were reported in the *Chronicle*.

Dr. Oller reminded members that the overall subject started on page 27 of the October *Chronicle*, and the actual amendment was on page 29. He also noted that there were two changes that had been made at the November meeting. The first was a correction where the word "only " had been added in paragraph (a) after "awarded" which was what should have been there on the basis of the wording in the *Manual*, and the other was in section (d) : "The University Distinguished Professor Review Committee shall

review all nominations made by the deans as set forth in section (b) above" - to which was added -"MAKE A POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE RECOMMENDATION IN EACH, AND RETURN THEM TO THE PROVOST."

Dr. Auburn then noted that members could find Dr. McGucken's arguments on pages 12 - 15 of the November *Chronicle*.

Dr. Gerlach supported Dr. McGucken's arguments for voting down the proposal and wanted to emphasize two particular points. The present proposal would remove the ability to allow separate department faculty to make nominations in this process. Also it would clearly remove from various colleges the right of each of the degree-granting colleges to elect a member to the University Review Committee.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted and rejected the proposal.

Dr. McGucken then asked whether it was appropriate for him to introduce an amendment to the language which was in the *Faculty Manual* regarding the Distinguished Professor. His thinking was that the proposal which had just been defeated was an amendment to the language in the *Manual*. Since that proposal had been voted down, the language in the *Manual* was still before Council, and therefore he wished to present a second amendment. Since there was no objection, Dr. Auburn agreed.

Dr. McGucken then handed out his amendment which read as follows: "The title of Distinguished Professor shall be awarded only to one who, already holding the rank of professor at The University of Akron for five or more years excels. . ." He noted by moving the phrase "at The University of Akron" to its position in the amendment would emphasize that someone had to be here at the University for five years before applying for the position of distinguished professor. The deletion of "continues to" and the addition of the "s" to "excel", would help to emphasize that one had to excel in teaching, scholarly activity, or artistic performance at a level significantly beyond the expectations for the rank of professor. He then moved the amendment which was seconded by Mr. Haas.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

ITEM NO. 8 - NEW BUSINESS. Dr. Frank Griffin stated that at the meeting Council members had received a copy of a document called Cost Analysis and Benefits of the Early Retirement Incentive Program. It had been prepared by Professor Paul Chang from Civil Engineering with consultation with Dr. Helmick. He moved that this study be referred to the Faculty Well-Being Committee with a request that the committee report back to Council with the recommendation on a future ERIP at the University of Akron. This was seconded by Dr. Gerlach.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

Dr. Auburn then recognized Dr. Bee who, on behalf of Dr. Walton for the APCC, wanted to introduce Attachment Number One to the APCC Committee report and move for the adoption of the suggested admission policy at the University of Akron (See Appendix A,1). When Dr. Auburn called for discussion, Mr. Haas moved to postpone which was seconded by Dr. Bee. Council then voted its approval to postpone with one abstention.

Dean Sylvester asked Dr. Auburn whether there now was in place a procedure that would permit someone to be named distinguished professor during this academic year. Dr. Auburn replied that the question was out of order, but there was a procedure in place.

Ms. Peggy Richards, as another item of new business, proposed the following motion: "Whereas part-time faculty are a valuable asset to this University, be it resolved that they should be accorded comparable salary increases in line with full-time faculty, administrators, and all staff." This was seconded. Council then voted its approval.

ITEM NO. 9 - ADJOURNMENT. Dr. Bee moved that Council adjourn, and this was seconded. Council voted its approval, and the meeting ended at 4:55 p.m.

APPENDIX A

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
Interoffice Correspondence**

December 5, 1991

TO: Members of University Council

FROM: Joseph M. Walton
Associate Provost for Academic Services

SUBJECT: APCC REPORT FOR DECEMBER 5, 1991

APCC met on Tuesday, December 3, 1991 at 3:00 p.m. in the Board of Trustees Room of the Gardner Student Center. APCC was updated on the current status of the Report with recommendations for a Revised General Studies Program as follows.

The Curriculum Subcommittee of APCC met on Tuesday, November 12, 1991 at 3:00 p.m. for the primary purpose of considering the above designated report. The Curriculum Subcommittee heard from several guests, who expressed their views on the Report. In the meantime, the Subcommittee chair has received several pieces of written communication on the proposed general studies revision. These communications and suggested amendments to the proposed document will be considered at an upcoming meeting of the Curriculum Subcommittee on Tuesday, December 10, 1991. It is projected that the Curriculum Subcommittee will make its recommendation to APCC early in the Spring Semester, 1991, and that a recommendation for adoption of a revised general studies programs will be made to University Council shortly thereafter.

In other business, APCC accepted the recommendations of the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee on two items: (1) a suggested Admission Policy for The University of Akron, and (2) a proposed permanent calendar for 1992-93 and a proposed Preliminary calendar for 1993-94. These items are appended as attachments one and two of the present report. Since both of the items are of an urgent nature, and the next meeting of University Council will not be held until the Spring of 1992, I request that a member of University Council move a suspension of the rules so that these two items can be considered now.

As a final item of business, APCC received a proposal to change the Graduate School Policy on transfer of academic credit. This proposal was referred to the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee for consideration.

attachments (2)

APCC endorses the following outline as an admission policy and recommends that the Office of Enrollment Management be directed by University Council to formulate and present to University Council for approval a proposal for implementation which shall also resolve such issues as student advisement and retention.

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON SUGGESTED ADMISSION POLICY FOR NEW STUDENTS, EXCLUDING TRANSFER STUDENTS

UNCONDITIONAL

Direct Admission to a Degree-Granting College

Individual degree-granting colleges and departments shall propose admission criteria which shall then be submitted for approval by University Council. These criteria shall include at minimum: high school grade average, test scores, class rank and core curriculum.

Admission to University College or the Community and Technical College

Unconditional admittees to University College or the Community and Technical College are those students who fall below the requirements of direct admission but stand above the standards of conditional admission. This group includes students who qualify for direct admission to a degree-granting program, but who are undecided on a major, or who choose to enter through University College or the Community and Technical College.

CONDITIONAL

Conditional Admission to University College or the Community and Technical College

Admission to University College or the Community and Technical College with conditions for students who have:

< 2.29 and < 16 ACT
with or without the core curriculum

OR

< 2.79 and < 19 ACT
without the core curriculum

Each conditional admittee will be required to complete a set of prescriptive courses or activities within one year as a prerequisite for continued enrollment e.g., completion of developmental courses, tutoring, advising sessions, and achievement of standards for progress.

APPENDIX A.2**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
ACADEMIC CALENDAR****1992-93****Preliminary 1993-94****FALL SEMESTER**

- Classes Begin**
- * Labor Day
- + Veterans Day
- ** Thanksgiving Break
- Classes Resume**
- Final Instructional Day
- Final Examination Period
- Commencement
- Spring Intersession

Monday, August 31, 1992
 Monday, September 7
 Wednesday, November 11
 Thurs.-Sat., Nov. 26-28
Monday, November 30
 Saturday, December 12
 Mon.-Sat., December 14-19
 Saturday, December 19
 Mon.-Fri., Jan. 4-15, 1993

Monday, August 30, 1993
 Monday, September 6
 Thursday, November 11
 Thurs.-Sat., Nov. 25-27
Monday, November 29
 Saturday, December 11
 Mon.-Sat., December 13-18
 Saturday, December 18
 Mon.-Fri., Jan. 3-14, 1994

SPRING SEMESTER

- * Martin Luther King Day
- Classes Begin**
- * Presidents' Day
- Spring Break
- *** May Day
- Final Instructional Day
- Final Examination Period
- Commencement
- Summer Intersession
- Commencement, Law School

Monday, January 18
Tuesday, January 19
 Monday, February 15
 Mon.-Sat., March 22-27
 Friday, May 7
 Saturday, May 8
 Mon.-Sat., May 10-15
 Saturday, May 15
 Mon.-Fri., May 17-June 11
 Saturday, May 22

Monday, January 17
Tuesday, January 18

 Mon.-Sat., March 21-26
 Friday, May 6
 Saturday, May 7
 Mon.-Sat., May 9-14
 Saturday, May 14
 Mon.-Fri., May 16-June 10

SUMMER SESSION I

- First 5/8-Week Sessions Begin
- Independence Day
- First 5-Week Session Ends

Monday, June 14
Monday, July 5
Friday, July 16

Monday, June 13
Monday, July 4
Friday, July 15

SUMMER SESSION II

- Second 5-Week Session Begins
- Eight-Week Session Ends
- Second 5-Week Session Ends

Monday, July 19
Friday, August 6
Friday, August 20

Monday, July 18
Friday, August 5
Friday, August 19

FALL SEMESTER

- Classes Begin**

Monday, August 30

Monday, August 29

- + Classes held, staff holiday
- * Classes cancelled
- ** Classes cancelled from Wednesday at 5 p.m. through Monday at 7 a.m.
- *** Classes cancelled from 12 noon to 5 p.m.

APPENDIX BFACULTY ATHLETICS REPRESENTATIVEReport to University CouncilDecember 5, 1991

The following summarizes the proposals for action at the 1992 NCAA Convention on which the Faculty Athletics Representatives Academic Requirements Committee and the Faculty Athletics Representative Association have taken a position.

<u>Proposition</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>FARA Position</u>																														
14	Initial Eligibility: high school core curriculum credits from 11 to 13; extra 2 must be in English, math, science.	Favor																														
15	Initial Eligibility: Raise high school core GPA to 2.5	Favor																														
16	Initial Eligibility: Establish a sliding scale:	Strongly Favor																														
	<table><tr><td>GPA</td><td>SAT</td><td>ACT</td></tr><tr><td>2.500</td><td>700</td><td>17</td></tr><tr><td>2.375</td><td>750</td><td>19</td></tr><tr><td>2.250</td><td>800</td><td>21</td></tr><tr><td>2.125</td><td>850</td><td>21</td></tr><tr><td>2.000</td><td>900</td><td>23</td></tr></table>	GPA	SAT	ACT	2.500	700	17	2.375	750	19	2.250	800	21	2.125	850	21	2.000	900	23													
GPA	SAT	ACT																														
2.500	700	17																														
2.375	750	19																														
2.250	800	21																														
2.125	850	21																														
2.000	900	23																														
17	Initial Eligibility: Establish a sliding scale:	Oppose: floor too low																														
	<table><tr><td>SAT</td><td>ACT</td><td>11</td><td>12</td><td>13</td><td>14</td></tr><tr><td>800-899</td><td>20-21</td><td>2.000</td><td>2.000</td><td>2.000</td><td>2.000</td></tr><tr><td>700-799</td><td>18-19</td><td>2.100</td><td>2.000</td><td>2.000</td><td>2.000</td></tr><tr><td>650-699</td><td>17</td><td>2.200</td><td>2.100</td><td>2.000</td><td>2.000</td></tr><tr><td>600-649</td><td>15-16</td><td>2.300</td><td>2.200</td><td>2.100</td><td>2.000</td></tr></table>	SAT	ACT	11	12	13	14	800-899	20-21	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	700-799	18-19	2.100	2.000	2.000	2.000	650-699	17	2.200	2.100	2.000	2.000	600-649	15-16	2.300	2.200	2.100	2.000	
SAT	ACT	11	12	13	14																											
800-899	20-21	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000																											
700-799	18-19	2.100	2.000	2.000	2.000																											
650-699	17	2.200	2.100	2.000	2.000																											
600-649	15-16	2.300	2.200	2.100	2.000																											
19	Eligibility: certification for mid-year transfer students at next full term	Favor																														
20	Eligibility: 75% of satisfactory progress hours during regular school year terms	Favor																														

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 21 | Satisfactory Progress
·% of degree requirements (25-50-75)
·% of graduation GPA (95-100) | Favor |
| 22 | Satisfactory Progress
·minimum GPA 1.8/term
first 2 years; 2.0 term after | Oppose:
GPA does not
assure degree
progress |
| 23 | Satisfactory Progress
·minimum GPA 1.7 (48)
1.8 (72); 1.9 (96 credits) | Oppose:
GPA does not
assure degree
progress |
| 24 | Satisfactory Progress
·minimum credits
24/51/78/105 | Oppose:
credits alone
do not assure
degree progress |
| 25 | Satisfactory Progress
·make remedial, tutorial, and
non-credit courses <u>not</u>
countable as s.p. hours | Oppose:
advisors must
be able to
select course-
work best for
student |
| 26 | Transfer Eligibility
·2-year college transfer who was
initially ineligible will be
ineligible for one-year at
four-year school of transfer | Favor |
| 30 | Financial Aid-Summer School
·allow athletics funds to pay
incoming student summer program | Favor |
| 39 | Eligibility
·allow 4th year of competition
for initial non-qualifiers | Oppose:
two laudable
goals stronger
one is better
h.s. prep. |
| 65 | Division I-A Football
·change present 25/95 limit
to 21/X | Oppose:
could reduce
competitive
opportunities |

Fall 1991 Faculty Research Grants
 Awarded 11/11/91
 Effective 11/12/91 through 1/31/93

<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME AND DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1175	Dr. M. Kay Alderman Educational Foundations	"Implementation of Motivation and Learning Strategies Course for Ninth Grade: Changes and Effects in Teachers and Students"	\$ 2,225.00
1176	Dr. Kim Calvo Chemistry	"The Enzymology of Excitotoxin Metabolism"	3,690.00
1177	Drs. F. K. Choy/ M. J. Braun Mechanical Engineering	"Improvement of Turbomachinery Performance Through Active Control of Tribosystems"	4,650.00
1178	Dr. Steven Chuang Chemical Engineering	"Surface Design of Supported Metal Catalysts for the Synthesis of Higher Alcohols"	4,700.00
1179	Dr. Ronald Eby Polymer Science/ Polymer Engineering	"Materials for Electronic Packaging: Characterization by Computational Modeling"	4,141.00
1180	Dr. James J. Egan English	"Artistic Motives and Political Statements in the Literature of the English Renaissance"	1,050.00
1181	Mr. Gabriel Giralt Communication	"OBLIVION"	4,658.00
1182	Dr. James K. Hardy Chemistry	"Permeation Sampling for the Halogenated Ether Priority Pollutants"	3,200.00
1183	Dr. Vern R. Harnapp Geography	"Mapping Radon Site Information for Summit County, Ohio as Part of a Geographic Information System (GIS)"	2,142.50
1184	Dr. James Holda Biology	"The Effect of Cisplatin on Hematopoiesis and Immune Function"	3,800.00
1185	Dr. Roberta S. Hurley Home Economics & Family Ecology	"Longitudinal Study of Lean Body Mass in Medically Stable Elderly"	4,773.60
1186	Dr. Dale Jackson Biology	"A Biological Monograph of the Platygastriid Wasps of the Laser Antilles"	4,777.00
1187	Dr. Mark Johnson Biology	"Maternal Lineage of Hypertensive Rat Strains"	4,700.00

1188	Dr. Jerome Mushkat History	"Martin Van Buren: A Life in Law and Politics, 1796-1828."	300.00
1189	Dr. Donald Ott Biology	"Preliminary Cytological Survey of Plant Cell Motility Systems Employing a New Fixative"	4,453.00
1190	Dr. Helen W. Richter Chemistry	"Screening for Urinary Organic Acidemias in Newborns by High Pressure Liquid Chromatography"	4,514.00
1191	Dr. Ronald Viola Chemistry	"Enzymatic Synthesis of Selective Drugs"	4,425.00
1192	Dr. Chrys Wesdemitis Chemistry	"Tandem Mass Spectrometry of Biomolecules"	4,500.00
TOTAL AWARDS = 18			<u>\$66,699.10</u>

APPENDIX D**Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of
the Ohio Board of Regents****Report to University Council
December 5, 1991**

At exactly 7 a.m. on December 4, 1991, The University of Akron representative, June Burton, climbed into the driver's seat behind the 305 horsepower Oldsmobile-built engine in her 1990 Electra Wagon. As she backed out of her driveway and turned the huge vehicle into the wind, she calmly noted the fluffy white stuff accumulating on the windshield and heard the announcer on the radio saying that the wind chill factor was -17 degrees Fahrenheit. Like a typical Akron faculty member, she bravely accelerated onto I-76 at 45 mph, to avoid the ditch that had already been occupied by faster drivers during the previous night. And at the junction of I-71 she joined the endless cavalcade of Big Rigs, heading southward toward the weighing station whose sign said: "Open." As she glanced back at the line of drivers who had been playing tag with her on all the downhill stretches (Burton always drives evenly even with her cruise control off), she fantasized that all the truckers were using their idle time wisely by giving full attention to their Akron U Continuing Education tapes, which are now playing on all their respective decks, for the four-credit classes they are all taking at the new Akron Convention Center.

After a pit stop at Mohican State Park, Burton arrived safely in downtown Columbus and found her way to the FAC Meeting on the 36th floor and made her usual grand entrance--right on the nose. She was greeted with: "Hey, this isn't Paris!" Obviously, the meeting was poorly attended, in fact, the weather must have been worse than Burton thought because the OSU people never got there.

As for the meeting, the weather and the numbers present and those not present made the tone more informal than usual (and notes harder to take). There were three activities. The FAC Committee discussed various things and made some plans. Gary Walters from the Chancellor's Office spoke to the group for about an hour and Chancellor Elaine Hairston talked to us and responded to questions for more than an hour.

We left with three assignments to handle on each campus:

1. The Chancellor thinks it would be helpful to her if we can present her with samples of what typical faculty members do to use their time in a typical work week. (Translate the term "faculty member" as any full-time teaching colleague who are not a department head, dean, vice president, or administrator of any size, shape, or configuration).
2. Each campus needs to evaluate its Selective Excellence Programs. This process ought to start with a faculty member or faculty committee *use same definition of term "real faculty member" as above). She sees this somehow evolving into a multi-tiered self-study. The evaluators should use the massive annual reports that already exist for all these programs and that are filed in the Research Office upstairs in the old brick house yonder. The impetus for this evaluation is coming from the General Assembly's Office of the Education Oversight Committee. The latter, the Governor, and the Board of Regents is negotiating for the creation of a 5-member steering committee which will direct a consultant who will be hired to do the actual task for the General Assembly. Her exact words were "Tell your campus to get going on faculty evaluation of Selective Excellence."

3. The third assignment has to do with the Faculty Workload issue. The Ohio Managing for the Future Task Force wants responses to the question "What is faculty productivity?" "How does workload need to be defined?" She will ask for the creation of a Committee to look at workloads. Other universities, she said, ought to copy the model in use already at Miami University where they have a faculty member charged with looking into load. He has held hearings and engaged in dialogue with the entire faculty in preparation for a university-wide study. At Miami, department chairs also did a load study themselves, so that this, too, becomes a multi-tiered effort. Eventually, a study of faculty load will come out of the Ohio Management for the Future Task Force's work.

Besides giving these assignments to us to relay to our homebases, the Chancellor answered several questions.

She said she has told the Presidents to expect a 3-5 percent budget cut in January.

She hopes to revive all the Selective Excellence Programs in the next biennium.

She is now more interested in administrative costs than she was last year.

Finally, she had us formulate a long list of questions for the evaluation of the Selective Excellence Programs for the Steering Committee for the evaluation of the Selective Excellence Programs.

The next FAC meeting will be January 29. A discussion of my report on the use of part-time faculty in Ohio during the Fall Semester of 1990 will be on the agenda.

APPENDIX E**SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS FOR SPRING, 1992****Academic Policies, Curriculum, and
Calendar Committee**

Tuesday, January 21, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Tuesday, February 18, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Tuesday, March 17, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Tuesday, April 21, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00

Curriculum Subcommittee

Tuesday, January 14, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Tuesday, February 11, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Tuesday, March 10, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Tuesday, April 14, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00

Policies & Calendar Subcommittee

Thursday, January 30, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, February 13, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, February 20, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, February 27, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, March 12, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, March 19, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, April 9, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, April 16, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, April 23, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00
Thursday, April 30, 1992	Board of Trustees Room, GSC - 3:00

APPENDIX F

The following represents the members of the Search Committee for the Associate Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies:

Dr. Dolores Bower
Professor of Nursing

Mr. Lee Mazanec
Doctoral Student
Secondary Education

Dr. Lathardus Goggins
Asst. Dean of the Graduate
School for Minority
Recruitment
Professor of Geography

Dr. Isadore Newman (Chair)
Professor of Education
Coordinator of Research &
Evaluation

Dr. Karyn B. Katz
Assoc. Professor of
Communicative Disorders

Dr. Mostofa Sarhan
Assoc. Professor of
Accounting

Dr. Frank Kelley
Dean, College of Polymer
Science & Polymer
Engineering
Professor of Polymer Science

Dr. Daniel Sheffer
Associate Professor of
Biomedical Engineering
and Biology
Department Head, Biomedical
Engineering
(Chair, Research {Faculty
Projects} Committee)

Dr. Ernst vonMeerwall
Distinguished Professor
of Physics
Faculty Research Assoc., IPS

APPENDIX G

The following represents the members of the Search Committee for the Dean of the College of Fine & Applied Arts:

Andrew Borowiec, CHAIR
School of Art

Isaac
Issac Hunt, Jr.
School of Law

Kaye Davis
School of Dance

James Lynn
School of Communicative
Disorders

Lyle Dye
School of Theatre Arts

Thomas Miles
School of Communication

Marvin Felt
School of Social Work

Mary Myers
Community Representative

Betsy Garrison
School of Home Economics
and Family Ecology

Julie Newhall
Student Representative

Cynthia Hollis
Performing Arts Hall

Georgia Peeples
School of Music

Virginia Wilson
Community Representative