

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

4-4-1991

Faculty Senate Chronicle April 4, 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.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of the Meeting of University Council of April 4, 1991	2
Appendix to the Minutes of the University Council Meeting of April 4, 1991	21
A. Report of the Campus Facilities Planning Committee .	21
B. Report of the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee	26
C. Revised General Studies Program as submitted by the General Studies Advisory Council	30
D. Resolution on Part-Time Faculty Salary Raises . . .	35
E. Resolution on Salary Allocation for 1991-92 and Beyond Prepared by the Faculty Well Being Committee . . .	37
E,1. Supplementary Information Forwarded to the President in Reference to the Resolution on Salary Allocation for 1991-92 and Beyond	38
F. Resolution on Revised Eligibility and Transference of Part-Time Faculty Fee Remissions	40
G. Radiation Safety Guidelines	41
H. Curriculum	45
I. Transfer Module	46
J. Curriculum Change Circulation	49
K. Repeat for Change of Grade Policy	50
L. Withdrawal Policy	51

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
April 4, 1991**

The regular meeting of the University Council was called to order by the President Pro Tem, Dr. John Bee (serving as Chairman in the absence of Dr. Marion Ruebel), at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, April 4, 1991 in Leigh Hall 307.

Sixty of the 83 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Dr. Jackie Anglin; Mr. David Brink; Dr. Janis Campbell; Dean Patricia Carrell; Dr. Alice Christie; Dean Robert Dubick; Dr. Patricia Edwards; Dr. Bridgie Ford; Mr. Dale Lynk; Dr. William McGucken; President William Muse; Dean Russell Petersen; Interim Senior Vice President and Provost, Marion Ruebel; Dean Wallace Williams; Mr. Samir Yebaile. Those absent without notice were Dr. Hilton Bonniwell, Dr. Roger Durbin, Dr. Nathan Ida, Ms. Laura Johnson, Mr. David Weill.

ITEM NO. 1 - REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT.

The Chairman stated that President William V. Muse was not in attendance, but he had a statement from him which he wanted to read.

Item No. 1 - Search Process for Provost - The Search Committee for the Senior Vice President and Provost has recommended three persons to be consistent with the Faculty Manual. I am currently evaluating these individuals using input from both the campus and external sources. I expect to recommend an appointment to the Trustees at their April 24 meeting.

Item No. 2 - Budgetary Planning - Preliminary estimates indicate that the Governor's recommended budget for 1991-92 would result in a substantial reduction in the University's instructional subsidy for next year. An analysis of this matter has been prepared for distribution to all faculty and staff. In light of the major shortfall in revenue that is anticipated, I have extended the hiring freeze into 1991-92. Further information is available in my memo to the campus.

Mr. James Inman wanted to know whether the President was going to divulge the names of the three candidates for Provost. Otherwise he would have no way of knowing who they were. The search committee had never reported this information to the entire University. Was that consistent with the process? He asked the Chairman to pass this along to the President.

ITEM NO. 2 - CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL, MARCH 7, 1991 AS PRINTED IN THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON CHRONICLE OF MARCH 22, 1991.

Dr. Gary Oller, Secretary, made the following corrections:

On page 10, second paragraph from the bottom, last line of that paragraph, last phrase "and this would insure..." change the spelling of insure to ensure.

On page 11, there are some incorrect page citations referring to the Appendix section. In the third paragraph, second line, where it says Appendix B, page 27, it should read "page 26." In the fourth paragraph, where it says "page 28," it should read "page 27," and finally, in the sixth paragraph where it says "page 29," it should read "page 28."

On page 17, the second paragraph, it lists Dr. Bruce Holland as seconding the motion made by Dr. Lawrence Focht to move up the starting date of classes in Spring '93. Dr. Holland says that this is incorrect. Whoever did second the motion should let the Secretary know so that it can be correctly recorded in the minutes. At the bottom of the same page, last paragraph, third line from the bottom, it says "he would take his vacation between May and June, if we could get some time off...." The "we" should read "he."

Ms. Joyce Mirman had an additional correction on page 56, CT-91-30 at the bottom of the page. The sentence "Add the following existing courses as electives" should continue "to the Certificate Program, Computer Software for Business," and the phrase beginning "Delete" should read "Delete from the Associate Degree Program."

Since there were no other corrections, the Council approved the minutes as corrected.

ITEM NO. 3 - REMARKS OF THE PRESIDING OFFICER.

There were none.

ITEM NO. 4 - SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS.

There were none.

ITEM NO. 5 - REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

A. Executive Committee.

Dr. Oller, Secretary, reported that the Committee had met on March 14 and set the agenda for today's meeting. It forwarded to the Policy Subcommittee of APCC a few items related to issues on which it was already working. First, a memo from Dean Nicholas Sylvester of the College of Engineering regarding suggested changes concerning contract periods and tenure. Second, a memo from Dr. Edwin Wilson of the Department Heads Committee on Withdrawal and Repeat for Change of Grade Policy. Another item forwarded to APCC was a request from Dr. Kenneth Pakenham that students receive service credit for English Language Institute courses.

Finally, the Committee wanted Council's approval to refer to APCC a proposal which it had received from Mrs. Holly Mothes for staff representation on University Council. With Council's assent, he moved that this be referred to APCC.

Dr. Don R. Gerlach commented that this proposal to add still more representatives to this body, which was supposed to be, essentially, a faculty body, troubled him. In the first place, he was personally opposed to the whole idea, but secondly he was not certain that, if this issue was to be referred, the APCC was the correct committee to handle such a question. He suggested that the Executive Committee could properly take up this business since it was the committee which handled what might be called constitutional questions. However, aside from those points, he wanted to try a further motion on this issue, and he then moved that it be laid on the table. This was seconded by Dean Claibourne Griffin.

Since this issue was neither debatable or amendable, the Chairman called for a vote. The motion to table passed by a vote of 28 to 15.

B. Academic Planning and Priorities Committee.

No report.

C. Academic Policy, Curriculum, and Calendar Committee.

Associate Provost Joseph Walton, the Chairman, stated that the members of Council had received his committee's report and those items which required action were on the agenda under New Business.

D. Athletics Committee.

Mrs. Cheryl Buchanan presented a report from Mrs. Irene Glanville, the Chair, which read as follows:

1. The Athletic Committee met on March 11, 1991
2. J. Dennison gave a summary of the winter team records:

Men's Basketball	15-13 overall, 6-10 conference (6th place)
Women's Basketball	3-25 overall, 2-12 conference (8th place)
Men's Track	16-12
Women's Track	13- 7

Several athletes were honored by the conference:

Stacey Burrier, 2nd team, All North Star Conf.
Pete Freeman, 1st team, All Mid-Continent Conf.
Roy Coleman, All Newcomer Team, Mid-Continent Conf.

Pat Ciccantelli, strength and conditioning coach, has resigned. He will be joining the Cleveland Indian's staff.

The University will host the Regional Championship games for high school boy's basketball. Over 6,400 were present last weekend for the District Championship games.

3. Clarification of topics discussed at the previous meeting:
 - a. For the 5-year budget analysis presented at the last meeting, cost of graduate assistants assigned to each sport (also known as restricted earnings coaches) is not included in the coach salary/benefits expenditures.
 - b. The conference changes will not result in more travel time or expense for the women's teams. Conference champions will be determined in the same manner as currently.
 - c. Regarding the NCAA rules and regulations changes:
 1. The University of Akron meets 2 out of the 3 grants-in-aid requirements. Schools are mandated to meet only 1 out of 3 in order to maintain Division I status.

2. This University will be required to support 7 women's-only sports as part of the requirements to remain in Division I. Because of the University's football program, an amendment allows women's indoor and outdoor track can each be counted as a separate sport. Thus the 7 women's sports will be: basketball, volleyball, softball, tennis, cross country track, indoor track, and outdoor track.
3. We presently have a football-only athletic dorm but this will be phased out next year. There are currently no training table meals for any sports.
4. Declared majors of the 201 athletes at junior standing were examined (about 1/2 of the total athletes.) Few trends were apparent among or within the sports. Several majors were highly represented among the athletes: criminal justice, business organization communication, and P. E. trainer. Interpretation of this data at face value is difficult.
5. The NCAA has recommended that evaluation take place starting August, '91 for athletes who exhaust eligibility. Since the NCAA does not mandate the content or mechanism for data collection, a form has been developed to be used during exit interview of those athletes. Its great length dictates that it not be used with every athlete, but rather a random sample. This form was examined.
6. Topics of the agenda for the next meeting are:
 - Fall 1990 GPA by sport, including a frequency distribution within each sport for athletes with grades below 2.0, 2.1-2.9, 3.0-3.29, and above 3.3.
 - Graduation rate for each sport
 - Financial Aid/Scholarships
 - Title IX as it applies to athletics
7. The next scheduled meeting will be held on April 8, 1991 from 1-3 p.m. in the Tommy Evans Lounge of the JAR Arena.

E. Campus Facilities Planning Committee.

Since this was the first opportunity his schedule had permitted meeting with the body, Dr. Harvey Sterns, the Chairman, presented a summary of four major meetings which the Committee had held (See Appendix A, pages 21-25). Rather than read that summary, he wanted to discuss some of the main points of the meeting of February 6.

Much of the earlier meetings had dealt with the past role and utilization of the Committee and how that could be changed. A great deal of the success in all of this came from the cooperation of Interim Provost Ruebel, Assistant Provost David Jamison, and Vice President Roger Ryan. Dr. Sterns then read a substantial section of the report starting with the fourth paragraph at the bottom of page 21 and continuing on to the fourth paragraph of page 22.

The most important part of the report related to the two meetings which the Committee had held on the first Biennium (1993/94) Capital Plan, which the Provost's Office and the Planning Office had shared with it. This information was attached to the report (see page 23). After deliberation at the March 27 meeting, the Committee voted to move the priority placement of the Science and Technology Library from number 8 in the priority sequence to number 3. It also reaffirmed the revised document which was being presented to Council today. The Committee hoped that University Council would endorse the recommendations of the committee so that it could have its full voice in the planning process of the University.

Dr. Gerlach asked whether, based on Dr. Stern's last request, it would be in order to propose a motion that Council receive and adopt this report, thereby giving its sanction to the recommendations. The Chairman answered that this would be in order as long as Council realized what it was approving was merely a recommendation from the Committee.

Dr. Sterns agreed that the Committee's recommendation was purely advisory and that the Provost would make his final recommendation to the President on the basis of this recommendation as well as additional advice from the Dean's Council and the President's cabinet. With this as a clarification, the Chairman accepted Dr. Gerlach's motion which was seconded by Ms. Ann Bolek.

Dean Griffin wondered whether his assumption was correct that since the chances of getting \$41 million of funding in the first biennium were zero, items 5 through 11 would become the first items in the second biennium, rather than what was listed on the second biennium sheet.

Dr. Sterns replied that it was his understanding from Mr. Ryan that we would probably be very lucky to get down to item 6 on the list. However, in the traditional planning process, just because something was number 7 or 8 on the first list, it did not mean that it would move to the top of the planning list for the next year. What happened was that everything could be reexamined and new priorities set.

When Dean Griffin had questions about rationale behind specific items on the list, the Chairman stated that this kind of discussion, which could lead to possible reordering or changes in the list, would take the matter into the realm of New Business which would have to be deferred until the end of the agenda. If Council wanted to approve the motion to receive and adopt the Committee's report, it should vote on that.

Dr. Sterns noted that Dean Griffin's concerns were the same concerns that many people in the University community had. The Committee's purpose in sharing this information with Council was to give it a chance to see the priority list and provide an opportunity for reaction and possible reordering.

The Chairman answered that if this was the Committee's intention, then the matter had to go under New Business at the end of the agenda. The motion to receive and adopt was therefore dead, and the item would be placed at the end of the agenda at which time the order of items on the list could be debated.

F. Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee.

Dr. Oller read a report from Mr. David Brink, the Chairman, which stated that the Committee had met on March 11 and April 1, 1991. A grievance had been filed with the Committee and given file number 40-91.

G. Faculty Well-Being Committee.

Mr. Paul Richert, the Chairman, reported that the Committee had revised the salary proposal from the last meeting. It also discussed concerns regarding smoking and had a resolution regarding the implementation of the smoking policy to discuss under New Business.

H. Library and Learning Resources Committee.

Dr. Oller read a report from Dr. Elizabeth Erickson, the Chair, which stated that the questionnaire which had been sent to faculty regarding library use was being processed. At last count, 457 surveys had been returned, of which 353 were from full-time faculty. Initial examination of the results indicated that as library users, 76 percent of the respondents agreed that the library should have a higher priority in the current University budget. Eighty-six percent considered that there should be a high budget priority in improving the quality of the Library over the next 10-20 years. The Committee was still analyzing the specific concerns with Library Services, and there would be a full report at the May Council meeting.

I. Reference Committee.

Mrs. June Patton, the Chair, stated that the Committee had submitted its report to Council and its item was under New Business.

J. Research (Faculty Projects) Committee.

The Chairman reported that Dr. John Wodarski had submitted a written report which would appear in the Chronicle (See Appendix B).

K. Student Affairs Committee.

No report.

L. General Studies Advisory Council.

Dr. Eric Birdsall, the Chairman, discussed the recommendations which the GSAC was now presenting to Council (see Appendix C). He first wanted to point out the remarkable fact that these recommendations had been unanimously approved in every part by the GSAC members, who represented every College on campus. He also wanted to draw attention to the two or three governing assumptions from which GSAC had proceeded. Of particular importance was the basic principle that all General Studies courses should be department based with those departments maintaining responsibility for designing and staffing courses. As the General Studies Advisory Council screened new proposals for courses, it would strongly be inclined to insist on departmental responsibility. All proposals should come from departments and not some kind of standing unit. He then asked for questions, but there were none.

The Chairman stated that the items proposed in the report fell to the bottom of the agenda under New Business. However, Dr. Gerlach thought that another kind of motion might be in order at this point, and this was that the set of recommendations be referred to the APCC. He so moved and this was seconded by Ann Bolek. Council then voted its approval of the motion to refer.

ITEM NO. 6 - REPORT OF THE AKRON REPRESENTATIVE ON THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS.

Dr. June Burton, the representative, stated that there was no report.

ITEM NO. 7 - UNFINISHED BUSINESS.

The Chairman stated that since copies of the revised version of the proposal on Salary Allocation were currently being made, Council would move on to the second item of Unfinished Business, a recommendation for Part-Time Salary Increases (See Appendix D).

Receiving permission from the body to speak, Mr. Richert noted that this item had been handed out at the last meeting but was not treated because of lack of time. Basically, the Part-Time Faculty

were concerned that their salary levels were not competitive with comparative institutions. Yet they were providing a very valuable service throughout the University--for example, teaching some 80 percent of the instruction of the General Studies Courses in the University College. Data which the FWB had collected comparing our pay scales to those of the four Northeast Ohio institutions showed that we did not rank very well. The Part-Time Faculty would appreciate the support of the University Council in recommending substantial salary increases for all Part-Time Faculty effective with the 1991-92 school year.

Dean Griffin questioned the wisdom of resolutions on salary raises in light of the existing budget problems for the coming year. If he were to receive such a request in a budget year when he was looking at \$7 million less in state funding than he had in the present year, he would say that the persons who passed that request were asleep or inordinately...he said that Council members could fill in the blank. There were a large number of adjectives that would fit there. He did not argue the sentiment or the objective, and was fully supportive of it. However, the timing was just not right, and he felt the same way about the resolution relating to Full-Time Faculty salaries.

Dr. Dale Jackson remarked that having sat on the committee for a few years which had looked at part-time faculty salaries and seeing the general trend in this country relating to the use of part-time faculty at various universities, he thought that we should not simply ignore the person's financial situation, but look at the long-term picture. The point of approving this was to emphasize a long-term policy toward raising their salaries, not the specific dollars this year or perhaps the next 18 months.

Dean Griffin replied that the resolution as worded did not seem to be a long-term policy statement.

Receiving permission to speak, Mrs. Linda Weiner pointed out that the copy of the resolution which had been attached to the agenda was missing the data which Mr. Richert had referred to regarding the comparison of our pay scale for part-time faculty to that of other Ohio universities. It showed Akron falling next to last as far as the salaries of the part-time staff.

Mr. Blin Scatterday reminded Council of the fact that 80 percent of the instruction in General Studies was done by part-time faculty. That was something which the University needed to address, but until more full-time faculty were hired, the least we could do was pay the part-time faculty a decent rate for what they did.

Allen

Dr. Robert Holland and Dr. ~~Alan~~ Noble both spoke in favor of the proposal. Dr. Noble reminded Council that he had spoken before about his concern regarding the large number of part-time faculty used at the University. As long as the salaries of the part-time faculty remained low, the University would continue to hire more of them because it was so much cheaper than hiring full-time faculty. By supporting this, we would be sending the administration an indication of the fact that we were not in favor of increasing the number of part-timers, but that we were in favor of compensating the very good part-timers at a much more reasonable level.

Since there was no further discussion, the Chairman called for a vote on the resolution, and it was passed.

Now that copies of the revised proposal relating to Full-Time Faculty salary allocations had been disseminated, Council returned to that first item of Unfinished Business. The Chairman reminded Council that this had been postponed at the last meeting until today. At the time it was postponed, Council had a motion from Dr. Bruce Holland to delete the WHEREAS section dealing with the recruitment and hiring of minority faculty. At the same time, there had been a number of potential amendments suggested by Dr. Burton. Those amendments had now been incorporated into the new draft which had just been handed out. Procedurally, Dr. Holland's motion had to be dealt with first and then Council could proceed to the revised draft, which at the moment, had no status.

Dr. Holland tried to withdraw his motion, but the Chairman stated that this was not possible. Council then voted on his motion to delete, and it was passed.

Dr. Burton now moved to amend the original document by substituting the newly revised and disseminated draft. This was seconded by Dr. Gerlach. Council then voted its approval of the motion to substitute.

Dr. Gerlach now stated that he had absolutely no objection to any of the WHEREAS clauses except that there were so many of them and he thought that Council was going to get bogged down in details. Therefore, he wished to offer an amendment which would strike out all of those clauses and replace them with one single WHEREAS statement of his invention. The amendment would read as follows:

WHEREAS the recent survey of faculty indicates that 77.5 percent of the respondents disapprove of the all-merit basis for salary increments and 64 percent of them prefer a combination of merit/cost of living and flat sum by rank.

He so moved, and Dr. Noble seconded the motion.

Dr. Edwin Wilson wanted to know what the total percentage of respondents was.

Dr. Oller pointed out that in the last issue of the Chronicle under Item No. 4 (Special Announcements), pages 3 and 4, there was a preliminary report presented by Dr. Burton of the AAUP's faculty survey. There it stated that there had been 438 usable responses.

Dr. Wilson said that this meant that the 77.5 percent of that figure translated into about 40 percent of the faculty.

Dr. John Serafini thought that this was not a fair point because one could make the same kind of statement about any election after you looked at the number of people able to vote in relation to the number of people who actually did.

Mr. Dan Buie wondered whether the other WHEREAS clauses would be forwarded to the President if Dr. Gerlach's motion passed. The Chairman replied that only the one WHEREAS clause would be a part of the resolution, but any other supplementary material which Council chose to send along with the resolution could also be forwarded.

Mrs. Karin Billions wanted to speak against the motion because in the draft with all of the clauses there was a great deal of evidence presented to support the resolutions. In the motion under discussion, it merely suggested that this was what the faculty wanted.

Dr. Noble wanted to speak in favor of the motion in the interest of economy and time. As a long-time member of Council, he knew how much time was wasted arguing over commas, periods, etc. If this passed, he would immediately make a motion instructing the Executive Committee to transmit with the resolution the material presented by the FWB Committee as evidence.

Ms. Bolek preferred to have Dr. Gerlach's WHEREAS clause added to the WHEREAS clauses that were originally presented by the FWB Committee.

Mr. Clifford Billions wanted to speak against the motion for the same reasons Mrs. Billions had raised, and the Chairman noted that perhaps more than one purpose was accomplished with that statement.

Dr. Bruce Holland was in favor of the motion, but in doing away with the WHEREAS clauses Council was missing an opportunity to get information from President Muse on three or four of them. Even

if this passed, he wondered whether Council still might ask the President when he next addressed the body to speak about some of them. A few in particular were: the supposed savings from ERIP which was alluded to in one of the clauses, the five-year plan which was referred to as an attempt to raise faculty salaries to certain levels, and allusions to his remarks favoring the strengthening of undergraduate teaching. It would be good to have the President address these issues.

Mr. Billions, in agreement with Dr. Holland, noted that there was an element of accountability from the President built into the original resolution which was not met in the amendment.

Dean Griffin suggested for the sake of clarity that it might be useful to say "64 percent of THE RESPONDENTS prefer" instead of "64 percent of them", and this was accepted as an editorial change.

Council then voted on Gerlach's amendment, and it was approved unopposed.

Dr. Noble then moved that the Executive Committee be instructed to add to the resolution which Council had just passed, the material which came from the Committee as supporting material for the President's consideration. This was seconded by Mr. Scatterday.

Further discussion then made clear that what Council had just passed, the Gerlach amendment, was the only WHEREAS clause that would go with the resolutions relating to salary. Dr. Noble's motion would have the effect of sending the March 15 revised draft of the proposal from FWB Committee (along with the three attachments with the earlier version - see February 28 Chronicle, pages 43-45) as additional information which would show the Committee's original thinking in formulating the resolution as well as what Council considered in reaching its final conclusion.

Discussion then ensued regarding a proposed preamble or disclaimer to make clear to the President exactly what this information was. Ms. Bolek moved that the document which was to be sent to the President be amended to include a statement that it was adopted by the FWB Committee, but not by the Council, and this was seconded.

After additional discussion, Dr. Oller stated that if Council would trust its Secretary and staff to transmit the material, the nature of the supplementary material would be made clear.

Council then voted on Bolek's motion, and it was defeated. It then returned to Noble's motion, and it was passed. (See Appendix E for the final approved resolution and E,1 for the supplementary information sent to the President).

The third item of Unfinished Business was Part-Time Faculty Fee Remission (Appendix F). Mr. Richert stated that there was a problem in that most of the part-time faculty were teaching three-hour courses, and University policy for fee remissions for classes required a minimum of four teaching hours. This virtually locked out many occasional teachers from ever taking a class. The FWB Committee was suggesting that the minimum be lowered to three credit hours. This would give the part-time faculty more incentive to teach and a little more recognition of their contributions to the University. Even if they did not want to take a class, it would be a good thing if the benefit could be transferred to a qualified dependent, and this was recommended by the Committee as well.

Dr. David Buchthal commented that as he read the resolution, it was a request allowing someone teaching a three-hour course to use a fee remission. Did this mean only for a three-hour course and therefore prohibit someone teaching a three-hour course from using the fee remission on a four- or five-hour course?

Mr. Richert replied that it would follow the policy of the University on that. He also reminded Council that the fee remissions, when used, generated subsidy. It actually was a benefit for us.

Dr. Noble wondered whether anyone had looked into the economic implications of the proposal. When Mr. Richert replied that the Committee had not and that he had no specific data on how many part-time faculty were using fee remissions or how many dependents might use them, Dr. Noble thought that it would be prudent for us to find out. He had no basic objections to the proposal, but he was uneasy about not knowing what he was approving. He therefore moved to postpone this motion until some report could be made to Council about the economic implications. This was seconded by Dean Sylvester.

Ms. Bolek spoke against this motion because she did not know how the data for this could be acquired.

Council then voted on Noble's motion, and it was defeated.

At the risk of prolonging the meeting, Dr. Noble wanted to offer a couple of observations. It seemed that Council was going to approach this issue from a position of sentiment rather than from a factual one. He had no objections in doing that, but, on

the other hand, as Dean Griffin had so eloquently pointed out earlier, this did not seem the right time to be giving things away. There were too many unanswered questions here regarding numbers of part-timers and dependents who would make use of this. For example, if some of those dependents were now taking classes and paying tuition, would this new benefit now lose us money because some of them now would pay less? A great deal more information was necessary here, and he urged people to vote this down.

Mr. Scatterday noted that it always had been difficult for him to tell part-time instructors who were teaching a three-hour course that they could not have the fee remission when the person right next to him could because he was teaching four hours. He had tried to look into this a few times and could never get a straight definition as to the difference between three and four. He thought that this had been done when the University had gone over to the quarter system, and it had never been corrected when it went back to semesters.

Dr. Robert Holland reminded Council that it improved the general worth of the University if its part-time faculty were attempting to improve themselves by taking advanced coursework in their subjects. Also in extending the benefit to dependents, we would be helping people who were trying to make ends meet and raise a family by piecing together part-time work at a number of different places. This was a small difference for us, but could be a large difference for them.

Dr. Jackson commented that Dr. Noble said that he did not have information on this item, but everything that he (Jackson) had read told him that this was insignificant as far as the economic impact was concerned.

Dean Griffin thought that the transferability provision probably would not be critical financially, and to be consistent, since Council had supported the pay raise for part-time faculty, it ought to pass this one as well.

Dr. Gerlach said that Council should pass this because if it thought of the economics involved, he trembled to think of what little this would be compared to that enormous amount, millions, wasn't it, put into auxiliary enterprises like athletics which had nothing to do with higher education.

Dr. Oller wondered whether, if this passed, would the same benefit have to be extended to part-time staff, since full-time faculty and full-time staff now had the same benefits as far as fee remission was concerned.

Dr. Noble commented that this was an interesting point which buttressed his position that Council really did not understand all of the ramifications of this. Also, what about those part-timers who taught only two hours of coursework? Shouldn't they get something out of this? It had also been stated that the part-time faculty would take courses to increase training in their respective fields, yet no evidence had been presented to support that.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted on the resolutions and gave its approval.

The last item of Unfinished Business was an amendment to the Bylaws of University Council with regard to retired faculty representation on University Council (section 3359-10-03 Composition of Council) which read as follows:

(H) One retired University of Akron faculty member as a voting member whom the President appoints from a list of nominees supplied by retired faculty IN RESPONSE TO AN INVITATION FROM THE PROVOST.

Since following the guidelines, this had been tabled at the last meeting, the Chairman now asked for a motion to remove it from the table for discussion and debate. This was moved, seconded, and approved by Council.

Speaking for Vice President Faith Helmick who was unable to attend the meeting and whose amendment this was, Dr. Oller presented the rationale for it. This arose from a question from the Committee of the AAUP regarding how the list of retirees submitted to the President was prepared. By adding the phrase "IN RESPONSE TO AN INVITATION FROM THE PROVOST," this made clear that the Provost solicited the nominations and compiled a list from the responses received from the entire faculty. That was the reason for this amendment.

Since there was no discussion, Council voted on the amendment and gave its approval by a majority of its voting members (40 affirmative votes).

ITEM NO. 8 - NEW BUSINESS.

The first item of New Business was approval of the tentative list of prospective graduates for May, 1991, and this was moved by Dr. Walton and seconded by Mr. Inman. In answer to a question from Mr. Billions, the Chairman reminded Council that this motion was contingent on all of the persons named having successfully completed all of the requirements for the degrees. Council then voted its approval.

Next Dr. Oller moved to suspend the rules in order to take up the last item of New Business, the Radiation Safety Rule, now. He did this at the request of Dr. Helmick who hoped that, if Council approved this today, it could go along with the other Faculty Manual revisions which would be presented to the Board of Trustees at its April 24 meeting. If Council did not do this today, there would not be another opportunity to submit it to the Board until the June meeting, by which time it might be too late to get it into the new edition of the Faculty Manual. This was seconded by Ms. Bolek, and Council voted its approval by the required two-thirds majority.

The Chairman indicated that this matter, the inclusion of some material on radiation safety in the Faculty Manual, was now open for discussion (see Appendix G). Dr. Frank Griffin, who in the past had been Radiation Safety Officer and Chairman of the Radiation Safety Committee, explained the background of this issue. It was this committee's job to serve as policemen regarding radiation safety on campus, and it often was about as welcome as traffic cops when they pull you over for speeding. Crucial items here for the Safety Committee would be in section (D), Compliance with Radiation Safety Laws and Regulations. There was a detailed Safety Manual, but the purpose of putting this information in the Faculty Manual was to provide another avenue for getting specific and very important rules relating to radiation safety to all of the campus. This way it would be much harder for people to plead ignorance of the rules. Its appearance in the Faculty Manual also added another sense of legality to it.

Dr. Gerlach was puzzled by an inconsistency which seemed to exist in section A (1). The second sentence said "Members of this committee are appointed to terms of five years." Then it said "Each member shall serve at the pleasure of the Senior Vice President and Provost." Which was it? Did they serve five year terms or at the pleasure of the Provost?

Dr. Jackson stated that it said that they would be appointed. It did not say that they would continue for five years. Dr. Griffin agreed and noted that the point was that members could be removed. There were occasions when this was necessary for reasons of non-performance of duties.

In answer to a question from Mr. Terry Haas regarding the purchase of such items as x-ray machines for Nursing, Dr. Griffin said that these guidelines did not prevent that, but permission did have to be acquired from the committee.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted its approval of the motion to include the Radiation Safety Regulations in the Faculty Manual.

Returning to the regular order of agenda items, the next item of business was Curriculum. Dr. Walton moved that the 64 curriculum change items, listed on the attachment to the agenda (see Appendix H), be approved. Since there was no discussion, Council voted its approval.

Dr. Walton next presented and moved acceptance of the Transfer Module (see Appendix I), and Council voted its approval.

Dr. Walton then presented and moved acceptance of the proposed change in the deadline for submission of curriculum changes from February 1 to October 1 commencing in the Fall of 1992.

In answer to Mr. Inman's question regarding the purpose of this change, Dr. Walton stated that this would allow the various committees dealing with these changes a full working year to consider them rather the very brief period from February through April which existed now.

Dean Griffin saw this as advantageous to everybody. The department could now plan its curricular changes in the Spring and submit them in the Fall to move through the University procedure. The way it worked now was that everyone started thinking about curriculum changes about October 15 and jammed it into a two-month period. The proposed change seemed a much more rational process.

Council then voted and gave its approval.

The next item from the APCC was a proposal to modify the circulation of curriculum changes on campus (see Appendix J). After moving its adoption, Dr. Walton explained that one set would be sent to each collegiate dean's office, and complete sets (one each) would also be available in the Provost's office, Bierce Library, and the Science and Technology Library. Also one complete set of the long form proposals would be made available to each of the members of the Curriculum Subcommittee of APCC. Abbreviated listings of all proposals would go to all deans, all Council members (excluding the dean to avoid duplication), all department heads and division chairs, and all members of the APCC who were not on University Council. This abbreviated listing would include the proposal number, the effective date, and a brief description of each proposal. Anyone wanting to see the full proposal could go to the various places where full sets were available. The rationale for this change was the expense involved in continuing the system as it was presently working.

After a brief discussion, Council passed this motion.

The next item from APCC was a revision of the proposal for repeating courses. Dr. Walton moved its adoption, and Ms. Joyce Mirman described the changes that this proposal would make in the policy (see Appendix K). The first was to remove the twelve month time limit on repeating the course, and the second was to allow only two attempts to repeat any course for a change of grade. This meant that any course could be taken a total of three times - the initial attempt and then two repeats.

In response to a question from Dean Thomas Vukovich, Ms. Mirman noted that a withdrawal from a course would not count as one of the three attempts.

Dr. Wilson commented that the Department Heads Committee had been considering the withdrawal and repeat policy. On its behalf he wanted to suggest an amendment to this proposal which would read as follows: "No more than three repeats for change of grade would be allowed throughout the academic career." He moved this and it was seconded. He went on to explain that the rationale for this was to keep students from grade shopping. If limits were put on the number of courses which one could repeat for a change of grade, it would be in the student's best interests to set a priority of what courses he or she would like to repeat for a change of grade.

After some discussion of this amendment, Dr. Gerlach moved that Wilson's proposed amendment be referred to the APCC for further study. It was not clear what the impact of its insertion into the proposal would be, and therefore it was better to act slowly without confusion and misunderstanding. Gerlach's motion was seconded, and then approved by the Council.

Dr. Wilson now moved that the whole proposal be referred back to APCC, and this was seconded. Dr. Gerlach begged the body not approve this. He explained that what was needed now was to go forward and get this change through so that at least that much could go into effect. It was very doubtful whether the APCC and its Policy Subcommittee could act on this again this year. If further changes were necessary, they could be made next year. In the meantime, the changes made in the present proposal could be put through.

Mr. Haas agreed with Dr. Gerlach. It had taken the Committee much time to come up with the present proposal. Council should act on it and come back to Wilson's proposal later.

Ms. Mirman added that the Committee had considered proposals as rigid as Dr. Wilson's and did not deem them to be appropriate. She did not think that reconsidering some of these things would have much impact.

Council then voted on the motion to refer the entire proposal back to APCC, and it was defeated.

After further discussion, Council voted on the proposal for repeating courses from the APCC, and it was approved.

The next item from APCC related to the Audit Policy. It added to what was in the Faculty Manual under (K) Auditing Courses on page 87 the following statement: "Any faculty member may initiate withdrawal for a student not meeting these expectations." Dr. Walton moved this.

Dr. Robert Holland wondered whether in such circumstances the student would be entitled to a refund. Mr. Buie replied that he thought that the student would as long as the withdrawal took place before the refund deadline.

Since there was no further discussion, Council voted its approval of the motion.

The last item of New Business was a proposal from APCC to change the withdrawal policy. Copies of this proposal were attached to an updated version of the agenda (see Appendix L). Dr. Walton moved acceptance.

Mr. Buie explained that there was a two-fold change here. First, at the beginning of the semester, it allowed about an extra week for students to withdraw without instructor's signatures (through the fourteenth day). Second, rather than allowing students to withdraw up to the end of the fifteenth week, it would require withdrawals to have been made by the end of the twelfth week.

Dr. Wilson had another proposal from the department heads committee regarding withdrawals. It was supported by data showing the number of withdrawals by department over a seven-semester period from 1986-1990. There was an enormous number of them. In one case, one student withdrew from as many as 28 classes; that is, four courses per semester. This suggested a student who was trying to use the system in one way or another. The Department Head's Committee wanted to see some kind of limitation put on the number of withdrawals allowable during the student's career at the University.

With this in mind, Dr. Wilson wanted to amend by substituting a motion with four parts. These were the following:

1. Withdrawal from courses would be allowed only to the end of the tenth week of classes;

2. The total number of withdrawals with a grade of "W" and the total number of courses taken for a re-grade would be limited to three each in the entire undergraduate career;
3. Withdrawal until the end of the third week of classes will not appear on the student transcript; withdrawal between the end of the third week of classes and the end of the tenth week of classes will result in a "W" grade on the transcript and count towards the limit of three withdrawals. Students should seek advice of the instructor before withdrawing after the third week of classes;
4. A student who withdraws totally from the University will not be permitted to enroll in classes the semester following the withdrawal.

Dr. Gerlach seconded Dr. Wilson's motion, but he then moved that it be referred to APCC and be promptly considered to be worked out at a later date. He once again asked Council to go ahead and deal with the proposal it had received from APCC on withdrawal so that it could take effect in the Fall of 1991. His motion to refer was seconded.

Dr. Jackson thought that the rigidness of the points of Dr. Wilson's proposed substitute amendment did not take into account such things as catastrophic illness and other problems which students might encounter. He hoped that when and if this proposal ever got back to Council, it would be rejected.

Council then voted on the motion to refer the substitute amendment and it was passed.

It then voted on the withdrawal proposal as presented by APCC and gave its approval.

ITEM NO. 9 - ADJOURNMENT.

There was then a motion to adjourn, which was seconded and approved by Council. The meeting ended at 5:15 p.m.

Appendix A**REPORT OF THE CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE 1990 - 1991**

The Campus Facilities Planning Committee began its work during Fall Semester. An initial meeting of the Committee was called by Art Pollack, Chairperson 1989-90, on September 27, 1990. Nominations were made at the meeting and ballots were sent to the Committee. Dr. Harvey Sterns was voted as Chairperson of the Committee.

Before the Committee began to meet formally, a special meeting was held on November 28, 1990 between Provost Marion Ruebel, Roger Ryan, and Harvey Sterns to discuss the past history of the Committee, its role according to University Council By-Laws, and the role that would be helpful to the Office of the Senior Vice President and the Vice President of Administrative Services. It was mutually agreed that input from the Committee on space planning and priority setting was an important part of the planning process.

On December 5, 1990, the Committee met with Senior Vice President and Provost Ruebel and Vice President Roger Ryan. Dr. Ruebel described the space planning process and forms that were initiated on November 1, 1990 for the allocation of unassigned space or reassignment of space. Dr. Ruebel then went on to report that he and Assistant Provost Jamison were in the process of meeting with each Dean and each Dean was developing a plan for the next three years.

The Provost was asked who has the final say in decisions regarding space utilization. Dr. Ruebel stated that he does but that he would look at and consider carefully the recommendations of the Deans, the Vice President of Administrative Services and the Committee before forwarding his recommendations to the President. At this same meeting, Vice President Ryan presented the Committee with the highlights of the Year 2000 report.

The Committee met next on February 6, 1991. At that time, Provost Ruebel, Assistant Provost Jamison and Vice President Ryan again met with the Committee to further discuss issues of current space usage and future plans. Major issues facing the campus include the need for a number of temporary moves while buildings are redone and asbestos removal carried out. Phase I of Auburn Science North Tower is an example. There is ongoing discussion regarding possible placements at Polsky's and the possibility that all 5 floors may be able to be finished. In addition, there was discussion regarding whether it is financially wise to move departments that have considerable fixed equipment if current space is adequate.

Provost Ruebel and Assistant Provost Jamison described the process that had gone on in the meeting with each Dean and that each Dean had forwarded a plan for future space needs within their respective colleges. There was considerable discussion regarding whether the information written within these reports should be shared with the Committee. It was the opinion of Assistant Provost Jamison that for the present time such information was confidential. The Chairpersons of the Committee responded that in order to have meaningful input into the process, a mechanism needed to be worked out so that the Committee could review relevant information and play an integrative role representing a faculty viewpoint. It was also recognized that the Committee is advisory, but it was felt that the purpose of the Committee was to provide a faculty-based input into the planning process.

The need to provide opportunities for input on facilities and space utilization by faculty needs to be available at the department, college and University-wide level. The role of the Committee is to provide the University-wide perspective.

A concern on the part of Committee Members is the need for better communication during planning procedure. Faculty and Department Heads often do not know what the Deans are proposing for their colleges. Deans may not know the proposals of higher administration. This is not meant to be confrontational, but reflects "what is" rather than "what ought to be."

It was discussed that the Campus Facilities Planning Committee can play an important role in communicating the planning process to faculty as well as communicating a faculty perspective to the University's planning process. As a Committee of the University Council, its responsibility is to the University Council who can then act on its recommendations. It is not a Committee of the Provost. However, by having the active interest and support of the Provost, Assistant Provost and Vice President of Administrative Services, the Committee is able to function in a meaningful way.

Appendix A

On March 6, 1991, the Committee met again to discuss the recommendations for the Capital Plan for 1st Biennium (1993/1994). Two issues were brought before the Committee for discussion. One issue was the way we are handling parking in our visitor lots. If people do not have the correct amount of money, they are turned away. The question was raised as to why we could not issue time tickets and have people pay on exit. The Committee by consensus felt that we needed to improve our "public face." Mr. Ryan indicated that he would follow up on this.

The second issue for discussion was the way in which moving costs for Departments and Colleges were being handled. There was great concern expressed regarding the cost incurred when Departments move. A number of departments will make temporary moves to accommodate construction. The issue was raised concerning how moving costs were being built into construction budgets.

Another issue brought to the Committee was a concern for a recreational facility for students and faculty. Such a facility is not able to be funded by state. The question was raised whether The University of Akron was moving ahead with such a project.

Discussion then focused on 1st Biennium (1993/1994) Capital Plan. Vice President Ryan shared with the Committee the tentative plan. The Committee reviewed the recommendations. Major discussion focused on the priority placement of the Science Technology Library addition which was number 8. The Committee recommended that the Science Technology Library addition be moved to priority number 3. The Committee unanimously endorsed the priority list with the revision. It was decided that the Committee would meet again on March 27, 1991 to review the recommendations after further deliberations by other University committee officials.

On March 27, 1991, the Committee met to further discuss and affirm the recommendations for 1st Biennium (tentative) (1993/1994) revised document (3-19-91). After considerable discussion, the Committee unanimously endorsed the recommendations. See attached document.

The Committee Chairperson and members of the Committee wish to acknowledge the high level of cooperation evidenced by Provost Ruebel, Assistant Provost Jamison, and Vice President, Roger Ryan and staff.

Submitted by



Harvey L. Sterns, Ph.D.
Chairperson, Campus Facilities Planning Committee
April 4, 1991

April 25, 1991

1ST. BIENNIUM (TENTATIVE)

(1993/94)

Page 23

PRIORITY

1. ASC, PHASE II, SOUTH TOWER REHAB.
FOR ELECT. ENG. & CHEM. ENG. +
GREENHOUSE ADDIT'N. FOR BIOLOGY \$ 8,400,00
2. LEIGH HALL REHAB. FOR MATH.
SCIENCES 4,900,00
3. SCI-TECH. LIBRARY ADDIT'N. 2,900,00
4. KOLBE HALL ADDIT'N. & REHAB.
FOR COMMUNICATION, WZIP &
UNIV. MEDIA PRODUCTION 8,700,00
5. WEST HALL REHAB. FOR SCHOOL
OF LAW 700,00
6. SIMMONS HALL REHAB., INCL.
HUAC SYSTEM & NEW ELEVATOR 4,200,00
7. BUCKINGHAM BLDG. REHAB. FOR
ADMISSIONS, CO-OP EDUCATION,
CAREER PLANNING/PLACEMENT &
EMPLOYMENT SVCS. 1,500,00
8. PARKING DECK/CLASSRM/OFFICE BLDG.
FOR GROUNDS MAINT., G.P. CLASSROOMS,
P.T. FACULTY OFFICES & PARKING.
(TOTAL \$18 M. PROJECT) 5,000,00
9. HIGH TEMP. WATER BALL JOINTS 800,00
10. GIRL SCOUT BLDG. PURCHASE & REHAB. 1,000,00
11. GOODWILL BLDG. PURCHASE & REHAB. 3,000,00
- SUB-TOTAL \$ 41,100,00

NOTE: BASIC UTIL/RENO. PROJECTS TO BE FUNDED
BY FORMULA (APPROX. \$ 3 MILLION)

P.E. BARTLE
3/19/91

2ND. BIENNium (TENTATIVE)
(1995/96)

PRIORITY

- | | | |
|----|---|-------------|
| 1. | <u>ASC, PHASE III, WEST TOWER</u>
<u>REHAB. + WHITBY ASBESTOS</u>
<u>ABATEMENT.</u> | # 8,000,000 |
| 2. | <u>AYER HALL REHAB.</u> | 1,200,000 |
| 3. | <u>BALLET CTR. ADDIT'N. & REHAB.</u> | 1,500,000 |
| 4. | <u>SCHRANK (N) REHAB. FOR COLLEGE</u>
<u>OF ENGINEER'G.</u> | 2,000,000 |
| 5. | <u>ADMISSIONS REHAB., FOR PENN</u>
<u>OF GRAD. STUDIES.</u> | 600,000 |
| 6. | <u>ZOOK/CROUSE LINK + HVAC, FOR</u>
<u>COLLEGE OF EDUCATION</u> | 4,500,000 |
| 7. | <u>CARROLL HALL HVAC + REHAB.</u> | 3,300,000 |
| 8. | <u>COMPUTER CENTER ADDIT'N.</u> | 2,300,000 |

SUB-TOTAL

23,400,000

P.E. BARTLETT

3RD. BIENNium (TENTATIVE)
(1997/98)PRIORITY

- | | | |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1. | <u>BIERCE LIBRARY ADDIT'N.</u> | \$ 9,700.00 |
| 2. | <u>LAND ACQUISITION</u> | 3,000.00 |
| 3. | <u>CONVERTER PLANT RECONFIGURATION</u> | 2,500.00 |
| 4. | <u>HAZARDOUS MAT'LS. BLDG.</u> | 8,600.00 |
| 5. | <u>EXCHANGE ST. PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE</u> | 1,700.00 |
| 6. | <u>EMERG. POWER TELEPHONE SYSTEM</u> | 600.00 |

SUB-TOTAL

\$ 26,100.00

OUT #
GLADWIN 2.6 M
Folk Hall 1.8 M

P. E. BARTLET
3/12/91

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE
Meeting of March 11, 1991

A meeting of the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee was held on Wednesday, March 11, 1991 at 9:00 a.m. in the Conference Room at 138 Fir Hill Center. Membes present were: Mrs. Ann Bolek, Dr. Dolores Bower, Ms. Margaret Carlson, Dr. Clayton Fant, Dr. James Grover, Dr. Jon Hawes, Dr. Sebastian Kanakkanatt, Dr. Wayne Mattice, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Daniel Sheffer, Dr. David Stark, Mr. Dudley Turner, Dr. Adele Webb, Dr. Diane Vukovich, and Dr. John Wodarski, Chairperson. Members absent were: Dr. Shelley Baranowski (she sent in her votes), Dean Patricia Carrell, Dr. Roger Creel, Acting Director Roger Durbin, Dr. Keith Klafehn (he sent in his votes), and Ms. Lynne Miller (she is on leave).

The meeting began at 9:03 a.m. There were a total of 28 proposals submitted for the Spring 1991 competition, along with 2 proposals for the International Summer Fellowship. All 28 proposals were reviewed for merit, using the scoring procedures used before by secret ballot, 1 ranking a superior proposal, 2 ranking good, 3 average, 4 poor, and 5 ineligible. It takes at least 3 votes of a 5 for a proposal to be considered an ineligible proposal.

After reviewing the proposals in rank order for merit, a motion was made to cease funding at 2.53. That motion was seconded, and it passed unanimously. There were a total of 17 awards made, totalling \$57,521.

The two proposals submitted for the International Summer Fellowship were discussed. A motion was made to fund both of these proposals, totalling \$12,843. The Committee voted on it, and it passed unanimously. The total awards made were 19, totalling \$70,364.

There was a small business meeting after reviewing the proposals. Dr. Wodarski reminded the Committee of a motion that was made at the October 29, 1990 meeting. This motion was to ask the President and Provost for an additional \$100,000 for this Committee. Dr. Wodarski passed around a memo in reference to that request for everyone's signature and department.

Mrs. Ann Bolek asked Dr. Wodarski if this additional money was going to go strictly to the Humanities and Social Sciences departments? Dr. Wodarski answered that the additional money will primarily be for those departments.

Dr. Wodarski mentioned that funding is up 105% and submission is up 110%. Ms. Margaret Carlson stated that the Fine & Applied Arts departments are losing funding rapidly. Dr. Wodarski stated that as far as this Committee, the Fine & Applied Arts areas have done very well.

Dr. David Stark raised the issue concerning the proposals being double-spaced. Dr. Wodarski stated that he wants the faculty members to submit proposals to this Committee as they would to NIH or NSF. It was agreed that the proposals should be typed in Pica 10 and nothing smaller.

RESEARCH (FACULTY PROJECTS) COMMITTEE
Meeting of March 11, 1991
Page 2

Dr. Daniel Sheffer made a suggestion for next year's competitions. He suggested that one primary reviewer be assigned to a project in their area of expertise.

Dr. Wayne Mattice made an objection to proposals needing to be in the Research Office 72 hours in advance. Dr. Wodarski noted that, due to the lack of staff in the Research Office and the number of proposals going out, the 72-hour rule is to protect the Principle Investigator and the Research Office.

Dr. Wodarski thanked everyone for a very good year! See you in the fall!

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Bauer

April 25, 1991

Appendix B

Spring 1991 Faculty Research Grants
Awarded 3/11/91
Effective 3/11/91 through 1/31/92

<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME AND DEPARTMENT</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
1156	Dr. William Brittain Polymer Science	"Kinetic Study of Group Transfer Polymerization Mechanism"	\$ 4,000
1157	Dr. Keith Bryant History	"A Cultural History of the Southwest Since 1880"	2,346
1158	Dr. Janis Campbell & Ms. Therese Dowd Nursing	"Prevalence of Urinary Incontinence in an Acute Care Setting: Phase 2"	2,745
1159	Dr. Victoria Elfrink Nursing	"A Description of Nurses' Lived Experiences About Value Conflicts in Nursing Practice"	3,209
1160	Dr. J. Richard Elliott Chemical Engineering	"Permeability Studies of Microcellular Polymer Foams"	3,826
1161	Dr. Mark Foster Polymer Science	"Microstructure of Thin Ionomeric Films"	4,050
1162	Dr. William Francis English	"An Interview with New Orleans Novelist Nancy Lemann"	699
1163	Dr. P. D. Gujrati Physics/Polymer Sci.	"Numerical Simulations of Topological Properties in Lattice Gauge Theories"	4,500
1164	Dr. Peter Henriksen Physics	"Growth and Characterization of Thin Metal Films with Scanning Probe Microscopy"	3,600
1165	Dr. Lu-Kwang Ju Chemical Engineering	"Enhancing In-Situ Biodegrada- tion of Aquifer Petroleum Contaminants by Applying Emulsion and Surfactant Technologies"	4,495
1166	Drs. M. Kermani, F. Choy, & M. Braun Mechanical Engineering	"Experimental and Analytical Study of Thermoelastic Response of Self-Lubricating Polymeric Bearings"	4,383

Appendix B

1167	Drs. Robert Liang & Fred K. Choy Civil & Mechanical Engineering	"Experimental Verification of Fault Detection Algorithm in Large Structures"	4,200
1168	Dr. Suzanne MacDonald Educational Foundations	"Ohio Home Schooling Parent Study"	610
1169	Dr. Lazarus W. Macior Biology	"The Pollination Ecology of Pedicularis Palustris in North America"	2,335
1170	Dr. R. R. Mallik Physics	"Atomic Force Microscopy of Transition Metal Clusters on Alumina"	4,230
1171	Dr. Ronald Viola Chemistry	"Enzymology of the Polyol Metabolic Pathway"	4,373
1172	Dr. Wiley Youngs Chemistry	"Organometallic Polymeric Conductors"	3,920

TOTAL (17)

\$57,521

International Summer Programs

1173	Dr. Elizabeth Erickson Economics	"Analysis of Public Policy Problems of the Pastoral (Ranching) Industry in Arid Zone of Western Australia"	5,843
1174	Dr. Yueh-Jaw Lin Mechanical Engineering	"Motion Planning and Obstacle Avoidance of Coordinated Multiple Robots for Manufactur- ing Tasks"	7,000

TOTAL INTERNATIONAL SUMMER FELLOWSHIPS:

\$12,843

TOTAL SPRING AWARDS (19)

\$70,364

Appendix C

**University of Akron
General Studies Advisory Council**

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 29, 1991
To: University Council
From: General Studies Advisory Council
Subj: Report with Recommendations for a Revised General Studies Program

The attached report comes unanimously recommended by the General Studies Advisory Council.

We emphasize that proposal is an integrated unit, not merely a congeries of unrelated requirements. Each time we considered changes in a particular area, we discovered ramifications for the package as a whole. We urge the readers of this proposal to keep in mind the need for unity and coherence in the core curriculum.

Appendix CIntroduction

In a sequence of meetings from February 1990 to the present, the GSAC has considered every aspect of the current General Studies program and spoken with administrators responsible for most areas of that program. Particularly in areas where we are recommending changes from current requirements, we have thought it important to confer first with representatives of the areas affected.

The General Studies Advisory Council unanimously recommends the revised GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM described in the following pages.

Goals of the Program

The General Education Program of the University of Akron is the core of courses that provide the skills and knowledge considered essential for all graduates of the University. The General Education Program is designed to ensure, insofar as possible, that our graduates will possess:

- the capacity for critical, independent thought
- a personal sense of values, tempered by tolerance and a regard for the rights of others
- the ability to use language effectively as a medium of both thought and expression
- the analytical skills necessary to make sound qualitative and quantitative judgments
- the ability to describe and explain differences in civilizations and cultures
- an understanding of the conditions that affect them as individuals and as members of society
- the capacity to evaluate intellectual and artistic achievements
- a knowledge of science, technology, and mathematics and their effects on human activities

Governing Assumptions

We began our consideration of the General Education Program by formulating the following basic principles:

That all general studies courses should be department based, with those departments maintaining responsibility for designing and staffing the courses.

That we should hold as nearly as possible to the 39 credits currently allocated to the present General Studies program. Many majors with already full requirements would have difficulty accommodating additional credits. [We have arrived at a proposal that totals 40 credits.]

That we should take into account previous proposals regarding General Education. However, because the previous recommendations are to some extent contradictory, we decided not to be governed absolutely by any of them. Our recommendations, we reasoned, are merely recommendations, and will be subjected to examination and debate during the curricular approval process.

Appendix C

Recommended Core Curriculum

The General Education Program consists of 40 credits distributed in the following eight categories.

English Composition 7 credits

Students must complete one 4-credit and one 3-credit course to be proposed by the Department of English.¹ Both courses should concentrate upon college writing skills.

We endorse "writing across the curriculum" and urge that it be adopted by all academic departments.

Mathematics a minimum of 3 credits

Students must complete 3 credits of mathematics or statistics beyond the high school level, to be chosen in accordance with student interest and requirements of the student's major department.²

Computer science will not count for this requirement.

We endorse the development of the Finite Mathematics course for students in non-technical majors.

Natural Sciences a minimum of 6 credits

Students must complete courses in two different areas of the natural sciences. At least one course must include a laboratory component.

We encourage departments to propose new or existing courses to meet these requirements.^{1,2}

Oral Communications 3 credits

We encourage the Department of Communications to propose new or existing course(s) to meet this requirement.¹

Social Sciences a minimum of 6 credits

Students must complete a minimum of two courses totaling at least six credits selected from two of the following six sets of existing courses:

- Set 1 Introduction to Economics or
 Principles of Macroeconomics or
 Principles of Microeconomics or
 Introduction to Economic Analysis
- Set 2 Introduction to Geography
- Set 3 Government and Politics in the United States
- Set 4 Introduction to Psychology
- Set 5 Introduction to Sociology or
 Cultural Anthropology

Appendix C

Set 6 United States History to 1877 or
 United States History since 1877

Humanities 10 credits

Students must complete a 4-credit Introduction to Western Culture to be taught at the freshman/sophomore level. We envision this as an introductory course and invite the Department of History to design and title an appropriate course.¹

Students will then choose two additional courses, one each from two of the following sets. These courses will be taught at the sophomore/junior level and will carry as a prerequisite the course identified above. Students may not use courses from their major to satisfy this requirement. We invite departments to design new courses to meet these requirements.¹

Set 1 Music Appreciation
 History of Art
 Theater and Film

Set 2 Philosophy
 Classics

Set 3 Literature Written in English
 Other Literature in English Translation

Area Studies and Cultural Diversity a minimum of 4 credits

Students must complete two courses totaling at least four credits chosen from among the following:

World Civilizations: China
World Civilizations: Japan
World Civilizations: Southeast Asia
World Civilizations: India
World Civilizations: Near East
World Civilizations: Africa
World Civilizations: Latin America
Social and Cultural Diversity (course or courses to be proposed)¹

Physical Education 1 credit**Additional Observations**

The General Studies Advisory Committee, a committee of faculty members with representatives from all colleges, will review the program continually to ensure that courses meet the goals and standards of the General Education Program. The program is intended to be evolutionary. Departments should be encouraged to propose new courses as necessary to keep pace with rapid changes in a complex society.

We strongly support the oft-reiterated call to reduce the University's reliance on part-time faculty to teach General Studies courses. The conversion this year of part-time sections to full-time faculty positions is a positive first step, and we urge that every effort be made to hire additional full-time faculty.

Appendix C

Notes

1. The General Studies Advisory Council will review all courses proposed to meet General Studies requirements. We encourage departments to take this opportunity to design new courses to meet these requirements. Insofar as possible, we will favor courses designed specifically to meet these requirements, and we will endeavor to keep the list of approved courses short in order to avoid creating a diffuse menu of unrelated offerings.
2. We recognize that some major departments may need to specify requirements that exceed the basic General Studies competency level, especially in Mathematics and Natural Sciences.

Appendix D

RESOLUTION ON PART-TIME FACULTY SALARY RAISES

Whereas, part-time faculty are a much-needed teaching component of the university faculty; and

Whereas, part-time faculty are responsible for 80% of the instruction of the General Studies Courses in the University College, and

Whereas, President Muse publicly stated his opinion (December 1990) that undergraduate teaching needs to be strengthened;; and

Whereas, higher salaries will enable the University to be more competitive in attracting and maintaining qualified part-time instructors; and

Whereas, part-time faculty at the University of Akron are paid at a rate significantly lower than the rates used at the three neighboring universities of Kent, Cleveland State and Youngstown; (See Attachment 1) and

Whereas, in the interest of fairness and equity, the University of Akron's part-time faculty deserve a significant salary increase to establish parity with their colleagues in this part of the state.

Now, therefore, the Faculty Well-Being Committee requests University Council to recommend that President Muse consider granting a substantial salary increase for all part-time faculty effective the 1991-92 school year.

Appendix DPART-TIME SALARY COMPARISONS AMONG NORTHEAST OHIO INSTITUTIONS

1990-91 School year

All data is based on semester hours

Cleveland State	Youngstown State	Kent State	Univ of Akron
Lowest \$562 Sem. Hr.	BA/BS \$637 Sem. Hr.	English Dept. 750	Lec. 1 \$420 Sem. Hr.
			Lec. 2 470 " "
Highest 1500 " "	MA/MS 787 " "	Bus. Adm. 833	Lec. 3 520 " "
			Lec. 4 570 " "
Ave. 1031 " "	PHD. 1050 " "		Lec. 5 620 " "

COMPARISON OF 1990-91 PART-TIME SALARIES AT 9 OHIO UNIVERSITIES FOR MASTER'S DEGREE APP.

INSTITUTION	AVERAGE	RANGE AMONG ALL RANKS
1. Cleveland State University	\$1031 Sem. Hr.	\$562 - 1500
2. Youngstown State University	787 " "	637 - 1050
3. Kent State University	833 Bus. Adm 750 English No campus-wide salary structure	500 - 833
4. Ohio University	772 Sem. Hr. (1989-90 figures)	720 - 885
5. Miami University	700 " "	
6. Bowling Green University	550-650 Sem. Hr.	500 - 825
7. University of Cincinnati	555 " "	525 - 600
8. University of Akron	520 " "	420 - 620
9. University of Toledo	375 " "	
Ohio State University	No salary information available	

Appendix E

Council-Approved Resolution on Salary Allocation
for 1991-92 and Beyond

WHEREAS, the recent survey of faculty indicates that 77.5 percent of the respondents disapprove of the all-merit basis for salary increments and 64 percent of ~~them~~ THE RESPONDENTS prefer a combination of merit/cost-of-living and flat sum by rank.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT COUNCIL URGES THE PRESIDENT TO PROPOSE TO IMPLEMENT A NEW FORMULA OF SALARY ALLOCATION TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES--A FORMULA THAT INCLUDES ACROSS THE BOARD RAISES TO OFFSET COST OF LIVING INCREASES IN ADDITION TO "MERIT" FOR ALL CATEGORIES OF FACULTY, INCLUDING CONTRACT PROFESSIONALS, EFFECTIVE IN THE 1991-92 CONTRACTS.

WE ALSO RECOMMEND THAT THE PRESIDENT APPOINT AN AD HOC COMMITTEE CONSISTING OF ELECTED FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES FROM ALL CATEGORIES OF FACULTY, INCLUDING CONTRACT PROFESSIONALS, ALONG WITH ADMINISTRATORS TO DEVELOP A MORE COMPLEX FORMULA FOR USE IN SUBSEQUENT YEARS THAT INCLUDES "MERIT" AS WELL AS OTHER METHODS OF ALLOCATION DESIGNED TO ADDRESS MAJOR SALARY PROBLEMS.

(Not approved by Council but sent as supplementary
information to the President)

Revision of March 15, 1991

Resolution on Salary Allocation for 1991-92 and Beyond
Prepared by Faculty Well-Being Committee

Whereas, in 1990 both salaries and compensation are a smaller % of total budget than they were in 1988, with salaries being 3.1% less and compensation 2.2% less (see: Attachment I); and

Whereas, faculty load at the University of Akron is the highest among doctoral degree granting institutions in Ohio (see: Attachment II); and

Whereas, the average salary for all ranks at the University of Akron has fallen dramatically from 5th to 10th place among Ohio institutions over the last six years; and

Whereas, the average salary differential between the University of Akron and some leading national research universities is significant (see: Attachment III); and

Whereas the Salary Equity Committee only awarded one tenth of the money set aside by the Board of Trustees for that purpose almost two years ago; and

Whereas, funding has increased for certain athletic programs; and

Whereas, on 4 October 1990, University Council expressed its opposition to further cuts in health care benefits and its wish for significant salary increments next year; and

Whereas, the Ohio Board of Regents is changing the method of subsidy allocation so that the state universities will no longer be underfunded due to the "enrollment lag" in the subsidy formula, which has been detrimental to the University of Akron; and

Whereas, the entire "cost" of funding the cash flow of the ERIP was charged off on the 1988-89 budget (pulling \$9,434,456. from educational and general funds and only \$278,267. from auxiliary enterprises (see Akron 1988-89 Financial Report, pp.26-27) so that the savings and the interest on the savings from the ERIP were available thereafter to improve salaries more significantly than before ERIP (see: Attachment I); and

Whereas, far more than half (specifically, 3 out of 4 general faculty/contract professionals and 3 out of 5 regular faculty full time faculty) of both regular and general faculty have been receiving raises below the level promised in the Five Year Plan for several years past; and

Appendix E,1

Whereas, excellence ought to be rewarded wherever it is--not according to the level of the students whom we teach (see: President Muse in Akron Beacon Journal, 26 December 1990); and

Whereas, when the salary levels of the various colleges as a whole are compared, they reflect current market differences; and

Whereas, we believe that the majority of the faculty would welcome a change in the method of allocating raises; and

Whereas, while four of the state universities of Ohio continue to use the "merit" only method of salary allocation, with three of these having the lowest salaries, all those comparable to the University of Akron in size and mission use a combination of "across the board", "at the base" and "merit"; and

Whereas salary compression is a serious problem for all faculty who are not recent hirees (see: Attachment III, footnote #1 at the bottom of the page: Akron Comparative Figures); and

And whereas, salary problems greatly contribute to morale problems (see: Hertzberg's study of this);

Appendix F

RESOLUTION ON REVISED ELIGIBILITY AND TRANSFERENCE
OF PART-TIME FACULTY FEE REMISSIONS

Whereas, the existing policy for eligibility for part-time faculty fee remission use requires a minimum teaching load of 4 credit hours per semester; and

Whereas, many part-time faculty who are hired to teach only 3 credit hours each semester have requested a change in the eligibility for receiving fee remissions; and

Whereas, many part-time faculty finding themselves unable to use their fee remission for a given semester would like to transfer their fee remission to a qualified dependent; and

Whereas, changing this eligibility and adding transferability would potentially increase student enrollment at all levels of study.

Now, therefore, the Faculty Well-Being Committee requests University Council to recommend that President Muse grant this change in eligibility to allow part-time faculty teaching 3 credit hours any semester to use the single course fee remission with the existing limitations of time eligibility to remain the same.

Additionally, the Faculty Well-Being Committee requests University Council to recommend that President Muse allow the transfer of the single course fee remission of the part-time faculty member to a qualified dependent. All existing limitations on the number of credits allowed and time eligibility to remain the same.

The
University
of Akron

Appendix G

DATE MARCH 15, 1991
TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MEMBERS
FROM REFERENCE COMMITTEE, JUNE G. PATTON, CHAIR
SUBJECT RADIATION SAFETY

THE REFERENCE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDS THAT THE ATTACHED RADIATION SAFETY GUIDELINES BE INCLUDED IN THE FACULTY MANUAL AS RULE #3359-20-059.

THE UNIVERSITY RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE, DR. L.L. CHYI- CHAIR,

HAS REQUESTED INCLUSION OF THE ATTACHED MATERIAL IN THE MANUAL.

MICHAEL D. SERMERSHEIM REVIEWED THE RULE FOR LEGAL FORM AND SUFFICIENCY AND HAS FOUND THE MATERIAL TO BE LEGALLY ACCEPTABLE.

Appendix G**OGC Draft 1-7-91**3359- 20 - 059**RADIATION SAFETY****(A) RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE**

- (1) A UNIVERSITY RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE (URSC) OF AT LEAST FIVE MEMBERS SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST. MEMBERS OF THE URSC SHALL BE APPOINTED FOR TERMS OF FIVE YEARS. EACH MEMBER SHALL SERVE AT THE PLEASURE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
- (2) THE URSC SHALL DEVELOP POLICIES AND PROGRAMS, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST, RELATING TO RADIATION SAFETY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON CONSISTENT WITH APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS.
- (3) THE UNIVERSITY RADIATION SAFETY OFFICER SHALL BE A PERMANENT MEMBER OF THE URSC.
- (4) THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST SHALL DEVELOP GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES FOR RADIATION SAFETY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON, BASED UPON NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REQUIREMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE URSC. UNLESS OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY LAW OR APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, THE URSC SHALL REVIEW ANNUALLY SUCH GUIDELINES AND RECOMMEND SUCH CHANGES AS ARE APPROPRIATE AND NECESSARY.

(B) RADIATION SAFETY OFFICER

A RADIATION SAFETY OFFICER (RSO) SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT TO IMPLEMENT THE RADIATION SAFETY PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON. THE RSO SHALL ENSURE THAT RADIATION SAFETY ACTIVITIES ARE PERFORMED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON IN ACCORDANCE WITH APPROVED PROCEDURES AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS IN THE DAILY OPERATION OF THE UNIVERSITY'S BYPRODUCT MATERIAL PROGRAM.

(C) DUTIES

THE RSO IS CHARGED WITH THE FOLLOWING DUTIES:

- (1) INVESTIGATE OVEREXPOSURE, ACCIDENTS, SPILLS, LOSSES, THEFTS, UNAUTHORIZED RECEIPTS, USES, TRANSFERS, DISPOSAL, MISADMINISTRATION, AND OTHER DEVIATIONS FROM APPROVED RADIATION SAFETY PRACTICE AND IMPLEMENT CORRECTIVE ACTIONS AS NECESSARY.
- (2) ESTABLISH AND IMPLEMENT, IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE UNIVERSITY RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE, WRITTEN POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR:

- (a) AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF BYPRODUCT MATERIAL;
 - (b) RECEIVING AND OPENING PACKAGES OF BYPRODUCT MATERIAL;
 - (c) STORING BYPRODUCT MATERIAL;
 - (d) KEEPING AN INVENTORY RECORD OF BYPRODUCT MATERIAL;
 - (e) USING BYPRODUCT MATERIAL SAFELY;
 - (f) TAKING EMERGENCY ACTION IF CONTROL OF BYPRODUCT MATERIAL IS LOST;
 - (g) PERFORMING PERIODIC RADIATION SURVEYS;
 - (h) PERFORMING CHECKS ON SURVEY INSTRUMENTS AND OTHER SAFETY EQUIPMENT;
 - (i) DISPOSAL OF BYPRODUCT MATERIAL;
 - (j) TRAINING PERSONNEL WHO WORK IN OR FREQUENT AREAS WHERE BYPRODUCT MATERIAL IS USED OR STORED; AND
 - (k) KEEPING A COPY OF ALL RECORDS AND REPORTS REQUIRED BY NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGULATIONS, A COPY OF THESE REGULATIONS, A COPY OF EACH LICENSING REQUEST AND LICENSE AND AMENDMENTS, AND THE WRITTEN POLICY AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED BY THE REGULATIONS.
 - (1) IMPLEMENT DECISIONS OF THE URSC.
- (3) REPORT DIRECTLY TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
- (4) PROVIDE A WRITTEN BRIEFING TO THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST ON AN ANNUAL BASIS ON THE BYPRODUCT MATERIAL PROGRAM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON. IN ADDITION, THE RSO SHALL MAKE MONTHLY REPORTS OF HIS ACTIVITIES TO THE URSC.
- (5) ESTABLISH PERSONNEL EXPOSURE INVESTIGATIONAL LEVELS THAT, WHEN EXCEEDED, WILL INITIATE AN INVESTIGATION BY THE RADIATION SAFETY OFFICER OF THE CAUSE OF THE EXPOSURE.
- (6) ESTABLISH PERSONNEL EXPOSURE INVESTIGATIONAL LEVELS THAT, WHEN EXCEEDED, WILL INITIATE A PROMPT INVESTIGATION BY THE RADIATION SAFETY OFFICER OF THE CAUSE OF THE EXPOSURE AND A CONSIDERATION OF ACTIONS THAT MIGHT BE TAKEN TO REDUCE THE PROBABILITY OF RECURRENCE.
- (7) APPROVE OR DISAPPROVE MINOR CHANGES IN RADIATION OR RADIATION SAFETY PROCEDURES THAT ARE NOT POTENTIALLY IMPORTANT TO SAFETY WITH THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE UNIVERSITY RADIATION SAFETY COMMITTEE AND THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST.
- (D) COMPLIANCE WITH RADIATION SAFETY LAWS AND REGULATIONS
- (1) ALL UNIVERSITY PERSONNEL SHALL COOPERATE FULLY WITH THE UNIVERSITY RADIATION SAFETY OFFICER.
 - (2) NO RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL, MACHINES, OR DEVICES CONTAINING OR PRODUCING ANY RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS OR PRODUCING ANY RADIATION WHATSOEVER, SHALL BE DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY

BROUGHT ONTO THE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS, WAYNE COLLEGE, OR ANY PROPERTY OWNED, LEASED, OPERATED BY THE UNIVERSITY WITHOUT FIRST RECEIVING CLEARANCE FROM THE RSO.

- (3) VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL, STATE, OR UNIVERSITY REGULATIONS OR ANY LAWS RESPECTING RADIATION SAFETY WILL BE CONSIDERED SERIOUS MATTERS WHICH MAY WARRANT LOSS OF APPLICABLE LICENSE PRIVILEGES, FINES OR MORE SERIOUS ACTION AS THE SITUATION MAY WARRANT.

rom. Under: 111.15
ule Amp.: Ch. 3359

Appendix H**CURRICULUM****Curriculum Changes:**

AS-91-2	ED-91-6	EN-91-1	FAA-91-10	WC-91-1
AS-91-3	ED-91-8	EN-91-2	FAA-91-29	WC-91-3
AS-91-4	ED-91-9	EN-91-4	FAA-91-35	WC-91-4
AS-91-5	ED-91-10	EN-91-13	FAA-91-37	WC-91-5
AS-91-6	ED-91-11	EN-91-14	FAA-91-39	WC-91-6
AS-91-7	ED-91-12	EN-91-17	FAA-91-45	WC-91-7
AS-91-8	ED-91-13	EN-91-18	FAA-91-46	WC-91-8
AS-91-20	ED-91-14	EN-91-21	FAA-91-47	
AS-91-24	ED-91-15	EN-91-22	FAA-91-59	
	ED-91-16	EN-91-32	FAA-91-60	
AS-91-9	ED-91-17	EN-91-34	FAA-91-61	
	ED-91-18	EN-91-35	FAA-91-62	
	ED-91-19	EN-91-36		
	ED-91-20	EN-91-37		
	ED-91-21	EN-91-39		
	ED-91-22	EN-91-41		
	ED-91-23	EN-91-46		
	ED-91-24	EN-91-52		

TRANSFER MODULE
The University of Akron

DRAFT

The Transfer Module is designed to aid students who may consider transferring to another state assisted institution in Ohio after first matriculating at The University of Akron.

The academic areas and specific courses listed below are used to fulfill a Subset (36 cr hrs) of The University of Akron 39 semester credit, General Studies Curriculum.

ENGLISH/SPEECH (11 credits)

(Minimum of 8 credits of English, with emphasis on written composition and a literature component plus 3 credits in a Speech performance course)

*1100:111	English Composition I	(4)**
*1100:112	English Composition II	(4)
*2020:121	English	(4)**
*1100:105	Intro. to Public Speaking	(3)
*1100:106	Effective Oral Communications	(3)

****Equivalent Courses**

MATHEMATICS (3 credits)

*3450:113-138	Modern University Mathematics	(1 cr each)
*3450:145	College Algebra	(4)
*3450:149	Precalculus Math	(4)
3450:211	Calculus for the Life Sciences I	(3)
3450:215	Concepts of Calculus I	(4)
*3470:253-7	Intro to Statistics	(1 cr each)
*3470:260	Basic Statistics	(3)
*3470:261	Introductory Statistics I	(2)
	and	
3470:262	Introductory Statistics II	(2)
2030:141	Math for Data Processing I	(4)
	and	
2030:142	Math for Data Processing II	(3)
2030:152	Elements of Math II	(2)
	and	
2030:153	Elements of Math III	(2)

SOCIAL SCIENCE (6 credits)

*1100:115	Institutions in the U.S.	(3)
*1100:116	Institutions in the U.S.	(3)

OR

Two courses selected from two different sets of the following courses:

* Introductory Courses

Set I

*3250:100	Introduction to Economics	(3)
3250:244	Intro to Econ Analysis	(3)
3250:201	Prin of Macroeconomics	(3)
3250:202	Prin of Microeconomics	(3)
*2020:247	Survey of Basic Economics	(3)

Set II

*3700:100	Govt & Politics in the U.S.	(4)
-----------	-----------------------------	-----

Set III

*3850:100	Introduction to Sociology	(4)
*3870:150	Cultural Anthropology	(4)
*2020:242	American Urban Society	(3)

Set IV

3400:201	U.S. History to 1877	(4)
3400:202	U.S. History since 1877	(4)

NATURAL SCIENCE (6 credits)

The science requirement can be fulfilled by taking six credits from the following list of non-laboratory courses or either laboratory or non-laboratory courses from the Biology (3100), Chemistry (3150), Geology (3370), Physics (3650) Departments or basic courses in the Departments of Chemical Technology (2840) or General Technology (2820).

Non-Lab Courses (see note below)

*1100:221	Natural Science Biology	(3)
*1100:222	Natural Science Chemistry	(3)
*1100:223	Natural Science Geology	(3)
*1100:224	Natural Science Physics	(3)
3100:105	Introduction to Ecology	(2)
3150:124	Chemistry	(3)
*3370:100	Earth Science	(3)
3370:200	Environmental Geology	(3)
*3650:130	Descriptive Astronomy	(3)
*3650:133	Music, Sound and Physics	(3)
*3650:137	Light	(3)
*3650:141	Physics, Energy and Man	(3)
*3650:160	Physics in Sports	(3)

Please note: Students should consult the "accepting" institution regarding the necessity of transferring at least one (1) lab science course.

Lab Courses

2820:151	Basic Physics: Mechanics	(3)
2820:152	Basic Physics: Electricity & Magnetism	(2)
2820:153	Basic Physics: Heat, Light and Sound	(2)
*2840:100	Basic Chemistry	(3)
2840:101	Introductory Chemistry	(3)
*3100:100	Nature Study: Plants	(3)
*3100:101	Nature Study: Animals	(3)
*3100:111	Principles of Biology	(4)
*3100:130	Principles of Microbiology	(3)
*3100:206/208	Human Anatomy & Physiology	(4)
3150:121	Inorganic Chemistry I	(3)
3150:129	Introduction to Gen. Organic and Biochemistry I	(4)
3150:132	Principles of Chemistry I	(4)
3370:101	Introductory Physical Geology	(4)
3650:261	Physics for Life Science I	(4)
3650:291	Elementary Classical Physics I	(4)

ARTS/HUMANITIES (10 credits)

(Completion of 8 credits Western Cultural Traditions and 2 credits Eastern Civilizations fulfills this requirement)

1100:320	Western Cultural Traditions	(4)
1100:321	Western Cultural Traditions	(4)
1100:330	Eastern Civilization: China	(2)
1100:331	Eastern Civilization: Japan	(2)
1100:332	Eastern Civilization: S.E.Asia	(2)
1100:333	Eastern Civilization: India	(2)
1100:334	Eastern Civilization: Near East	(2)
1100:335	EAstern Civilization: Africa	(2)

Completion of a "Transfer Module" at another institution will fulfill 36 credits of the 39 credit hour General Studies Curriculum at The University of Akron.

The remaining areas would include a 1 credit Physical Education requirement and a second 2 credit course under the Eastern Civilization category.

CURRICULUM CHANGE CIRCULATION

One complete set mailed to each of the 12 collegiate dean's offices.

One complete set available in the Provost's Office.

One complete set available in Bierce Library.

One complete set available in the Science and Technology Library.

(Total mailing - 15 complete sets of proposals)

One complete set of Long Form proposals only will also be made available to members of the Curriculum Subcommittee of APCC (n=16).

A list of proposals (5-6 page document) sent to:

All collegiate dean's offices (n=12)

All members of University Council (n=71) (excluding
collegiate deans)

All department heads and division chairs (n=50)

Members of APCC WHO ARE NOT ON University Council (n=10)

(Total mailing - 143 copies listing proposals)

Appendix K

REPEATING COURSES *

Any course may be repeated ~~as many times as necessary~~ TWICE by an undergraduate student subject to the following conditions:

- To secure a grade ("A-F") or a grade of "NC," "CR" or "AUD," a student may repeat a course in which the previously received grade was "C-," "D+," "D," "D-" "F," "AUD" or "NC." Registrations under the "CR/NC" option are subject to the restrictions in the "CR/NC" policy.
- ~~The student must repeat the same course within 12 months of the completion of the prior attempt.~~ With the dean's permission, a student may ~~extend this period or~~ substitute another course if the previous course is no longer offered. Courses must be repeated at The University of Akron.
- Grades for all attempts at a course will appear on the student's official academic record.
- Only the grade for the last attempt will be used in the graduation grade-point average.
- All grades for attempts at a course will be used in grade-point calculation for the purpose of determining graduation with honors and class standing.
- For purposes of this section, credit for this course or its equivalent will apply only once toward meeting degree requirements.

* Effective for all new students entering for the Fall 1991 and for all other University students beginning Fall 1992.

Amended by the Policy and Calendar Subcommittee 2/26/91

Amended and approved by APCC on 3/12/91

Appendix L**WITHDRAWAL POLICY****Current Withdrawal Policy**

A student may withdraw from a course up to the midpoint of the course with the signature of his adviser. After the midpoint of a course, a student must have the written approval of both the course instructor and the adviser. Such approval must be dated and processed through the offices of the Registrar and the Cashier prior to the final examination period. Should the instructor or adviser refuse to sign the withdrawal form, the student may appeal to the dean of the student's college, who shall make the final decision after consultation with the instructor and adviser who declined to approve the withdrawal.

An approved withdrawal will be indicated on the University official academic record by a WNY. A student who leaves a course without going through the withdrawal procedure will be given an NY in the course.

PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL POLICY

A student may withdraw from a course without an adviser's or course instructor's signature through the 14th day of a semester or comparable dates during summer session, intersession, etc. After the 14th day of a semester, and up to the midpoint of a semester, a student may withdraw from a course with the signature of the student's adviser.

After the midpoint of a semester, a student must have the signature of both the course instructor and the adviser. Such authorization must be dated and processed through the offices of the Registrar and Cashier no later than the last day of the 12th week of classes or comparable dates during summer session, intersession, etc.

Should the instructor or the adviser refuse to sign the withdrawal form, the student may appeal to the dean of the student's college, who shall make the final decision after consultation with the instructor or adviser who declined to approve the withdrawal.

An approved withdrawal will be indicated on the University official academic record by a "WD." A student who leaves a course without going through the withdrawal procedure will be given a grade of "F."

Effective Date: Fall 1991

