

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

5-1-1975

Faculty Senate Chronicle May 1, 1975

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.

AU Chronicle

a report to the faculty of
the university of akron



1974-75, No. 8 (23 pages)

May 1, 1975

COMMENCEMENT AND COMMISSIONING

The 103rd annual June Commencement will be held at Blossom Center on Sunday afternoon, June 15, 1975, at 3 p. m. The Honorable John T. Dunlop, United States Secretary of Labor, will address the graduates and receive an honorary degree.

The 22nd annual Joint Army and Air Force Commissioning Exercises will take place on Saturday morning, June 14, at 11 a. m. in John S. Knight Auditorium. General Russell E. Dougherty, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command, will address and commission the new Second Lieutenants, and be awarded an honorary doctorate.

The second annual Alumni Award for Outstanding Teaching on campus will be presented at the traditional Alumni Banquet to be held Saturday evening, June 14, at 6 p. m. in the Student Center.

FACULTY RECOGNITION LUNCHEON

The annual Faculty Recognition Luncheon, honoring those who retire this year, will be held in the Student Center on May Day, May 16, 1975, at 12:30 p. m. All faculty are invited to attend this friendly and informal occasion, which this year will honor Dr. Clare Bedillion, Dr. Peter Hampton, Mr. Robert W. Larson, Dr. Estelle Naes and Miss Evelyn Tovey. Reservations may be sent to Mrs. Jane Watkins in the Community and Technical College by May 9. Dr. C. F. Poston is chairman.

OHIO BOARD OF REGENTS

Mr. Marvin L. Warner of Cincinnati has been elected chairman of the Ohio Board of Regents, succeeding Mr. John Marshall Briley who resigned in March, moving to Connecticut.

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

Meeting

Regular meeting, May 15, 1975, in Leigh Hall 307, 3 p. m. (organization of new membership for 1975-76).

Current Change in Membership

Mr. David Grant, the new president of the Student Bar Association, succeeds Mr. William Sremack on Council.

Standing Committees for 1975-76

The Procedural Committee of University Council invites all faculty members to inform the Vice President for Academic Affairs by June 9 of any standing committee on which they would be interested in serving. The Procedural Committee will consider these assignments after Commencement. Announcement of membership will be made in advance of the fall 1975 quarter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Adjourned Regular Meetings of University Council (from March 20, 1975), April 3, 1975	Page 2
(from March 20 and April 3, 1975), April 17, 1975	Page 8
Resolution on Student Ombudsman (adopted April 17, 1975)	Page 9
Amendment to Honors Program (minutes of April 3, 1975)	Page 3
Appendix to Minutes of Meeting of April 17, 1975	
Report of Advisory Committee to Chancellor	Page 15
Curriculum Changes	Page 18

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from March 20, 1975),
April 3, 1975.

The adjourned regular meeting of the University Council (from March 20, 1975) was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:05 p. m. on Thursday, April 3, 1975, in Leigh Hall (Business Administration Building) 307.

Forty-eight of the 66 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Mr. M. d'Amico, Dr. J. W. Dunlap, Dr. D. J. Guzzetta, Mr. K. Gwyn, Mr. D. Jamison, Dr. C. Poston, Mr. H. P. Schrank, Jr., Dr. F. Schultz, Mr. R. Shedlarz and Dr. R. Zangrando. Others absent were Mr. C. Baker, Miss S. DiStefano, Mr. D. Jenkins, Dr. I. MacGregor, Dr. M. Moore, Dr. A. Noble, Mr. W. Sremack, and Mrs. A. West. Dr. R. Bruce Holland, a member of the committee to draft the Honors Program, was also in attendance.

In continuing the agenda from March 20, Council first considered the retyped draft of the Honors Program as amended that day.

Dr. Gerlach noted that in Article VII, the second sentence, the word "shall" should have been "may". He then moved to amend the balance of the "First" paragraph in Article VII by substituting the following for the original items listed as "1.", "2." and "3.":

- "1. Credit by examination.
2. Credit awarded for satisfactory achievement (as defined by present University policies) on high school advanced placement tests and various other achievement tests (e.g. CLEP, SAT and ACT) to a maximum of 30 credit hours."

The motion was seconded.

Dr. Gerlach explained that the committee was concerned with the generality of original Item 3. Although he felt the original concept of the Honors Program was for enrichment rather than acceleration, the proposed amendment represented a compromise.

Dr. Hart, while in agreement with the proposed new Item 1, moved to amend the proposed amendment by changing Item 2 to read "include CLEP and examinations administered under department rules." [This would not include high school advanced placement.] Dr. Gerlach would not accept this amendment. It was put to a vote and failed.

Dean Griffin stated that he did not consider SAT and ACT tests appropriate for advanced placement and felt that such recognition should be restricted to CLEP. He then moved to delete SAT and ACT from proposed Item 2. The motion was seconded.

A discussion ensued regarding the University's policies on advanced placement and advanced standing; on the ways to obtain credit (bypassed credits, examination, etc.); on a possibility of providing sections in freshman English for honors students, etc. Dr. Hart reiterated his belief that an Honors Program was not designed to enable students to get out of college faster, but to intensify their education. Dr. Holland questioned unlimited acceleration and declared that college is a learning process and not, as someone had said about the Louvre, to go through on roller skates. Mr. Pernice advocated leaving some decision on acceleration to the students in the Honors Program, as they would be exceptional.

The motion to delete SAT and ACT from proposed Item 2 was put to a vote and carried.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20/75), 4/3/75

The motion made by Dr. Gerlach, as amended above, was put to a vote and carried. The first part of Article VII of the proposed Honors Program now reads:

"First, the honors student shall have earned the normal total of credit hours required for the baccalaureate degree. The honors student's progress toward his objective may be accelerated by:

1. Credit by examination.
2. Credit awarded for satisfactory achievement (as defined by present University policies) on high school advanced placement tests and various other achievement tests (e.g. CLEP) to a maximum of 30 credit hours."

Mr. Finan opined that there were discrepancies throughout the Honors Program document in the use of "shall" and its implications of duty and necessity. He advocated returning the document to the Reference Committee.

Dr. Leathers explained that Mr. Finan's intent was to have the language more precise, but he said that the Program could now be adopted and then referred to the Reference Committee for any changes which would not be substantive.

Dr. Gerlach opposed sending the document to the Reference Committee inasmuch as the Honors Program Committee had systematically used the word, "shall", with purpose. He said that they would be glad to correct any inconsistencies, but he thought the changes should be made by the original drafting committee.

Dr. Leathers urged the Council to vote on the Honors Program and refer afterward.

Mr. Edminister moved for a roll call vote. The motion was seconded and carried.

The roll call vote on the Honors Program, as follows, approved the proposal, 39 to 4:

<u>For the Honors Program</u>		<u>Against the Honors Program</u>	
R. Adams	J. Gwinn	M. Pernice	T. Brittain
H.K. Barker	M.G. Harrington	I. Pfeiffer	J. Edminister
B. Bayless	A. Hart	H. Pinnick	R. Hansford
J. Bee	H. Hollingsworth	W. Rogers	L. Sugarman
P. Bomar	D. Jackson	C. Salem	
C. Carrino	J. Lenczyk	S. Samad	
D. Dilley	H. Livingston	R. Sandefur	
D. Dobrindt	G. Makar	W. Sterling	
D. Dolan	M. Mason	P. Stuyvesant	
J. Finan	R.P. Merrix	T. Sumner	
B. Frye	R. Mravetz	J. Watt	
D. Gerlach	E. Naes	R. Weyrick	
C. Griffin	R. Oetjen	C. Wood	

Mr. Finan moved that the Honors Program document be referred to the original drafting committee for further consideration of the language. The motion was seconded and carried.

Honor

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20/75), 4/3/75

Dr. Gerlach expressed his appreciation for the opportunity of serving on a committee which had accomplished something of reasonable merit. He thanked the committee and especially Dr. Holland for writing the draft and Dr. Lepke for all his work. He was grateful to the Council for adopting the final amendment which, despite his disappointment in the reduced language requirement, was a significant compromise in the acceptance of the total Program. He said it was a pleasure to work with the committee whose members saw eye to eye.

The Council then considered the proposal from the Academic Policies Committee which had been first presented on February 20, 1975 to the Council:

"Any student who completed 12 quarter credit hours in any particular quarter, or any part-time student who completes 12 quarter credit hours in two succeeding quarters, with a quality point grade, i.e., A, B, C, D, F and obtains a 3.5000 quality point average will appear on the Dean's List of the College in which he is enrolled."

Mrs. Sugarman opposed penalizing students in a College where standards are maintained citing that in Engineering and Business Administration this rule would create a hardship.

It was clarified for Dr. Roberts that this policy pertained only to undergraduate students.

Dr. Watt pointed out that a change in the "cum laude" requirement had been defeated, and if this proposal for the Dean's List was adopted, a student could graduate "cum laude" and never be on the Dean's List.

Dean Carrino spoke against the proposed change and said that if there are now too many high grades, the matter should be approached from the other end, and grades should be lowered. If the proposal passed, he foresaw a further erosion of integrity.

Mr. Edminister praised the Buchtelite article on the subject and observed that there were too many inconsistencies among the Colleges in grade requirements. He said this proposal would be unreasonably hard on engineers and he opposed it.

Dr. Hart advocated that the criteria for Dean's Lists be determined by each College.

The motion to change the requirements for the Dean's List was put to a vote and failed.

Dr. Hart then moved that each College Faculty determine the quality point average for its Dean's List. The motion was seconded. Dr. Gerlach moved to amend by changing "Faculty" to "Dean". The motion was seconded.

Deans Oetjen and Barker both strongly stated that the Dean's List recognition should be a universitywide standard. Dr. Mravetz also opposed the amendment, observing that if the Colleges could make that decision, then why not determine their own grading values, such as 90 or 93 lower limit for an "A", etc. He felt this was a universitywide matter.

Dr. Sumner noted that the General College did not even have a faculty per se, and he was against the motion. Dr. Carrino also advocated defeat of the proposal as he considered the List appropriately designated for the entire University and there could be too many disparities in criteria among the Deans.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20/75), 4/3/75

The motion to amend the proposed change in Dr. Hart's motion on the Dean's Lists was put to a vote and failed.

The motion to permit the Dean's List requirements to be determined by each College was put to a vote and failed.

The next item on the Council agenda was consideration of the proposed change in the Drop Policy as presented by the Academic Policies Committee at the February 20, 1975 meeting of Council, which read as follows:

"On the initiative of the instructor, a student may be withdrawn from a course by his/her dean, after the latter has consulted with the student and the instructor, for the following reasons:

The student's attendance is violative of the standards of attendance established by the instructor

or

The student's conduct in the classroom is disruptive

or

When such withdrawal is recommended by competent medical authority."

Dean Hansford explained that a "drop" was failing, but "withdrawn" meant no grade; that the category "illness" did not belong with the first two categories, "excessive absence" and "disruption". Dr. Carrino opposed the change, citing problems with mental illness. Dr. Watt pointed out that the purpose of the proposal was to clarify the policies for the instructor and give him the initiative and protection in these situations.

Dr. Roberts suggested changing the name of the policy from "Drop" to "Withdrawn", because of the grade involved.

Mr. Pernice thought that action relative to "disruptive" was covered in the Student Disciplinary Procedures.

Dr. Bee moved that the middle provision be deleted, which read: "The student's conduct in the classroom is disruptive". The motion was seconded. He said there was no clear criterion for "disruptive" ... a subjective gray area between instructor and student.

Dean Samad did not consider the Student Disciplinary Procedures useable in this instance. He felt that the proposal provided due process and an easier alternative to #1219.

When Mr. Mason thought that the University had no choice but to use #1219, Dean Hansford reminded Council that a person must be arrested before invoking #1219.

Dr. Frye felt that the instructor needed the protection of the "disruptive" clause, while Mr. Salem observed that he had never been unable to handle any comparable situation individually in a class, and that he favored Dr. Bee's amendment.

At this point Dr. Leathers invited Dr. Gerlach as president pro tem to assume the chair, so that the chairman could comment on the issue.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20/75), 4/3/75

Dr. Leathers then reiterated the difference between an "F" and a "Withdrawn", and how there were advantages in this procedure to preclude necessity of arrest under #1219. This proposal provides a built-in review process and does not unduly penalize a student, while it also offers protection to the instructor in the classroom.

Dr. Merrix asked about a definition of "disruptive" and thought that a dean or professor should not have authority to withdraw a student who might only have had a difference of opinion.

Dean Barker said that a dean would follow an instructor's recommendation, and if the student wishes to appeal he has the right to go to the Academic Vice President and then to the President. He said this illustrated the danger of an individual's right being given more consideration than the rights of the many in the classroom. He added that there is often too great an emphasis on the individual at the expense of the many.

Dr. Hart lamented the possibility of such excluding a student from knowledge, although he acknowledged that class rights should also be protected.

Dean Carrino cited instances in evening classes where the rights of the many had to be protected while handling the individual, and he thought the original proposal provided this latitude without undue punishment.

Dean Rogers emphasized that this proposal from Academic Policies was a way to give the faculty members rights and mechanism to protect themselves and was not intended to put students in a bad light. He also commented that for the 25 percent of the faculty who are part-time, this would help them understand their prerogatives.

Mr. Pernice thought that Security would provide protection from unusual disruptions.

Dr. Roberts raised the question of academically disruptive students who don't belong in a class because of inadequate background. He did not want the "disruptive" clause deleted.

Mrs. Sugarman suggested changing "disruptive" to "unruly".

Dr. Hart moved to amend Dr. Bee's proposed amendment by adding after "disruptive", "which could be considered as violation of Resolution 14-69 of the University Board of Trustees". The motion was not seconded.

On voice vote of Dr. Bee's motion, the Chair declared it carried. Mr. Hollingsworth called for a division of the house, which on hand vote showed that Dr. Bee's motion lost 10 to 23.

Dr. Hart then moved to strike "The student's conduct in the classroom is disruptive" and replace it with "when student's conduct in the classroom is in violation of The University of Akron Board of Trustees Resolution 14-69". The motion was seconded.

Dean Hansford stated that this automatically calls for use of the Student Disciplinary Procedures. But Dr. Merrix thought that keeping in the "disruptive" clause might act against the students.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20/75), 4/3/75

It was observed by Dr. Gwinn that one adviser can sign a student into a class, but he wondered how many the faculty now think are needed to sign him out! Mr. Pernice thought that this amendment would subvert the students' rights under #1219.

Dr. Wood opined that the proposed amendment would weaken the instructor's authority in the classroom and would actually encourage student's disruptions.

The motion to substitute Resolution 14-69 was put to a voice vote and failed.

Dr. Barker, in the interest of clarifying "disruptive", moved to add to the sentence after "disruptive": "and seriously interferes with normal classroom procedures." The motion was seconded.

Dr. Bee asked what degree of disruption would be "serious". He thought that regulations should be evenly applied. Dean Carrino opined that an instructor can make good rational judgments and should be able to evaluate disruptions as well as he is qualified to grade each student.

Dean Hansford pointed out that this provision is to protect the greater number of students from individual disruptions, and often there is no time to get other help or to reach a higher administrative official for evaluation, as in instances of a problem occurring over a longer period. Whereas a student might be temporarily suspended, this does not preclude further investigation, and a student still has the right of appeal after leaving a class.

Mr. Mason cited certain provisions of Student Disciplinary Procedures.

Mr. Pernice advocated adopting the proposals and going on to further business.

Dean Barker's amendment was put to a vote and carried.

Mr. Salem opposed the entire "Drop Policy" as proposed. He said "Withdrawal" was too easy for a disruptive student and he would rather give him an "F". Dr. Hart, who admitted to being sensitive to problems in the classroom, also noted that Security and City Police were available. He thought the proposed policy was redundant and unnecessary.

Dr. Jackson moved to amend the proposal by adding, "Such action shall be recorded on the student's record as 'F' in Items 1 and 2, and as 'W' in Item 3." The motion was not seconded.

Dr. Bee moved to commit the amended proposed "Drop Policy" to the Academic Policies, Curriculum and Calendar Committee for further consideration. The motion was seconded and carried.

The Vice President for Academic Affairs then assumed the chair.

Dr. Hart moved that a special meeting of Council be held on April 24 for the exclusive purpose of discussing the amended revised draft of the Faculty Manual (of 1/6/75), and Parts II and III of the November 1972 Ad Hoc Committee Report on the Faculty Manual. The motion was seconded.

Dean Oetjen suggested that the current unfinished agenda be used for the regularly scheduled meeting of University Council on Thursday, April 17, and then if there is still unfinished business, another meeting date could be determined. Dr. Leathers concurred.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20/75), 4/3/75

Dr. Gerlach moved that today's meeting be adjourned to continue its agenda on April 17, 1975. The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Merrix suggested holding the date of April 24 tentatively for possible special meeting to consider any other leftover items.

The meeting was adjourned at 5 p.m.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from March 20 and April 3, 1975), April 17, 1975.

The adjourned regular meeting of the University Council (from March 20 and April 3, 1975) was called to order by the Chairman, Vice President Noel Leathers, at 3:05 p.m. on Thursday, April 17, 1975, in Leigh Hall 307.

Fifty-three of the 66 members of Council were present. Those absent with notice were Mr. C. Baker, Mrs. P. Bomar, Miss D. Dobrindt, Dr. J. W. Dunlap, Dr. D. Gerlach, Dr. C. Griffin, Dr. D. J. Guzzetta, Mr. H. Paul Schrank and Dr. R. Zangrando. Others absent were Mr. J. Finan, Mr. D. Jenkins, Dr. J. Richardson and Dr. T. Sumner. Also present were Miss Lyn Chalfant and Mr. Matt Pugliese, who had requested permission to speak for the Associated Student Government on the pending Student Ombudsman proposal.

Dr. Leathers introduced Mr. David Grant, President of the Student Bar Association, who succeeds Mr. William Sremack on the University Council.

The first item to be considered on the resumed agenda was the Minority Report from the Academic Policies Committee meeting of February 13, 1975. Dr. Hart informed Council that Dr. Gerlach, author of the report, was out of town and he asked Council's courtesy in postponing the discussion to the next regular meeting of Council, and so moved. The motion was seconded and carried.

Continuing with reports of the Standing Committees, the Chairman called upon Dr. Barker for the Athletics Committee. He said that the committee was taking a survey of faculty, students and alumni to determine the future role of athletics at The University of Akron.

In the absence of the chairman of the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee, Dr. J. Richardson, who was out of town, Dr. Hart moved that Council approve the resolution presented at the February 20, 1975 meeting of Council, and the motion was seconded. The resolution, as previously recorded, reads:

"All members of the University community shall cooperate with the Committee on Faculty Rights and Responsibilities by making available to committee members appointed to serve as an investigating subcommittee all material pertinent to a faculty complaint that the committee has deemed worthy of investigation. In no case will a faculty member from the same college as the complainant be appointed to serve on an investigating subcommittee. In reporting to the full committee, the investigating subcommittee will take all necessary precautions to preserve the confidentiality of material reviewed."

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20 and 4/3/75),
4/17/75, continued

Dean Oetjen said that this would seem to preclude keeping material confidential and would impose a handicap on requesting and receiving material when it might be necessary to guarantee its complete confidentiality.

Dr. Merrix thought that the President had issued an order to administrators to make any pertinent material available in similar instances, which could include letters of recommendation. Mr. Shedlarz noted that the resolution did not guarantee confidentiality and he also raised the point of subpoena. Dr. Leathers suggested that the subcommittee might attempt to camouflage its sources. Dean Samad refuted Dr. Merrix's statement, opining that the President had only authorized faculty members to see their own faculty records if desired. He also observed a lack of clarity as to who would decide "pertinancy"...the courts, the President, or ? Dr. Merrix replied that the Grievance Procedures provided for the matter covered in the proposed Resolution. Dean Samad recommended, in that instance, that any further resolution would be unnecessary and should be voted down.

Dr. Brittain considered the statement in the Grievance Procedures as clear, but that since the committee still has some trouble in obtaining some information it needs, this resolution was introduced.

The motion to adopt the Resolution from the Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee was put to a vote and carried.

Dr. Moore, on behalf of the Faculty Well-Being Committee, reported that the members were working on the Financial Exigency Statement, and had circulated their amended and updated version on March 18, with open hearings held on April 8. Some had attended these hearings, and the committee was currently considering their comments.

The subcommittee of the Library and Learning Resources Committee, according to Dr. Pfeiffer, was working on the budget and holding hearings.

In Dr. Griffin's absence, there was no report from the Research (Faculty Projects) Committee, but the statement of awards made by the committee for the period from December 4, 1974 to March 13, 1975 appeared in the April 1975 AU Chronicle.

Dean Hansford informed the Council that the Student Affairs Committee had met on April 11 and had circulated to Council the revised resolution regarding a University Student Ombudsman. He then moved that the University Council authorize the establishment of the Office of Student Ombudsman. The motion was seconded. The statement follows:

BE IT RESOLVED: That the University Council authorize the establishment of the Office of Student Ombudsman.

1. The University of Akron shall have an Ombudsman to serve the student body. The Ombudsman shall have direct access to the President of the University, functioning as an independent agent for the betterment of the University.
2. The functions of the Ombudsman shall include:
 - a) to resolve individual student concerns that may arise between the student and/or anyone in the University exercising authority;

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20 and 4/3/75),
4/17/75, continued

- b) the Ombudsman shall also examine existing University procedures encountered in the process of dealing with students, suggest alternative procedures where warranted, and send such suggestions through proper channels and copies of all such suggestions directly to the President of the University;
 - c) disseminating information in response to student requests.
3. A committee composed of the Academic Vice President, two teaching faculty (to be chosen by the teaching faculty), two members of the general faculty representing two different divisions of the Office of Student Services (to be chosen from this membership), one graduate student (to be chosen by the graduate students), and two undergraduate students (to be chosen by the undergraduate students), shall solicit nominations from the University community, evaluate nominees, and present the names of no more than three candidates to the President of the University. If none is acceptable, the committee shall submit additional names.
 4. The University President shall, with approval of the Board of Trustees, appoint the Ombudsman for a term of one year.

Mr. Pernice spoke on various aspects of the proposal, stressing that the Student Ombudsman would be a facilitator of communication, a source of information, and could hear grievances. He also cited five reasons why he felt the proposal for a University Ombudsman had failed some time ago, and how the ASG proposal would avoid these conflicts by having the Student Ombudsman be a mediator and not a decision maker, by insisting on need for his help being evident, by having responsibilities purposely general to avoid inconsistencies, by not including faculty, and by having a lower budget. The proposed budget, at \$27,000 for one year, was distributed.

Miss Chalfant referred to the Buchtelite's "Action Line" and the kinds of requests received for assistance and the time involved in finding answers. Mr. Pugliese described the types of Ohio schools and extent of their operations relative to Student Ombudsman offices.

Dean Samad questioned whether the proposal was out of order inasmuch as only the University Board of Trustees could sanction a new office with budgetary requirements. On the advice of Dr. Bee, regarding parliamentary procedure, the Chair said that Council could act, but it would serve only as a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

Dean Samad considered the only important difference between the former all-University proposal and this one was in the omission of faculty and the lower budget, which he felt very unrealistic and which would practically have to approach \$40,000, especially as \$15,000 seemed too low for the salary of an Ombudsman. He felt that this University should be a leader and not a follower of other schools which might not be in our more favorable position. Also, he saw no need for the Student Ombudsman because of the Open Door policy on this campus. He cited a meeting last year with students and Deans on accessibility, and complaints then were against very few faculty.

Dean Barker also recalled a meeting with ASG president Earl Kerr last year and the academic Deans and other students, but the students had not followed up on efforts to solve any problems.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20 and 4/3/75),
4/17/75, continued

Mr. Mason reminded the Council that the vote on rejecting the universitywide Ombudsman had been close, 31-24, and that the \$15,000 salary suggested was higher than some on this campus. He also mentioned that if budget was a problem, how did they justify the \$80,000 just allocated for the Honors Program.

Mr. Pernice, while not denying the Deans' willingness to be accessible, noted that their time was always limited. He did not react the same as Dean Barker to his recollection of the meeting last year.

Mr. Jamison considered our student body unique in its not being primarily resident on campus, and that therefore, particularly with evening students, the obtaining of information could be difficult. He thought that having a Student Ombudsman could also benefit the faculty in saving their time. He did not feel that money should be a factor, but the proposal should be considered on its merits.

Dr. Wood favored the establishment of the Student Ombudsman.

At this point a comment made on the floor of Council was ruled out of order by the Chair as being unrelated to the matter under discussion. A refuting of the allegation by another member of Council was similarly ruled out of order.

Dr. Carrino felt that the students were sincere in their desire to provide for easier accessibility to information, but he also felt that it was unfortunate that their request seemed to be misinterpreted here. Mr. K. Gwyn said that the evening students have a unique problem because often the offices elsewhere on campus are closed when they are there for night classes. He advocated the Student Ombudsman, especially if he had evening hours!

Dr. Merrix endorsed the students' recommendation and thought it would also help to free the faculty and administration.

Mr. d'Amico didn't see why the faculty should be freed from this responsibility. He thought that if there were problems at one level, people should either deliver or shape up. He thought \$15,000 was a salary proposed for a 24-hour job for a saint! He also considered Akron the most open of the six universities where he had been, and that the best solution would be for everyone to carry his responsibility.

Dean Barker saw the proposal in two aspects--one, to get information, and second, how to resolve a conflict. He saw no objection in providing for dissemination of information, but saw no reason for the additional authority in settling problems for which there are already provisions.

Dr. Bee saw an Ombudsman, even as a "communication facilitator", as creating an adversary role, as encouraging divisiveness between faculty and students, and taking much longer to settle problems because of additional bureaucracy. He could approve the information aspect, but deplored the probable polarization.

Mr. Shedlarz could assume that students might need help, but certain other ramifications of the proposal should be evaluated. Dr. Pfeiffer suggested that even if the students feel that the environment is closed, their impressions should be considered. However, she cautioned about the possible adversary role. Dr. Jackson thought the budgetary proposal was inconsequential in the overall University budget.

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20 and 4/3/75), 4/17/75, continued

Dr. Poston asked for clarification on the authority of the Student Ombudsman, and would he follow a Grievance Procedure for students? Mr. Mason referred to the outline in the Resolution, and reiterated that it would be the Ombudsman's intent to get the facts and to bring students and faculty members together. He would have no authority, other than reporting to the President.

Dean Hansford replied to Dr. Sterling's query that the students had drafted the rationale attached to the proposed resolution. Dr. Sterling then praised it.

Miss DiStefano saw a need for rapport between students and students, faculty and faculty, and faculty and students, and thought this proposal would act for the betterment of the University.

Dr. Gwinn endorsed the statement made on the possibility of an adversary role which would be more evident than in a universitywide Ombudsman. He also saw the possible need for disseminating information. He then moved that the Chairman of Council appoint a student-faculty committee to review the proposed document and hold hearings to correct any shortcomings in the proposal. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Pernice opposed this motion, recalling long meetings in its preparation as well as the delay in adopting the Faculty Manual. Dr. Schultz supported Mr. Pernice's stand.

Mr. Salem called for the question. Dr. Gwinn's motion was put to a vote and failed.

It was moved, seconded and carried to have a roll call vote on the Student Ombudsman question.

In response to Mr. Jamison's question, Dr. Leathers told Council that the proposal, if approved by Council, would have to go the University Board of Trustees as a recommendation for their approval or rejection, even if the language of the proposal is positive. The Student Ombudsman proposal carried, 33 to 13, with three abstentions. The vote follows:

Vote For the Resolution

Vote Against the Resolution

- R. Adams
- C. Barresi
- B. Bayless
- J. Bee
- T. Brittain
- C. Carrino
- D. Dilley
- S. DiStefano
- D. Dolan
- J. Edminister
- K. Gwyn
- R. Hansford
- A. Hart
- H. Hollingsworth
- D. Jackson
- D. Jamison
- H. Livingston
- I. MacGregor
- G. Makar
- M. Mason
- P. Merrix
- R. Mravetz
- A. Noble
- M. Pernice
- I. Pfeiffer
- C. Salem
- F. Schultz
- R. Shedlarz
- W. Sterling
- P. Stuyvesant
- L. Sugarman
- A. West
- C. Wood

- M. d'Amico
- B. Frye
- D. Grant
- J. Lenczyk
- C. Major
- R. Oetjen
- H. Pinnick
- C. Poston
- W. Rogers
- S. Samad
- R. Sandefur
- J. Watt
- R. Weyrick

Abstentions

- H. K. Barker
- J. Gwinn
- M. G. Harrington

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20 and 4/3/75),
4/17/75, continued

Dr. Fatemi, the Akron Representative on the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, summarized the report of the meeting held in Columbus on April 8, 1975. (This report appears in toto elsewhere in the issue of AU Chronicle as an appendix to these minutes.) At the end of Dr. Fatemi's summary, Dr. Leathers, in response to Dr. Poston's request, commented on the Advisory Committee's discussion of the State Auditor's insistence on faculty contracts including certain stipulations such as an availability of funds clause. Dr. Leathers said that the University administration had been working with state offices regarding the wording of the contracts as applied to Akron.

Dr. Pinnick had no report from the Ohio Faculty Senate.

Continuing with the first item under "Old Business", Council considered the pending proposal to amend University Council Bylaws, Article III, Section d. Mr. Pernice moved to add the word "beginning" after the word "elected" in the last line of the proposed amendment. The motion was seconded and carried.

Dr. Carrino moved to delete the word "undergraduate" following the word "evening". The motion was seconded by Mr. Gwyn and carried.

The proposed amendment, as amended, now read:

University Council Bylaws, Article III, Section d. :

"Sixteen representatives comprising ten students from the day undergraduate enrollment, three students from the evening enrollment, two students from the graduate enrollment, and one student from the School of Law enrollment shall be elected beginning in the year of adoption of this amendment."

In answer to a query about the rationale for sixteen student members of Council, Mr. Pernice said that it corresponded to the 22 percent student membership on University Council committees, and that it might also be correlated to enrollment. He saw a need to raise the level of student participation on Council.

Mrs. Sugarman reminded Council that the number of students appointed to Council standing committees was increased to give them more participation, and she resented their using this percentage in an attempt to gain additional members on Council. Mr. Hollingsworth thought students inadequately represented.

Although Mr. Edminister was impressed with the contributions of the present student members to Council deliberations, he considered their representation sufficient.

Dr. Hart observed that the students utilized their 22 percent for getting more work done. Mr. Salem favored a reasonable figure as a compromise to help get a broader perspective and better informed representation on Council. Mr. Mason added that students were more appropriately represented when the number was increased to eight, but that 16 would be more significant.

Dean Hansford, in response to a query, said that Council was presently constituted with 36 elected faculty, 19 administrators and eight students (and three ex-officio faculty).

MINUTES OF ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF UNIVERSITY COUNCIL (from 3/20 and 4/3/75),
4/17/75, continued

Mr. Jamison averred that if the University had a Faculty Senate as it had an Associated Student Government, rather than a University Council (which is the only faculty legislative body), he would find the students' request more persuasive.

Dean Hansford noted that when Council was structured in 1969 there had been 28 elected faculty, 19 administrators and four students. Faculty and student membership had increased by eight and four respectively while the number of administrators remained the same. He said the administration has the responsibility for implementing many of the regulations from Council and were held accountable. He moved to amend the proposal by changing the student representatives to 12 and the number of administrators appointed by the President of the University from three to seven. The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Mason said that ASG is not a legislative body and can only recommend and has no input on the Academic Policies Committee except through University Council. Dr. Roberts saw the proposal as a power play and felt that the students could only advise, not attempt to run the Council. Mr. Salem never felt that he as a member of the faculty and Council was running the University.

Dr. Schultz thought there was strength in a unicameral body where faculty, administrators and students work together, and he didn't fear the 22 percent representation of students. He reminded the Council that it operates at the discretion and purview of the President and the Board of Trustees. However, he asked what was the ultimate goal of the students, and would they now be satisfied with the 22 percent.

Upon the call for the question, the vote was taken on the proposed amended amendment to the Council Bylaws and on hand vote it failed by 20 to 25, with one abstention.

Inasmuch as it was 5 o'clock, it was moved, seconded and carried that the meeting be adjourned to Thursday, May 1, 1975, at 3 p.m. to continue the agenda, which would be consideration of the Revised Draft of the Faculty Manual, dated January 6, 1975. Dr. Hart recommended that the Council might meet further on May 8 if the agenda is not completed on May 1, but the Chair suggested that the meeting might not adjourn at 5 on May 1 if the business was not finished.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Any comments concerning the contents of AU Chronicle may be directed to the Office of the President or to the Executive Director of University Relations and Development.

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, April 17, 1975

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents--Dr. Ali Fatemi

On Tuesday, April 8, 1975, the Faculty Advisory Committee met in Columbus for a morning session prior to the regular meeting with Chancellor James A. Norton in the afternoon.

At the morning session among items discussed were:

Written Contracts:

It was called to the attention of the group the effort of the State Auditor to require a written contract for all administrators, staff, and faculty members (unclassified positions) beginning with the new biennium. In its interoffice communication of 14 February 1975, the Auditor's office specifies:

"In order to provide a clear audit trail and establish responsible accountability, any new contracts proposed or entered into from this date must provide for the following items:

1. Payment contingent on availability of funds
2. Percentage of time required for the job
3. Off-campus work provisions and procedures
4. Schedule of salary payments
5. Credentials clause."

The interoffice communication provides a sample contract, but provides that present contracts may be utilized if they contain "in essence the above conditions". Boards of Trustees are charged with approving each contract and are "encouraged to check from time to time accountability and work performances of employees of the university as a part of their responsibility. . . ."

The origin of the Auditor's interoffice communication was the absence of contracts at the University of Cincinnati. While presumably the Inter-University Council induced the Auditor to back off, Max Lerner of the OBR office has imposed this policy on the two-year schools as has Central State, where reportedly some faculty with tenure, were given new, term contracts.

The afternoon session with Chancellor Norton in the offices of the Ohio Board of Regents included the following subjects:

College of Osteopathic Medicine:

Asked who is behind the proposal to locate a College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM) at Ohio University, Chancellor Norton indicated that the Osteopaths are. He indicated he would testify directly on the bill to the effect that he greatly favored the proposal so long as an unlimited supply of money in support of higher education were available; if not he would indicate that a COM fell well below the priorities of many items in HB 155 and HB 555 that are badly underfunded. He stated that if the purpose of the COM is to generate family practitioners for Southeast Ohio, then there are cheaper means of doing so. The current measure would, when operating at full scale, generate 36 general practitioners per year for family practice in Ohio. Chancellor Norton further indicated that in the long run a COM would be expected to seek a bigger hospital in Southeast Ohio; a move that

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, 4/17/75, continued

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, continued—Dr. Ali FatemiCollege of Osteopathic Medicine, continued

would undercut many of the small, local hospitals that currently serve the region. Wright State has offered to accommodate the ODs, but the ODs desire a separate COM to maintain their independence from the MDs. Should the COM be located at Athens, clinical training would still have to be taken at Cleveland, Toledo, Columbus, or Dayton.

Budget for 1975-77 Biennium:

Regarding the interoffice communication of the Auditor's office, Chancellor Norton commented that this was a matter within the purview of the Auditor, but that he would look into the matter. Professor Jastram stated that faculty could live with the proviso that salary figures were subject to "sufficiency of legislative appropriations", but that there were objections to the auditor dictating the language of the contract and to the bar on outside work without prior presidential approval. Chancellor Norton indicated that there were objections to faculty using their university offices for private consulting activities.

Regarding the budget for 1975-77 biennium, Chancellor Norton indicated that the Ohio Board of Regents continuation budget included upward revision of enrollments at the several schools, excluded the extra subsidy for Ohio University, and excluded provision for a civil service pay raise.

Fees:

Chancellor Norton would preserve the present ceiling on instructional fees for in-state students, though he would drop the mandated ceiling on out-of-state fees. In fact, to protect Wilmington College with which it works closely, Southern must be free to raise its out-of-state fees (Wilmington has a substantial out-of-state enrollment). The Ohio Board of Regents supports a \$25/quarter increase in the general fees, but it is backing off on its proposal for a proportional fee structure for part-time students.

Ohio Instructional Grants:

Regarding the Ohio Instructional Grants, Chancellor Norton's priorities, if the program is to be expanded, are for 1) an increase in the magnitude of the grants, 2) eligibility of part-time students for grants, and 3) increase the minimum family income above the present \$4,000 level for eligibility for a full grant.

Attrition Rates:

Chancellor Norton presented a series of figures on the attrition rates for the various senior universities. The patterns varied widely from school to school and often varied from year to year with respect to a given school. He solicited explanations as to what contributed to these varying attrition rates.

APPENDIX TO UNIVERSITY COUNCIL MINUTES, 4/17/75, continued

Report of Akron Representative on Faculty Advisory Committee to the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, continued—Dr. Ali FatemiProjected Number of High School Graduates:

Chancellor Norton raised questions as to the impact on higher education in Ohio of the declining number of high school graduates projected for the years 1978 to 1992. By 1992 the projected number of high school graduates will be at the same level as in 1963. He pointed out that the universities would enter this period, staffed to handle the maximum student population. Chancellor Norton is concerned with how to cope with a situation in which the faculty and institutions have successfully smaller student populations to teach. He terms this the "opportunity gap". He will be meeting with the presidents of the senior institutions between now and June to discuss planning for meeting this problem.

General Discussion:

In the ensuing general discussion a number of observations and statements were made:

- 1) Chancellor Norton: by the end of the 1975-77 biennium, the capital plant for Ohio higher education will be topped off.
- 2) The percentage of high school graduates in Ohio that enter college is declining, adding to the problem of the "opportunity gap".
- 3) Early retirement can be explored as a means of reducing staff, but a member pointed out that STRS does not seem to recognize that its policies have repercussions and implications for early retirement as well as operating costs of the state institutions.
- 4) Questions were raised as to the feasibility of community service programs that cater to older students, tapping a population that does not currently utilize college and university services. A member noted that in urban areas there are groups that might well respond to sophisticated (i. e., 3rd and 4th year), non-degree work. Chancellor Norton added that ethnic groups and women might provide a focus for special courses. He emphasized the need for a marketing approach to identify needs—that is products that the universities seek to develop—as well as methods of distributing such products. We are getting more older and more part-time students; we must redesign our packages (course offerings) in order to get at the "opportunity gap". We must either sell knowledge or we lose the ball game. Chancellor Norton charged the Ohio Board of Regents Faculty Advisory Committee with raising questions on home campuses as to ways of dealing with the problems.

CURRICULUM CHANGES

The following curriculum changes, in accordance with the Curricula Change Process adopted by University Council on December 12, 1974 have had final approval by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, all effective September 1975:

BUCHTEL COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCESDepartment of Geology

Change in Number	337:410	<u>Regional Geomorphology of North America.</u> 4 credits.
	to	
	337:410/510	<u>Regional Geomorphology of North America.</u> 4 credits.
Add	337:441/541	<u>Fundamentals of Geophysics.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisites, 345:235 or permission, and 365:291-293. A study of fundamental concepts in solid earth geophysics, planetary physics, geodesy and geomagnetism, and of the contributions of geophysics to recent major developments in geoscience.

Department of Psychology

Drop	375:623	<u>Practicum in Individual Intelligence Testing in Adults.</u> 3 credits.
	375:624	<u>Practicum in Individual Intelligence Testing in Children.</u> 3 credits.
	375:625	<u>Practicum in Individual Intelligence Testing in Preschool Children.</u> 3 credits.
Change in Title	375:160	<u>Industrial Psychology.</u> 4 credits.
	to	
	375:160	<u>Introduction to Industrial/Organizational Psychology.</u> 4 credits.
Change in Prerequisites	375:325	<u>Comparative Psychology.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisite to be only 375:141.
	375:409/509	<u>Introduction to the Clinical Method.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisite to be only 375:141 and 4 credits in Psychology.
Change in Credits, Prerequisites and Description	375:421	<u>Advanced Industrial Psychology.</u> 5 credits.
	to	
	375:421	<u>Advanced Industrial Psychology.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:160 and permission. Application of psychology to organizations with special emphasis on engineering psychology, human factors, man-machine systems and personnel psychology.
Change in Title, Credits and Description	375:622	<u>Principles of Individual Intelligence Testing.</u> 2 credits.
	to	
	375:622	<u>Principles and Practice of Individual Intelligence Testing.</u> 5 credits. Prerequisite, Instructor's permission required. History, principles and methodology of Intelligence Testing, practice in the administration, scoring and interpretation of individual intelligence tests for children and adults.

CURRICULUM CHANGES, continuedBUCHTEL COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, continuedDepartment of Psychology, continued

Change in Title and Description	375:141 to 375:141	<u>General Psychology</u> , 5 credits. <u>Introduction to Psychology</u> , 5 credits. Introduction to the scientific study of behavior. Survey of physiological basis of behavior, sensation and perception, development, learning and cognition, personality, social interaction and other selected topics.
Change in Title, Prerequisites and Description	375:310 to 375:310	<u>Experimental Psychology</u> , 4 credits. <u>Experimental Methods in Human Behavior Research</u> , 4 credits. Prerequisite, 375:147. Scientific methods and tools in the modern experimental investigation of human behavior. Emphasis is an exposure to and performance on all aspects of a single, in-depth research project.
	375:405/505 to 375:405/505	<u>Psychopathology of Childhood</u> , 4 credits. <u>Psychological Disorders of Children</u> , 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:141 and 151 or permission. A survey of the psychological disorders of children from the standpoint of the developmental psychologist and behavior therapist. Emphasis will be on the role of the social environment in shaping and maintaining behavior. Relationships with problems in areas such as child psychology, intervention, approaches, and social and educational contexts will be presented.
Add	375:311	<u>Experimental and Observational Methods in Animal Behavior Research</u> , 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:141, 147 or permission. Methods and techniques used in the analysis of behavior. Emphasis will be on the use of the observational method primarily with regard to animal research.
	375:330	<u>Sensory and Perceptual Experience</u> , 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:141 or permission. A survey of basic sensory and perceptual phenomena covering the physical and psychological bases of each. An overview of the major theoretical treatments and empirical findings in perception and sensation will be included, plus discussion of the implications for behavior of fundamental sensory and perceptual processes.
	375:335	<u>Motivation and the Dynamics Behavior</u> , 4 credits. Prerequisite, 375:141 or permission. A wide-ranging treatment of motivation of behavior in humans and animals covering both physiological and psychological mechanisms, and including a survey of the major theoretical ideas on motivation and the empirical evidence concerning them.

CURRICULUM CHANGES, continuedBUCHTEL COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, continuedDepartment of Psychology, continued

Add	375:340	<u>The Psychology of Small Group Behavior.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:141, 315. Intensive investigation of factors affecting behavior in groups. Course covers joint effects of personality, social structures, task, and situational variables in effecting group behavior.
	375:345	<u>Introduction to Cross-Cultural Psychology.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisite, 375:141. An introduction to the influence of culture upon the development of individual psychological processes. The theories and methods of cross-cultural studies will be examined in relation to the following psychological processes: perception, motivation, intellectual functioning, values and organizational structure.
	375:410	<u>Contemporary Issues in Developmental Psychology.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:141, 151, or permission. A detailed survey of current issues, methodology and major contemporary research topics in developmental psychology. The topic areas of developmental change in intelligence, personality, sensation, perception, learning, memory and socialization will be explored in depth.
	375:415	<u>Cognition.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisite, 375:412 or permission. An introductory review of the research and theory concerning the higher-order mental processes, such as human conceptual behavior, problem solving and thinking.
	375:425	<u>Organizational Psychology.</u> 4 credits. Prerequisites, 375:160 and permission. Application of psychology to organizations with special emphasis on organization theory, leadership, management, consumer behavior and advertising psychology.
	375:460	<u>Special Topics in Psychology.</u> 2-4 credits. (May be repeated to a total of 8 credits.) Prerequisite, 375:141.

COLLEGE OF EDUCATIONDepartment of Educational Foundations

Add	565:630	<u>Operant Control of Student Behavior.</u> 4 credits. This course is designed to show classroom applications of the behavior control methods called "operant conditioning". Teachers and teacher-trainees will learn how to eliminate disruptive behaviors which often prevent quality teaching. They will also learn to use the operant methods to motivate students and to improve social, academic, and motor skills. Students will be required to select target behaviors, determine their causes, develop a plan for changing the behavior, research the literature on the control of this type of behavior, carry out the plan, and submit a report in writing. Graduate students will be required to submit a <u>comprehensive</u> review of the literature relating to their selected target behavior.
-----	---------	---

CURRICULUM CHANGES, continuedCOLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATIONDepartment of Accounting

Add 620:425 Current Developments in Accounting. 5 credits. Prerequisite, 620:318. In-depth study of official pronouncements issued by the Committee on Accounting Procedure, the Accounting Principles Board, the Financial Accounting Standards Board, and the Securities and Exchange Commission; current developments in accounting theory.

Department of Finance

Add 640:310 Personal Financial Management. 5 credits. Open to all students (Finance majors—free elective credit only). Reviews and analyzes the many personal financing decisions made by individuals. Areas of study include money management, credit acquisition, insurance program development, investment analysis, and pension evaluation.

COLLEGE OF FINE AND APPLIED ARTSDepartment of Home Economics

Change in Title 740:362 Home Management. 3 credits.
and Credits to
 740:362 Home Management Theory. 4 credits.

 740:422 Home Management Residency. 5 credits.
 to
 740:422 Advanced Home Management. 4 credits.

Change in Title 740:458 Seminar in Home Furnishings. 3 credits.
 to
 740:458 Practicum in Home Furnishings. 3 credits.

Change in Credits 740:421 Special Problems in Home Economics. 2-5 credits.
and Description to
 740:421 Special Problems in Home Economics. 1-5 credits. Additional study or apprentice experience in a specialized field or preparation; group and individual experimentation.

Department of Music

Add 750:640 Advanced Problems in Music. 2-4 credits (May be repeated for 12 credits.) Prerequisite, permission of the Graduate Advisor. Studies or research projects related to problems in music.

CURRICULUM CHANGES, continuedCOLLEGE OF FINE AND APPLIED ARTS, continuedDepartment of Music, continued

Add	752:642	<u>Applied Composition</u> . 2-4 credits. (May be repeated for a total of 12 credits.) Prerequisite, undergraduate degree with a major in music. Private instruction in Composition offered primarily for students majoring in Composition at the graduate level, and graduate students in other areas of music (music education, performance, history and literature, etc.) interested in taking Composition lessons.
	750:647	<u>Master's Chamber Recital</u> . 1 credit. The Composition student will present a recital of chamber music compositions (at least one-half hour in length) written while in residence at The University of Akron. The student will actively organize and coordinate the recital and will also participate either as performer or conductor.
Change in Number and Description	750:456/556 to 750:614	<u>Measurement and Evaluation in Music</u> . 3 credits. <u>Measurement and Evaluation in Music</u> . 3 credits. Prerequisite, 510:350 or equivalent. A course designed to explore in depth the principles of music aptitude, and music achievement, valid and reliable instruments for measuring them, elementary statistics as applied to music testing and basic guidelines for music test construction. Students are required to administer, analyze and interpret two separate testing projects dealing with some aspect of music.

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGEDivision of Business and Office Technology

Drop	228:123	<u>Fundamentals of Food Preparation III</u> . 3 credits.
	228:238	<u>Food Service Internship II</u> . 4 credits.
Add	228:240	<u>Food Service Management</u> . 4 credits (4-0). Prerequisite, 242:102. Introduction to management principles pertinent to the organization and administration of food service systems, supervisory development, personnel selection and training, management theories, labor relations, cost control structures, managerial interpretation and evaluation of current systems and procedures.
	228:245	<u>Food Service Maintenance and Sanitation</u> . 3 credits (3-0). The responsibilities of the food service manager are to coordinate the Housekeeping Department and the Maintenance Department in providing sanitary, attractive facilities and prolonging the life of the building and equipment. Emphasis is placed in proper food handling, safety and accident and fire prevention.

CURRICULUM CHANGES, continued

COMMUNITY AND TECHNICAL COLLEGE, continued

Division of Engineering and Science Technology

Drop	298:237	<u>Material Testing Lab I.</u> 3 credits.
	298:238	<u>Material Testing Lab II.</u> 3 credits.
Add	298:235	<u>Soils Testing.</u> 2 credits. Laboratory testing of soils following the testing procedures of the American Society for Testing Materials or the American Association of State Highway Officials with emphasis on the physical properties of the materials laboratory and field procedures which have been developed to control quality are presented.
	298:236	<u>Materials Testing—Metals.</u> 2 credits. Corequisite, 298:241. Emphasis is placed on ferrous and nonferrous metals. Laboratory experiments are designed to demonstrate the physical properties of metals as they relate to design. Whenever possible, procedures followed in the laboratory are based on the testing specifications of the American Society for Testing Materials.
	298:239	<u>Materials Testing—Nonmetals.</u> 2 credits. Mix design and testing of cement mortars and concrete. Wherever possible, procedures followed in the laboratory are based on the standard specifications of the American Society for Testing Materials.
	298:226	<u>Subdivision Design.</u> 3 credits. Prerequisite, 298:222, corequisite, 298:224. Topics include site analysis, land use controls, and plotting procedures. Laboratory includes the preparation of various types of projects leading to a complete subdivision.

Change in Requirements for Surveying Option in Surveying and Construction Technology Program:

Drop (as requirement only)	298:245	<u>Cost Analysis and Estimating.</u> 3 credits.
Add (as requirement)	298:226	<u>Subdivision Design.</u> 3 credits.

Esther Ward
T. Res. Reading Office Cpl.