

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

12-4-1997

Faculty Senate Chronicle December 4, 1997

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.



14 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of December 4, 1997	1
Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of December 4, 1997	11
A. Academic Calendar	11
B. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i>	12
C. Report of <i>Research Faculty Projects Committee</i>	13

Any comments concerning the contents in The University of Akron Chronicle may be directed to the Secretary, Dr. Gary Oller (+1910).
FacultySenate@UAkron.Edu

**MINUTES OF THE FACULTY SENATE MEETING
OF DECEMBER 4, 1997**

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman Devinder Malhotra at 3:04 p.m. on Thursday, December 4, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Forty-six of the sixty-four members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators C.Buchanan, Butler, Cheung, Kilgallin, Reep, and Ross-Alaolmolki were absent with notice. Senators Batur, Borowiec, Clark, DePaul, Gill, Griffin, Hammonds, Pitchford, Redle, Stevenson, and Turek were absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * **APPROVED THE CALENDAR FOR 98-99 AND THE PRELIMINARY CALENDAR FOR 99-00**
- * **APPROVED THREE SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CFPC**

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chairman asked for a motion to approve the agenda which was made by Senator Peggy Richards and seconded by Senator Tim Norfolk. Since there were no additions or changes, the body approved the agenda.

Before moving on to the next item of business, the Chairman stated that since the Senate's last meeting one of our colleagues, Gary Gappert, Director of the Institute of Future Studies and Research, had died. The body stood for a moment of silence in his memory.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 6, 1997 - Secretary Gary H. Oller said that he had one correction at the bottom of page 2, the last paragraph in the President's remarks, in the sentence beginning "The Forge St. building and former Alpha Pi sorority house..." He had managed to misspell a word to reverse the meaning of the sentence. "Raised" should be "razed." Since there were no other corrections, the Senate voted its approval of the minutes as amended.

III. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS - The Chairman wanted to offer his congratulations to the President and his office's staff for organizing President Clinton's visit yesterday. He thought that it had been very well done, and the University had gotten a lot of positive exposure. He also thought that he would be remiss if he did not mention the performance of Senator Derwin Hammonds, who had been master of ceremonies at the JAR Arena. Although the Chairman had not been in attendance, he had heard reports about the magnificent job that the Senator had done. He wanted to go on record in congratulating him for such composure and such an effort on his part.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chairman introduced and welcomed two new Senators - Mary Konkell from the Library and Scott Johnston from Fine and Applied Arts. The body welcomed the Senators with applause.

V. REPORTS

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT - President Marion Ruebel made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me pass on to everyone in the entire campus community my appreciation for all the efforts that went into the program yesterday. I didn't realize the amount of work that was involved in something like this. However, I can tell you in all honesty when I went home last night, I felt very good about The University of Akron. I felt very good about the city of Akron and all of northeast Ohio, because I think that we as an institution presented a good image for the entire country, and I want to express my appreciation formally for this. I think we brought a great deal of positive publicity about what's going on on our campus. Mr. Chairman, as you mentioned Senator Hammonds, let me indicate President Clinton's reaction to me as to how impressed he was with our student body. The way the students performed not only on the stage, but there were no demonstrations, there was nothing negative as far as the trip was concerned. So I feel this was a very good thing for us as an institution.

My formal remarks will be relatively brief. Our budgeting process for 1998-99 is beginning, and the Provost's office is seeking thoughts from four major campus groups - the Council of Deans, the Planning & Budgeting Committee, the central administration, and the Faculty Senate. Experience will tell us that we need concise, prioritized lists of academic achievements and things we want to accomplish through this budgeting process, so this is starting and is underway.

Since our last meeting the College of Nursing had a site visit on November 4 from the Ohio Board of Nursing, and the visit went very well. The consultant indicated that she found the program in full compliance and that the College of Nursing is looking forward to the National League of Nursing which will conduct an accreditation site this coming spring. But I'd like to congratulate publicly the College of Nursing for the good report that they got. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to entertain them."

Since there were no questions, President Ruebel congratulated the body for a very successful fall semester and, on behalf of the administration, wished the Senators and their families a very happy holiday season.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Provost Noel Leathers made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and unfortunately I probably won't be as brief as the President, but there are some things I want to mention to you so you're aware of what's happening with certain issues. One of the efforts that's going on state-wide through the aegis of the Board of Regents is the matter of the articulation and transfer policy among state universities. Over the past several years this policy's been in existence and has been moved along toward some implementation of the policy and ultimately full compliance. I think we're doing very well on this; we've had excellent cooperation from faculty and administrative offices on campus all the way through. Dean Mugler of the

University College has responsibility for transfer and articulation issues, and in the coming months there will be some convening of advisors in the colleges to address matters pertaining to transfer modules. This gets kind of complex and I know Karla has spent some time trying to drill what's supposed to happen into my locus up here, and it has a little trouble grabbing it all together. But basically it deals with how transfer students come to the University, get treated, and what happens in terms of accreditation or the accepting of credits that they have achieved elsewhere and so on. The number of transfer students is going up on our campus, so this is going to be very important, and anything we can do to help in the matriculation of these students certainly would be a good thing.

We have been selected as part of a course applicability system pilot project in northeast Ohio. This has been sponsored by the OBOR, and the purpose is of course to facilitate the articulation of transfer students among these institutions. As I understand it from Dean Mugler, this transfer articulation information will go out on the Web and make it available to any member of the general public and obviously will show how courses will be accepted and applied to programs at other public institutions in the state. In this northeast Ohio pilot, which will be on-line next April 1, are Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland State, Kent State, Lorain County Community College, and The University of Akron. We have already had a project where we have looked at reviewing Kent State's course descriptions to determine equivalencies on our own campus and we'll be looking at Cleveland State's courses in the very near future. This I think is an important project and one that with cooperation we'll get through and certainly be of benefit to our students. It certainly should help the advising and the transfer modules as we try to evolve these.

There was a notice that went out to the campus community on December 1 announcing that the former UASC organizational structure on campus will be discontinued at the end of this semester, and from that time on all the continuing education courses and programs will be under the supervision of Dr. (William) Beisel, who came to campus here in August as the director, and will be addressing the Senate I'm sure some time in the spring giving you much more information about this. The courses that have been planned for spring will continue as necessary. Bill will also be sitting with the Council of Deans as the Director of Continuing Education, and the point of all this of course is to centralize the administrative processing and to assist with greater improvements and efficiency in this area that we really want to develop as time goes on.

There are a couple of comments I want to make regarding where we are in developing some things. There is a research task force going on, the Research Council, under the direction of Dr. Mark Auburn. They've been meeting regularly and coming up with some recommendations about how we can expedite and facilitate research efforts of the faculty, and we anticipate that will be around the 1st of February; I believe that's the target date. In this way it could be incorporated into the planning for next year's budget. There's also the one on sponsored programs under Dr. Graham Kelly, and I think that one's moving along well, and the one on campus health services which unfortunately puts up with me as its chairman; in spite of that fact we are making progress and I think we'll come up with some interesting recommendations.

I find out all kinds of things being a student again - we're the only university in the MAC that does not charge students anything for the campus health service. Every other MAC school has some kind of health fee which ranges from \$5-\$6 at the lowest end to \$51 or \$52 at the highest, so we're trying to redefine what it is that the campus health service ought to do and whether we need to improve it. Obviously, everything needs improvement, and we need to determine how we are going to

fund this service and so forth. I hope we will be through by February 1 so that this can be worked into the plans.

I met this morning with the Campus Facilities Planning Committee, which I'm sure all of you hold your breath hoping to get appointed to. They have to be the most patient set of jugglers I think this side of Timbuktu when they deal with space issues on this campus. But they have a report of their own and we can take care of questions at that time. That concludes my remarks. I think we had a pretty good semester and I hope all of you have a very nice holiday season. If there are any questions, I'll try to answer them."

Senator Jack Braun asked about the status of deliberations regarding intellectual property.

Provost Leathers answered that this was a good question and it was being handled under the auspices of the earlier mentioned research task force. The Law School had stipulated and earmarked intellectual property as an area which they wanted to emphasize as a strong research point for the school. There was not any other in the Midwest, and he thought that it was most apt. This was a very complex issue, and the position had been, briefly put, that we did not want young faculty members who were doing research to sign off their whole professional interest for the sake of a minor grant of any kind. This got into a variety of problems in terms of negotiating the research items - the difference between an unrestricted research grant and one that simply was to test materials or test a process versus the kind that supported a faculty member to proceed with basic research in a particular area.

Senator Braun agreed that it was a complex issue but wondered whether the campus should be involved to a larger extent than it presently was. Rumors were being heard about deliberations or the end of deliberations. Shouldn't there be some interviews with faculty on campus to find out what the campus opinion was since it concerned so many of them?

Provost Leathers thought that this was an excellent suggestion which he would pass on to the chairman of the committee. Perhaps they could hold some hearings or invite faculty.

Senator Braun thought that his colleagues in the College of Engineering would appreciate that very much. In a college meeting today, this issue had been hotly debated, and the amount of information that could be transmitted to the faculty was very minimal. He thought that they deserved to be heard.

Senator Bonnie Filer-Tubaugh had heard a rumor about a committee on part-time faculty being started up under Interim Associate Provost Mark Auburn. What was the status of that?

The Provost responded that this was a nomenclature committee. Since the reclassification of part-time faculty there had been some confusion about the variety of titles including part-time lecturer, adjunct, special adjunct, etc. Full-time faculty had been labeled as part-time faculty if they had been doing anything other than during the regular academic year. The entire summer payroll was made up of part-time faculty, and that did not make any sense. The new PeopleSoft program for HR would be going on line over the Christmas vacation, and it would not recognize some of these things. The purpose of the Committee (to which Chairman Malhotra would be naming a part-time faculty member and regular faculty member) was to deal with this and to look at the nomenclature, do some research,

and come up with some recommendations. We needed to clarify exactly how we named things. The complications got unbelievable.

Senator Dan Deckler had another quick question regarding intellectual property. Were there any time lines or deadlines when some decisions were going to be made?

The Provost said that he anticipated there would be a report in February, but the suggestion about having hearings was excellent. He would pass that on to Associate Provost Auburn and get something scheduled.

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO FACCOBOR - Senator Shelly Baranowski reported that she had attended a meeting of the committee yesterday which had been fairly inconclusive. The higher education information system was being put into place, and the faculty sample survey that she had talked about briefly at the last Senate meeting was still being designed. The OBOR hoped to have the whole system up and running by the fall of '98, but she thought that was a fairly optimistic projection. They were still working on designing models, finding research facilities and so forth. She intended to report to the body as often as she could about the details. The way that these questions were framed was very crucial to the whole process of gaining subsidy and to the legislature actually understanding what we did.

The second issue on which she had reported last time had to do with the funding of K-12, which could indirectly and negatively affect higher education. There had been little public movement in the legislature, and there probably would not be much going on until after the first of the year, although there was a report this morning that a Republican Senator was introducing a voucher proposal to counteract the Governor's proposal to raise the state sales tax.

At the present time the OBOR was awaiting the arrival of a new Chancellor, Roderick Chu, who would assume his duties on January 1. For what it was worth, Senator Baranowski offered her own take on why this particular candidate had been picked. Although he was on the Board of Trustees in the SUNY system, his background was not in education but in management consulting. He evidently had good relations with business, and her guess was that this was consistent with the Regents' concern to build support from business for higher education in the state of Ohio, to convince business that higher education paid, and to convince businesses to move to Ohio and to indirectly generate further support to higher education. She classified this as the neo-corporate solution to get beyond the vagaries of the state legislature because we were now in a period in which the numbers to the budget were increasing. That could negatively affect higher education, K-12, not to mention Medicaid. She would be letting the body know how this was turning out in the coming months.

ACADEMIC POLICIES AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Dennis Kimmell, the Chair, stated that everyone should have received a copy of the calendar for 98 -99 as well as the preliminary one for 99-00 (Appendix A), and this now came as a motion from the Committee for the Senate's approval. The Chairman said that the motion was now open for discussion.

A Senator commented that, for a number of years, our calendar had been out of sync with other institutions, specifically Kent State. Was there any philosophy about how our spring break coincided with other institutions'?

Senator Kimmell answered that the Committee had not considered this issue this year, and, if his memory served him, it had not been considered the past few years that he had been on the Committee. Some other Committee members might have a different recollection than he did.

Provost Leathers noted that about twenty years ago Akron, Kent, and the superintendents of the public schools in Summit County, Portage County, and Stark County had all gotten together to attack this problem. There might be faculty teaching at one of the universities whose spouse taught at one of the public schools which had different breaks. This could cause problems without Christmas and spring breaks being synchronized. It had been a great love feast, and a common calendar had been created. Then the Akron superintendent took it to the Board of Education and for whatever reason, they did not want to do it. For a number of years it had been synchronized with everything except the Akron Public Schools but slowly through non-interest, more and more institutions had drifted away. He suggested that if one were going to do something, it was necessary to get to the Akron Board of Education which was changing faces and might have a better view of it now.

Since there were no further comments, the Senate voted its approval of the calendar with one no vote.

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Associate Provost Graham Kelly, the Chair, said that Senators should have received copies of the list of curriculum proposals which had matured without objection and had been approved by the Provost's office (**Appendix B**). There were ten, and unless the Senate acted otherwise, they would be approved.

Since there were no comments, the proposals were automatically passed.

ATHLETICS COMMITTEE - Senator Norfolk, the Chair, stated that following the resolution passed by the Senate last April he was reporting on the status of the Committee's examination of the Athletics Program. The Committee had met twice and was examining the budget, recruitment policies, retention of student athletes and the graduation rate. So far, there were no recommendations, but it was his hope that the Committee would have something to report by the February meeting of the body.

CAMPUS FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE - Senator Jerry Drummond had three separate recommendations from the Committee. First, he called the body's attention to a large sketch in the front of the room showing what would be called Corbin Common, which extended from the present Buchtel Common to Wolf Ledges Parkway. This work would be done through outside donation, and Ramesh Vakamudi had presented this at the Committee's November meeting. He was not sure when it was going to be done, but it would look like Buchtel Common extending all the way to the west end of the central campus. He invited all members to look at the sketch on the way out.

The first of the Committee's recommendations was as follows: **the CFPC unanimously recommends the continued use of JAR 151 by the Office of Admissions. Admissions has been using this room since 1996. It should also be noted that the original granting of this request included setting aside a meeting room in Gardner Student Center for general purpose classroom scheduling.**

Since there was no discussion, the body unanimously voted its approval.

The second recommendation read as follows: **The CFPC unanimously stands in agreement with the College of Fine and Applied Arts that the space being vacated in Guzzetta Hall by the School of Communication and the radio station be used by that college. It was recommended that their final specification of space usage be passed through the CFPC.**

Senator Drummond added that he thought this was a preemptive strike by Fine and Applied Arts to make sure that what space they already had would not be taken by anyone else. There had not been any requests for it, but the Committee had given them some encouragement to perhaps get a classroom out of it.

Since there was no discussion, the Senate voted its approval with one member voting no.

The third recommendation read as follows: **The committee also unanimously approved the request of the Affirmative Action/EEO Office to be moved from the Broadway Building to rooms 201A, 201B, 201C, and the secretarial space immediately adjacent to 201A in Leigh Hall. This move will take place after the move of the School of Communications to Kolbe Hall. The present thinking of the administration is to delay the renovation of Leigh Hall and use the building for "swing space" to allow the demolition of certain old facilities (Simmons Hall, Union Building being examples of that). Provost Leathers restated the commitment of the administration to a rigorous planning process that would include the CFPC.**

Senator Norfolk, speaking on behalf of his own department, Mathematical Sciences, noted that this delay of renovations to Leigh Hall could cause them problems. Ayer Hall, the department's present location, would be renovated soon. Where was Math to go? It needed a lot of facilities and was supposed to go to Leigh Hall immediately following its renovation originally planned for a year or so from now. The department had a large faculty plus four labs that would need to be moved. If it was not moving to Leigh Hall, and Ayer happened to get renovated in the meantime, where were they going to end up?

Provost Leathers said that he would try to respond to Senator Norfolk's very good question. The other day he had gone through Leigh Hall in regard to an investigation to determine exactly what it would cost to remodel it and what would need to be done. Right now there were 20 faculty offices occupied by Communications faculty who were going to move into Kolbe on January 5, so those offices would be available before the second semester started. There were classrooms currently being used and a variety of offices on the second, third and fourth floors. Also, on the fourth floor there were some math graduate students or part-time faculty occupying offices. If this all were used as swing space so that some old buildings could be torn down, then EEO could move into the space now occupied by Communications (three offices and secretarial space). The suite of offices presently housing ERD in Leigh Hall could also be used, since two of the faculty members did not go there but had other offices. As he had told the CFPC this morning, even the President only had one office. There were plans to move the budget office (four people) out of the old building at 43 S. Union into another administrative area. Then we could tear down that building and quit paying for it in terms of utilities, etc. The classrooms in Leigh would not be touched, and 20 people out of the Math dept. could be moved into the offices there so that would relieve some of the space problems which they were now having.

The Provost gave another example of a building which needed to be torn down: the old James St. (now Buchtel Ave.) house used for home economics and built in three days for a home show back in '71 or '72. There had been a suggestion to move some offices into it, but in order to properly equip it for telephones and make it part of the communications loop of the University would cost \$22,000. That was just the beginning, since the windows needed to be replaced. It was not worth spending that amount of money for a building that would eventually be torn down. It made better sense to just tear it down now.

Provost Leathers went on to say that there had been a long period here where the idea of maintaining buildings had gone out of style, and maintenance money had never been used or used in that direction. As a consequence, there were serious physical problems with many buildings. He was almost convinced that in the long run we were further ahead to quit patching and to get rid of the bad stuff and build new. He thought that this was going to be our aim. What we were trying to do was to relieve the points that needed to be relieved, and certainly the Math Dept. was one of them. The problem was how best to do it. It might be better to take the 5 or 6 million for Leigh and the 4 or 4-1/2 million for Zook and put them together and build another classroom/office building and tear the two of them down. But we had to get appraisals of what it would cost to fix those buildings.

Related to the use of space, the Provost also noted that a food service survey had been sent out to some people picked at random to get feedback in order to do something about food service in the student center by next August before school started. Students and faculty were complaining so they were trying to figure out the best thing to do.

Senator Greg Stewart raised a concern that if affirmative action moved away from the personnel relations offices, it would increase the processing time of personnel actions and cause delays.

Senator John Hebert said that this brought up a good question. Why was the EEO office moving?

President Ruebel answered that this was one of the recommendations from the North Central Committee. We would be more efficient if we drew a distinct line between Human Resources and Affirmative Action. They were not moving to Germany; someone could walk papers over in five minutes from the Broadway building to Leigh Hall. He agreed that they would be more efficient and effective offices if they were separate, because the jobs, duties and functions were different. Therefore, we were going to separate them.

Senator William Rich stated that he was at a loss to understand why the fact that two offices had different functions required that they be separated physically. He imagined that there was a reason here somewhere, but it was not apparent on the face of the explanation.

The Provost responded that one of the things we were trying to do here was to come into conformity with the department of administrative services and the department of labor. The department of administrative services had been here last year in September or October, had reviewed things and informally had said there were things here that we should do. There was not enough personnel to run the office and get the things done that needed to be done. In April of this year, these suggestions were no longer informal. There had been a formal statement from PASC that the

University had to do these things. Since these things were not getting done, the administration was now trying to reorganize the situation. There were four additional vacancies in HR (four regular contract professional positions not yet filled), and we were going to need to find room for these people in HR. When the department of labor had come and had finished up a couple of months ago, there was an agreement that they had found no cause on all the complaints, but there were certain things which they said we had to do in terms of classifications and so on. They had been talking about staff - classified, unclassified, civil service, etc. They said that we did not have the people to do what needed to be done, so we needed to get going and hire them. Therefore, by moving the affirmative action/EEO office over to central campus, it ought to make it better, and it gave HR more space to function at 277 S. Broadway, which was a building that we should probably have torn down 5 years ago anyhow.

Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted its approval of the recommendation with one abstention.

The Chairman now asked for a report from the five Senators which the body had elected as advisors to the presidential search committee. Senator Jesse Marquette had agreed to make that report.

Senator Marquette said that three of five (himself, Senator Virginia Gunn and Senator Chand Midha) had met with the search consultant and four members of the Board of Trustees. It had been both an information session and a discussion. They asked for feedback from the three Senators about the kinds of things our colleagues would like to see in a president and about the sorts of things we would like to see in terms of the process. It did appear from statements that were made that the process would be opened up more than it had been originally intended in terms of the availability of faculty time with the candidates and things of that nature. He and his colleagues had also pointed out the issues that had been raised previously about faculty access earlier in the process. There had not been any real resolution on that, but they were going to open the search up by the beginning of the year. One of the statements that had been made was the fact that there was very little success in advertising of the candidate pool by an actual recruitment process. They had had very little success when they had opened these up. The explanation given for this was that earlier open access to names was less and less popular and that the quality of the pool went down the earlier people became identified as members of the pool. Individuals who were in senior positions at other institutions liked to hold themselves in confidential negotiations until fairly late in the game. Therefore, the kind of access that we had been talking about - getting vitae and perhaps identifying land mines in terms of qualifications, etc. - actually tended to decrease the size of the pool you have generated, if one had to make obvious that a certain person was looking even before he or she became one of the three or four finalists. This was what had been presented and he did not think there would be much movement on this second issue.

RESEARCH FACULTY PROJECTS COMMITTEE - (Appendix C)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - Before starting on this item, the Chairman asked the members of the PBC to stay after the meeting and caucus as there was a need for a vice chair nominee for the next PBC meeting. He also asked the Executive Committee members to stay after and caucus with Secretary Oller regarding an alternate meeting time for that committee.

There was no unfinished business.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - There was none.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - Senator Marquette informed the body that Associate Provost Kelly would be moving to change part of the University Bulletin in terms of the distinction between 400 and 500 level courses. Actually there already was a policy which was going to be reinserted into the Bulletin, but faculty would also have to modify their syllabi. If one was teaching a 400/500 level course, there needed to be a formal indication of the additional requirements for the graduate students. OBOR was concerned about this regarding subsidies. There were two different subsidy levels for 400 and 500 courses. If the cost of the instruction was no different, then they wanted to know why they were giving us more money for the 500 level. This already was University policy but like many other things, had slipped through the cracks over the years and the requirement no longer appeared in the Bulletin. The descriptions of the two courses were exactly the same in the graduate and undergraduate bulletin, and in order to keep OBOR happy we needed to make clear that not only did we have a policy, but that everybody knew what it was, and that we were responding to it.

The Chairman asked whether APCC would be associated with this, and Senator Marquette responded that it was not necessary because the policy was already in place.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman wished everyone very happy holidays. He called for a motion to adjourn, which was given, seconded and approved. The meeting ended at 3:55 p.m.

APPENDIX A

	1998-99	PRELIMINARY 1999-2000
FALL SEMESTER Classes Begin Labor Day * Veteran's Day (classes held, staff holiday) Thanksgiving Break ** Classes Resume Final Instruction Day Final Examination Period Commencement Spring Intercession	Mon, Aug 31 Mon, Sep 7 Wed, Nov 11 Thu, Nov 26 - Sat, Nov 28 Mon, Nov 30 Sat, Dec 12 Mon, Dec 14 - Sat, Dec 19 Sat, Dec 19 Sat, Jan 2 - Sat, Jan 16	Mon, Aug 30 Mon, Sep 6 Wed, Nov 10 Thu, Nov 25 - Sat, Nov 27 Mon, Nov 29 Sat, Dec 11 Mon, Dec 13 - Sat, Dec 18 Sat, Dec 18 Sat, Jan 1 - Sat, Jan 15
SPRING SEMESTER Classes Begin Martin Luther King Day * Presidents' Day * Spring Break May Day *** Final Instruction Day Final Examination Period Commencement Summer Intercession Commencement/Law School	Tue, Jan 19 Mon, Jan 18 Tue, Feb 16 Mon, Mar 22 - Sat, Mar 27 Fri, May 7 Sat, May 8 Mon, May 10 - Sat, May 15 Sat, May 15 Mon, May 17 - Fri, Jun 11 Sun, May 23	Tue, Jan 18 Mon, Jan 17 Tue, Feb 15 Mon, Mar 20 - Sat, Mar 25 Fri, May 5 Sat, May 6 Mon, May 8 - Sat, May 13 Sat, May 13 Mon, May 15 - Fri, Jun 10 Sun, May 21
SUMMER SESSION 1 First 5-Week and 8-Week Sessions Begin Independence Day * First 5-Week Session Ends	Mon, Jun 14 Mon, Jul 5 Sat, Jul 17	Mon, Jun 12 Mon, Jul 4 Sat, Jul 15
SUMMER SESSION 2 Second 5-Week Session Begins 8-Week Session Ends Second 5-Week Session Ends Commencement	Mon, Jul 19 Sat, Aug 7 Sat, Aug 21 Sat, Aug 21	Mon, Jul 17 Sat, Aug 5 Sat, Aug 19 Sat, Aug 19
FALL SEMESTER Classes Begin	Mon, Aug 30	Mon, Aug 28

- * Classes canceled (day and evening)
- ** Classes canceled from Wednesday at 5:00 p.m. through Monday at 7:00 a.m.
- *** Classes canceled from noon to 5:00 p.m.

APPENDIX B

Report of Curriculum Review Committee

The following curriculum proposals have matured without objection and have been approved by the Provost. Unless specifically acted upon otherwise by Faculty Senate at its December 4, 1997 meeting, they will become record.

BA 98-01
BA 98-02
BA 98-03
BA 98-04
BA 98-05
BA 98-06
BA 98-07
BA 98-08
BA 98-09
EN 98-20

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. S. Graham Kelly, Associate Provost

APPENDIX C

Report of Research Faculty Projects Committee

Fall Faculty Research Grants

The Research (Faculty Projects) Committee met on Friday, November 7, 1997, at 9 a.m. in the McCollester Room. Members present were: Dr. Steve Aby, Dr. Celal Batur, Mr. Andrew Borowiec, Dr. Kathleen Endres, Miss Judith Fitzgerald, Dr. Jon Hawes, Dr. Peter Henriksen, Dr. Gwendolyn Jones, Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. William McGucken, Dr. Victoria Schirm, Dr. Dan Sheffer, Dr. Jerry Stinner, Dr. Mark Tausig, Chair, and Dr. Michael Williams. Members absent were: Dr. Clayton Fant, Dr. Karen Reed, and Dr. Phillip Schmidt. In addition, a new member has been added to the committee, Dr. Susan Clark of Educational Foundations and Leadership. The committee now consists of 19 members.

Dr. Tausig informed the committee that he met with Dr. Mark Auburn on Wednesday, November 5, 1997, regarding the funding of the committee for this year. Thus far, the committee has been allocated \$102,000 of which \$52,000 is carryover funds. The \$110,000 that was allocated to us last year was not reallocated. Dr. Tausig stated that we can expect to get that amount back before we meet again to review the summer proposals. We have had six summer fellowships turned in already, and it is clear that we need that extra money for the next two competitions. Our budget goal is to have an annual \$250,000 budget related to a percentage of IDC funds.

Dr. Tausig reviewed the scoring system that is used by the committee. A one is superior; two is good; three is average, and four is poor. A five is considered ineligible, and it takes three votes of five to have a proposal deemed ineligible. Each project is discussed in detail and then each member provides a score by secret ballot. The ballots are then collected and tabulated. When all proposals have been reviewed and scored, the range of scores is given to the committee. The committee then decides at what score level they want to establish a cut off. Those above that will be funded, and those below the cut off will not. The rejected proposers will be given feedback by the primary reviewers to enable them to resubmit for a later competition, if desired.

The committee reviewed and scored all 14 proposals submitted.

It was noted that in our guidelines it clearly states that travel to professional meetings is not an allowable expenditure of this committee. That is considered a departmental expense. Several proposal budgets were adjusted accordingly.

In this competition six proposals were funded for **\$18,469.35**.

- 1 - Engineering (Chemical Engineering)
- 5 - Arts & Sciences (1 - Biology, 1 - Mathematical Sciences, 1 - Geography & Planning)
- 2 - Chemistry

Respectfully submitted by
Mark Tausig, Chair

**THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON
INTERNAL GRANTS AWARDED BY
FACULTY (RESEARCH PROJECTS) COMMITTEE
FALL COMPETITION**

EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 12, 1997 - JANUARY 31, 1999

<i>ACCT</i>	<i>FRG#</i>	<i>NAME</i>	<i>TITLE OF PROJECT</i>	<i>AMOUNT</i>
2-07353	1390	Dr. W. J. Chang Biology	"Imaging the Surface Structures of Bacteria With the Atomic Force Microscope."	\$ 3,000.00
2-07354	1391	Dr. Brian J. d'Auriol Mathematical Sciences	"Geometric Representation of Programs."	\$ 1,504.55
2-07355	1392	Dr. Lu-Kwang Ju Chemical Engineering	"Enhancing Industrial Fermentation by Deitrication: Rhamnolipid Production From Vegetable Oil."	\$ 3,500.00
2-07356	1393	Dr. Kwadwo Konadu- Agyemang, Geography & Planning	"The Adaptation of African Immigrants to the Living Environment in the USA: Case Study Of Africans in the Greater New York and Washington/Baltimore Areas."	\$ 3,464.80
2-07357	1394	Dr. Daniel J. Smith Chemistry	"A Family of Nitric Oxide Releasing Com- pounds to be Used in the Treatment of Pulmonary Hypertension."	\$ 3,500.00
2-07358	1395	Dr. Ronald E. Viola Chemistry	"Creating New Enzyme Catalysts."	\$ 3,500.00

**Total: 6 Proposals for Fall, 1997
AMOUNT FUNDED: \$18,469.35**

10

