

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

2-6-1997

Faculty Senate Chronicle February 6, 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.



1996-97, No. 5

February 6, 1997

23 Pages

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 6, 1997 | 1 |
| Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of February 6, 1997 | 13 |
| A. Report of <i>Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee</i> | 13 |
| B. Report of <i>Academic Policies and Calendar Committee</i> | 13 |
| C. Council of Admission Officers document- Addition to "Bulletin" regarding minimum core for college preparation | 15 |
| D. Report of <i>Curriculum Review Committee</i> | 20 |
| E. Report of <i>Research Faculty Projects Committee</i> | 22 |

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 FEBRUARY 6, 1997

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate was called to order by Chairman H. Michael Cheung at 3:02 p.m. on Thursday, February 6, 1997, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education.

Fifty-six of the sixty-nine members of the Faculty Senate were in attendance. Senators Borowiec, C. Buchanan, Clinefelter, DePaul, Hardy, Hoover, Markovich, Murray, Ross-Alaolmolki, Stinner, and Witt were absent with notice. Senator J. Buchanan was absent without notice.

SENATE ACTIONS

- * APPROVED A MOTION IN HONOR OF THE LATE RONALD FISHER**
- * RE-APPROVED THE 97-98 ACADEMIC CALENDAR AND THE 98-99 PRELIMINARY CALENDAR**
- * APPROVED AN AMENDMENT TO THE SECTION OF THE FACULTY MANUAL RELATING TO DEPARTMENT CHAIR REVIEW**
- * APPROVED TWO MOTIONS FROM THE ACADEMIC POLICY AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE, ONE OF WHICH CALLED FOR THE CREATION OF A DEAN'S LIST FOR PART-TIME STUDENTS**

Before beginning the agenda, the Chairman reminded the body that the University community had lost several members recently, amongst them Trustee Ron Fisher, Professor Bernie Deitzer and Professor Alex Anikeef. He asked the Senate to stand and join him in a moment of silence to acknowledge their passing and any other of our colleagues and friends who might have passed away since the body had last met.

I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - The Chairman asked whether there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the agenda. Since there were none, the Senate voted its approval.

II. CONSIDERATION OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 5, 1996 - Secretary Gary H. Oller stated that he had two corrections. The first was on page 6 in the last paragraph. The sentence which began with "Using a faculty envelope calculation" should have read, "Using a back of the envelope calculation." The meaning was the same, but "back of the envelope" was what Senator Wolfgang Pelz had said. The second correction was on page 26 regarding Appendix D, the proposed changes to the section of the Faculty Manual pertaining to review of department chairs. In

the sentence, "To be continued as chair, a majority vote of the regular full-time faculty of the department" the words "is required" were left out. Unfortunately, the copy that had been transmitted to the President's office after the Senate had approved this also contained this error, but our eagle-eyed Provost had caught the omission and corrected it.

Since there were no other corrections, the body voted its approval of the minutes as amended.

III. REMARKS OF THE CHAIRMAN - The Chairman wished to inform the Senate that most of the University's rules and regulations were now available on-line. This had occurred officially today via the Home Page of the Office of General Counsel. He had put near the door a handout which was a printout of that page for the University rules available as what was known as a "pdf file" which one could read using a piece of software called Acrobat Reader, and the link to get that if one did not have it was also on the page. If you had Microsoft Word, it was also possible to read the regulations. The hot link for this was available on the page as well. The URL was also listed on the handout, but a link was now listed on the banner for the very front page of the University Web, so one could get there without knowing the URL. This had been a very long time coming, and he wanted to acknowledge the hard work of a number of people, amongst them Counselor Mike Sermersheim, Professor Steve Myers, who had really put us over the top in putting together the page members saw before them, Senator John Green, Kathy Watson, Cathy Moore, Associate Provost Dawn Trouard, Desnay Lohrum, Mieke Weissert, and especially Sonya Reisch, to whom much of the typing had fallen. Also, he had to tell the body that President Ruebel had played a characteristically decisive role in making this happen. Those members who had been in meetings where Rube had been decisive knew exactly what he meant.

The Web presentation of the rules was a work in progress, and maintenance items not requiring Senate action would be presented to the Board at its February 26 meeting. Maintenance items or items of policy that this exercise had brought to light would be brought to this body as they were pulled together. It was hoped that shortly these maintenance items would be marked so that if one saw something that did not appear to be right, this would be noted as needing an annotation. There was a provision on the rules page to send someone a message that you had found something which you did not think was correct. There were two mechanisms - one was simple email and the other was a comments or suggestions page that had space to fill in those comments or suggestions to be sent straight back to the people charged with this work. He invited members and the entire University community to have a look at this and significantly increase the number of proofreaders that this effort had available to it. Other means of distribution in addition to the Web were being considered, and members would be hearing more about that as some decisions were made. This had been the single, most expedient way to get something out there for most people to be able to access quickly.

IV. SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS - The Chairman stated that as many members were aware, Associate Provost Graham Kelly had recently been quite ill. The latest update that he had on his health was from yesterday; he was at home and doing quite well. The Senate's best wishes had been conveyed to Dr. Kelly.

V. REPORTS

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

"Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me, as an indication of my decisiveness, come to you this afternoon and apologize for a message that came from my office on January 15, and if I might take the credit for this, which was very poorly written. I'm going to quote from the memo and then I want you to disregard it: 'Effective immediately any contact you or your employees under your supervision may have with the news media should be handled through University Communications.' Please disregard that, and as soon as I can put pen to paper and do a better job of expressing myself I will, but this is what I meant: If the Community & Technical College or if the Wayne branch or if the Buchtel College of Arts & Sciences or the College of Education were going to have some major news release, I would want that to be centralized through Media Communications so that we were all on the same page. If you want to talk to a reporter you talk to a reporter. If a reporter calls you, don't tell them you have to go through Communications to speak to you as an individual. I'm sorry the way it was sent, I'm sorry the way it was written, and I'm more sorry the way it was received.

I have a number of things I want to cover with you today. The budget is foremost as far as the state is concerned right now, but please keep in mind that the budgeting process is just starting as far as the state is concerned. You will note that the Board of Regents, the state's presidents and the Governor's office came together this year and planned what the educational budget should be for the state of Ohio. At the last minute because of the political ramifications and so on this fell by the wayside, but if you recall from this performance funding budget that was proposed, and I've been in this state now 27 years, this was the first time in my opinion we talked about the right kinds of things and the things that should go toward education. We were talking about access, we were talking about effective learning as far as the teaching-learning process is concerned, we were talking about applied research that actually made a difference to the community. We talked about economic development and we talked about accountability. This made up the performance funding package. The presidents have come together because of the cuts that have been made so far, and keep in mind that this process is very early on in its stage, but we came together and decided that we should do away with the performance funding for this particular biennium because it's watered it down, diluted it too much. As a matter of fact, The University of Akron would get .1 percent next year. The next year, if I can use the term, would be "flat-line"; combined to a .1 percent, we're talking flat-line for two years. So this has gone by the wayside, we're going to go back to the basic funding formula. Then The University of Akron will not be hurt as severely as what has been originally proposed; however, it's very early in the process and I think some things will come about that will indicate a change for the University.

For instance, penal institutions - if the state budget goes through as written right now, in penal institutions the guard-prisoner ratio will be 6 to 1. My position on this is if our faculty-pupil ratio were 6 to 1, we wouldn't need any prisons. So I think that it's early in the stage and I think that we will not come out as bad as it looks right now.

Last weekend we had a retreat for the Cabinet members, the deans and two members of the Faculty Senate, which I felt was very worthwhile. Dr. Wilson in my office put this retreat together, so I can take no credit for this whatsoever. I feel that you have to sit down and let your hair down

and talk about the issues at the institution given the size of our institution and the issues we have. We talked about some important things, I feel. You'll say, what are the results? The results are not here yet because we're trying to *crystallize* things, but I think we at least have to get them on the table. We talked about our mission and goals, we talked about why we exist as an institution and where we want to be five years from now.

We tried to identify some priorities and we've got any number of things that we could put in priority order and they're not going to satisfy everyone, but at least we've started to put some things on paper. Information technology, human resource initiatives, management training - I could spend an entire month on that. We've got some critical areas in Student Services that we have to address. We talk about retention of students and we cut down on our academic advising - it doesn't make sense. The degree auditing system - when I left The University of Akron this was in process. When I came back to The University this is in process. It's time we get this thing on-line.

Deferred maintenance - we have \$50 million in deferred maintenance. That is a case of no planning. Facilities planning - someone asked me what are you going to do when the fifth floor and the third floor of Polsky's are finished? I don't know and I can't find anyone on campus who knows. We're going to establish an office for planning for the campus so we know where we're going to go and why we're going to go there. We have not done that. We spent time talking about student housing, about Bulger Hall. I'm getting information from all different sources, some telling me to tear Bulger Hall down, some telling me Bulger Hall is making money, some telling me that we could put other offices in Bulger Hall. I don't know; we're going to put this data all together and find out what will be the best thing to do with Bulger Hall. We've never planned this. We have the problem of hazardous waste material storage and so on. When I left The University of Akron this was a problem; this is still a problem. It has not been addressed, but we at least got it out on the table. Long-term planning is an absolute necessity here, and we're going to address it because I'm going to establish an office and that's going to be their 100-percent job, to plan. We have a budget of \$150 million, and as many people as we have working at this institution, it's not asking too much that we plan on what we're going to do, both short-term and long-term.

The North Central update: we last month submitted our monitoring report. It was accepted by North Central and they indicated back to the institution that they require no further information for the institution and that we will proceed with the visit as planned. We are still on course and you recall that I had the target of 200 academic scholarships. If we can get 50 a year I will be happy; I think we're going to get 50 for this coming year. We're not there yet but the money is coming in and I am optimistic that we are going to make this goal.

From the Board's perspective, they approved last month professional leaves for 62 full-time faculty members for the next academic year. They approved 114 applications of people to participate in the Early Retirement Incentive Program, 61 in STRS and 53 in SERBS.

In the search category, this next week we will have a decision on the Executive Director of Human Resources, we will have a decision on the Vice President for Public Affairs and Development, and I also have asked the Chair of the Provost Search Committee, Dr. Richard Gigliotti, if he would like to give us a brief report on that search because this is very important to the institution."

Dr. Richard Gigliotti reported that the Committee had been at it for two months or a year and two months, depending on how closely one had been paying attention. Tomorrow, February 7, was their formal screening, although there was no closing date. The Committee had adopted a practice which he had learned about in the Senate which was to conclude their meetings with a good of the order. At the last meeting, one of the members had brought to the floor concerns that had been expressed to him from several colleagues that the outcome of this search had been preordained. The other members of the Committee had been both interested and amused by this. They had concluded that someone had really messed up here because they had failed to tell the Committee who the priest should be.

Dr. Gigliotti wanted the Senate to know that this Committee had been operating on the working premise that this was the most important search that had been conducted at this institution in its 127-year history. It intended to present to this campus individuals who were well-qualified to be the Provost and Senior Vice President and to lead us in the obvious challenges that were before us. This was the statement which the Committee had presented to President Ruebel at the very beginning of the process, and he had stated that he would accept nothing less than that. The Committee had been going through the usual things - the letters, ads, nominations, and had also interviewed several "successful provosts and former provosts from around the country" to get a sense of what they felt would be good characteristics, etc., of a provost. To date there were 57 applications and, in his personal opinion, there was a working core of good candidates. He could not speak for the rest of the Committee members. In the near future, candidates who made the cuts would be asked to provide written responses to questions about issues that were important to this campus. The Committee would be conducting phone interviews with these people, as well as seeking their references and then would be moving to off-campus interviews and non-reference calls. It hoped to bring candidates to campus by the beginning of April and with luck after receiving faculty evaluations based on the interviews to get a recommendation to President Ruebel by the middle of April.

There were no questions for Dr. Gigliotti, but Senator Tim Norfolk had one for President Ruebel. He had heard that the only three universities in the Governor's proposed budget that received essentially no increase were Akron U., Central State and Youngstown. Was that correct?

When President Ruebel responded that it was not, Senator Norfolk went on to ask whether he was correct in assuming that some universities would have received an increase under the proposed budget. The President again replied in the negative and noted that if one converted the percentages to hard dollars and then went back five years in time in hard dollars, not in percentages, and brought us up to the current date, everyone would have fewer dollars.

Before returning to complete his remarks, President Ruebel had a question for Professor Gigliotti. As soon as the Committee knew who this preordained person was, would it please let him know?

President Ruebel then continued with his remarks:

"For the Trustees' meeting this month, from Senate we will present the academic calendar for 1997-98 and the preliminary calendar for 1998-99. I have forwarded from my office to the Provost's office from the Senate space allocation recommendations from the Campus Facilities

Planning Committee, the Bylaws changes regarding terms of office for Faculty Senators and the changes in department chair reviews. One final thing - the University is the recipient of a \$800,000 grant that will complete the Buchtel Common from where it is right now down to Wolf Ledges, which I think will add a great deal to our campus. So this was very fortunate to have this grant. I will entertain any questions."

Senator Devinder Malhotra commented that on a previous occasion President Ruebel had informed the body that Olin Hall was going to be converted into a student services building and some of the departments in the College of Arts and Sciences would be moved to a new building. What progress had been made in terms of planning, because that would help those departments to plan more effectively?

The President answered that his planning right now was that this was going to happen. If we went to the state and said that we wanted to build a student services building, they would be reluctant to do that. But if we went and said we wanted to build a classroom building, they would be more interested. He liked Polsky's and the people working in Polsky's, but selfishly he would like to enhance student traffic on this side of campus. Our auxiliaries - food service, housing, etc. - suffered when we did not have the traffic. It was just as if we ran a hardware store, the more people we got to come into the store, the more customers we would have. There might be disagreements on this and he would happy to entertain them, but he considered the new Olin Hall structure our number one priority along with converting the present Olin to a student services building. This was going to be put into the next capital plan, so it would be under construction within two years.

REMARKS OF THE PROVOST - Provost Randy Moore began by stating that in light of what President Ruebel had just said, he wanted to inform the body of a lesser known proposal. The Senate had just heard the comments about the state budget and prisons. He and the Council of Deans wanted to turn Bulger Hall into a prison. We could get some subsidy and start teaching some convicts; maybe we could make this work.

Provost Moore went on to say that hopefully before the next Senate meeting there would be some news on campus that would be of great benefit to faculty and staff. That was the opening of the new Media Center in the basement of the library which had been initiated by a proposal from the Council of Deans almost a year ago. With the President's help, some money had been reallocated for this; with the help of Del Williams, Steve Myers, and Tom Bennett there was construction going on and equipment arriving. One could see this on the Web page. They were going to offer workshops which would deal with what technology could do for the faculty in the classroom and in scholarship. Many faculty had already attended open houses on this - over 100 at one and 80 at another. This would be a major enhancement to all the money which was being spent on technology as a way of helping people. Learn to use it and exploit it.

In relation to the report which Professor Gigliotti had made earlier, he did hope that the Provost Search Committee was successful and wanted to emphasize the importance of that search. He had gotten a good appreciation for the extent of the job when he had been a dean; he had a perfect appreciation for the quality of the job now that he was in the position. He hoped that members of the Senate would be participating once the candidates came to campus. It would be something having a tremendous effect on them.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE - Secretary Oller reported that the Committee had met a number of times since the last meeting of the Senate and had done a number of things. First, it had set the agenda for today's meeting. It had also met with President Ruebel, Provost Moore, Vice President Mallo, and Special Assistant Wilson to discuss matters of mutual concern. In regard to one of those matters, the part-time faculty tier proposal, the Committee wanted to inform the Senate that since the Board had passed this proposal, Provost Moore had informed the deans and appropriate program directors to begin to work out the criteria for those part-time faculty positions in their colleges and programs. Also, Vice President for Finances McFarland had been asked to do a cost assessment for the funding of the proposal's implementation.

The Committee had also received a petition signed by ten members of the Music School faculty relating to amendments passed at the Senate's last meeting regarding department chair review which read as follows: "They support the introduction of passage of legislation by the Faculty Senate whereby the Faculty Senate would request that the President of The University of Akron exercise his executive prerogative to postpone action on any school director or departmental chair reviews that would be or would have been affected by changes to the Faculty Manual passed by the Faculty Senate in December, 1996. This postponement would remain in effect until the Board of Trustees acts to approve or disapprove these changes. The Faculty Senate would also request that if these changes to the Faculty Manual are approved by the Board of Trustees, the President would act to ensure that they apply to all school directors or department chair reviews in progress or concluded during the current academic year." The Committee after deliberation decided that because the proposed legislation would raise as many difficulties as it intended to solve, it could not introduce this as an item for Senate consideration. However, it did inform the faculty members who had sent the petition that it was certainly appropriate for them to approach any of their college's Senators and ask whether one of them would be willing to introduce such a motion.

The Committee had three motions to present to the body. The first was a motion in honor of the late Ronald Fisher which read as follows: "The Faculty Senate wishes to recognize the years of fine service and support which the late Ronald Fisher, both as a member of the Board of Trustees and as a private benefactor, gave to his alma mater, The University of Akron, and extends its condolences to his family." There was no discussion of the motion, and the body voted its approval.

The second motion related to consideration of the academic calendar for next year. At the last meeting the Senate had approved the academic calendar, but toward the end of the meeting there had been a motion to reconsider it. That motion had been approved, and certain items had been reconsidered. The body debated those modifications but voted not to make them. However, it did not formally vote to reapprove the whole thing again. Obviously, it had been the intention of the body to stand by what it had approved earlier, but for the sake of parliamentary correctness, the Senate should formally have that vote. Therefore, the Committee moved that the 1997-98 academic calendar and 1998-99 preliminary calendar be approved. Since there was no discussion, the Senate approved the motion.

The third motion was one which the body had seen before and was an amendment to language passed last month relating to department chair review, Faculty Manual 3359-20-02-B-(5)(b)(v)(aa). The sentence to be amended here would read, "To be continued as Chair, a majority vote of the ENTIRE regular full-time faculty of the department is required."

In regard to this, the Chairman said that he owed Senator Bee an apology because he had been right about this last month. Frankly, he (the Chairman) had bungled this when he had attempted his interpretation on the fly of "Robert's Rules." He also owed thanks to Senator Rich, who had attempted to save him from his folly and had regrettably failed. It took very little review of "Robert's Rules" to realize that Senator Bee was entirely in the right, and given his experience with said rules, the Chairman should have realized it before he opened his mouth. The matter was before the body to rectify the mess which he had created.

Senator John Bee said he did not think that apologies were in order. The rules were difficult enough as they were, and he had been remiss at not having been fully informed when he came to the assembly. "Robert's Rules of Order" on page 3 stated that, "The basic principle of decision in a deliberative assembly is that, to become the act or choice of the body, a proposition must be adopted by a majority vote; that is, direct approval must be registered by more than half of the members present and voting on a particular matter, in a regular or properly called meeting..." So it was the principle and practice of our parliamentary authority that the word "majority" unless otherwise modified meant "members present and voting." As a practical matter, that meant in a department of ten people, if eight people showed up and four people voted, three people could pass a motion. It seemed to him in fond reflection that this was not the wish nor the intent and indeed not the way we would anticipate interpreting the language of the department chair review. It was fairly simple to correct, and inserting the word "entire" was one of the options that our parliamentary authority provided us with for clarifying that. It was not the only one, but it was the standard one. In that spirit, he was happy to support and urge that the Senate adopt expeditiously the change proposed by the Chairman.

After a brief discussion about the language of the motion, the body voted its approval.

FACULTY RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES COMMITTEE - (Appendix A)

ACADEMIC POLICY AND CALENDAR COMMITTEE - Senator Bee, the Chair, began by noting that he was rising to report for a new committee created when the APCC split into a separate Curriculum Committee and a separate Academic Policies and Calendar Committee. Heretofore, Associate Provost Kelly had been the Chair of the combined group. He joined Chairman Cheung in wishing Dr. Kelly a speedy recovery. The APC had three items to bring before the Senate. The first was a report, and the other two were recommended actions.

The Committee had received indication through the Executive Committee that various departments in Buchtel College were expressing some concerns about practices of scheduling classes on the Wayne campus, and the Committee was requested to clarify that relationship. In response to that request, the Committee had met twice with individuals from Wayne, once with a member of the Wayne campus faculty and once with Dean Sturm, Associate Dean McElwee, and three of their colleagues along with some guests from outside of the Committee (Senator Devinder Malhotra). The Committee's report (see Appendix B) simply summarized those conversations. The Committee wished to propose no action, but it wanted to note in general that it was its impression that Wayne College had a very clear understanding that curriculum authority resided with the main campus. As far as initiating any curriculum items, it was the wish of Wayne College to cooperate and be consistent entirely with the main campus' wishes and practices in relation to content and teaching of various sections. The Committee noted a number of successful incidents of ongoing collaboration

between the two campuses. All agreed that the issues raised could be discussed and deliberated in the spirit and processes of collegial and professional interaction. The one mechanical point about which the Senate or others might have a specific interest was that there was no structural review by the home campus departments on courses that Wayne College offered in their schedule - at least not at the departmental level that the Committee could discern. There was to a considerable extent some latitude and independence by Wayne College in hiring part-time faculty when the need arose. That was really the main area in which the Committee thought there might be some further discussion to see whether there was a need to take some further action.

Senator Jesse Marquette asked whether Wayne College curriculum proposals came to the APC. Senator Bee answered that they would not come to APC which no longer had jurisdiction in curriculum matters. It was the APC's understanding that all curriculum matters in the University including Wayne College came to the University curriculum process, which he took to mean that they would come through this campus' Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee. That was Wayne College's understanding.

President Ruebel was curious about what had brought this question to the surface. Senator Bee and Chairman Cheung stated that there had been a number of departments in Buchtel College (including Economics and Geology) whose representatives had raised the issue in the Buchtel College Council, the representative body in the Arts and Sciences College, and that body had sent the question to the Executive Committee which had forwarded it to Senator Bee's committee.

Senator Bee then presented the first of two action items. The Committee had received through Provost Moore and the COD a suggestion that some provision be made on campus to recognize excellence and academic achievement by our part-time students. The proposal which the Senate had before it was to create a part-time students dean's list. It read as follows: "Undergraduate part-time students who carry between 6 and 11.5 graded credits without receiving an "incomplete" or "In Progress" grade and earn a grade point average of 3.25 or better are eligible for inclusion on the Part-time Student Dean's List of their respective college. This is an undergraduate academic honor recognizing excellence in the classroom prior to the completion of the degree." He moved this on behalf of the Committee.

Senator Bee went on to say that the language here basically mirrored the language which was currently in the Bulletin for regular academic honors by full-time students. It was the Committee's thought that first it was appropriate and desirable that we give academic recognition to part-time students who were doing well in their courses and in their studies. It was also the Committee's thought that there was a difference worth noticing between a student who completed 15 or 18 credits with a 3.25 average and a student who completed for example 6 or 9 credits with a 3.25 average. This was the reason for having the separate Dean's List for part-time students.

Senator Norfolk suggested that the wording be changed to "Dean's List for Part-time Students of their respective college." This would avoid the possible idea that we had part-time student deans. This was accepted as a friendly amendment by Senator Bee.

Senator Michele Scott asked whether students with a 3.9 average for a semester who started as full-time and then withdrew from several courses making them part-time would be able to be placed on the Dean's List. Senator Bee replied that it would. The only question there would be at the end

of the semester was how many credits the student had completed. That would determine on which Dean's List the student's name would appear.

The Chairman noted that without this, that student would not have the opportunity to be on any Dean's List. Since there was no further discussion, the Senate voted its approval of this modification to the University Bulletin and the establishment of said Dean's List.

Senator Bee's second action item arose from something which had been noticed in a document from the Council of Admission Officers for the state universities in Ohio which was prepared by State University Admissions Officers and which was sent to high school guidance counselors in the high school and secondary schools throughout the state. In the handout (Appendix C) there was a page containing what looked like a chewed-up apple that had in it what was described as the minimum core for college preparation in Ohio. Some programs might require more extensive preparation, but this core as described was endorsed by admissions officers of the universities listed at the bottom including The University of Akron. In the list as a part of the core was "The Arts: 1 unit." On another sheet of the handout was one of the pages from our current Bulletin. In the lower left there was a presentation of what was described there as the core curriculum, and it included all of the elements listed on the earlier page except the one credit of the Arts. For some reason that had been omitted or deleted. This omission was emphasized when one looked at two other pages of the handout which contained a chart presenting for high school guidance counselors all of the various possibilities for fulfilling that requirement and which of those possibilities each state university accepted for fulfillment. On the chart there were only three universities not represented - The University of Akron, Shawnee State, and The University of Toledo. The APC believed that as a matter of information that was going forth from the University to the secondary schools and the public at large, it was a desirable thing if we included and added back in our Bulletin any materials that would substantively issue forth from that inclusion of "The Arts: one credit." With that in mind, the APC proposed that "The Arts: 1 unit" be added back to the Bulletin description of the high school core and also directed that the specific high school courses fulfilling this unit be determined by the General Education Advisory Committee in consultation with the College of Fine & Applied Arts.

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

CURRICULUM REVIEW COMMITTEE - Senator Norfolk said that in the absence of Dr. Kelly, he had been asked to present the report. There was a long list of curriculum proposals filed by the College of Arts and Sciences, the College of Business Administration, one from the C&T College, and several from Engineering and from Wayne (for numbers, see Appendix D). These had been up on the Web; they had matured, received no objections, and had been approved by the Provost. Unless the Senate acted now on any of them, they would be approved by the University. In terms of a more complete report, the Curriculum Review Committee had not met yet this year because there had been no business because of the success of the rearrangement of the procedure. However, there was one proposal that had been objected to which had come out of C&T, and negotiation was underway between C&T and the College of Business Administration as a result of this.

Senator Karen Reed was concerned because there should have been at least four proposals from Nursing on the list. She had received communication on e-mail from Graham Kelly yesterday morning containing comments asking for a response. She had responded by e-mail sending it back

to Dr. Kelly's address and had said in the message that Nursing agreed with all of the comments.

Senator Norfolk said that he really did not know the answer to Senator Reed's question, but he guessed that Dr. Kelly had not yet managed to get that information processed, in which case he suspected that the Committee would bring these up at the next meeting.

The Chairman reminded the body that this report was for information purposes only. Barring action by any members of the Senate, these curriculum proposals would become active.

There were no objections to any of them.

RESEARCH FACULTY PROJECTS COMMITTEE - (Appendix E)

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - There was none.

VII. NEW BUSINESS - There was none, but Senator Norfolk had a question for Senator Marquette as the Vice Chair of PBC. Given the bad news that we had just had on the budget, how was PBC going to plan? Were we going to plan on the proposed amount as what we were actually going to get and hope for more, or what?

Senator Marquette answered that the planning process as it had been outlined was working from an expectation that we were going to prioritize various requests. We would not have to make actual dollar decisions until much later in the semester. The assumptions which we had begun the year with were that the cap would remain essentially the same on tuition and that we would get approximately a 3% increase. On the basis of what the President had said so far and on where the numbers had been massaged, he thought we were looking at a somewhat smaller cap and about a 2% increase if we did not do this performance funding stuff. So the initial assumptions had been relatively conservative because we had not expected major increases in funding for the institution. Until we had a better sense of things, we would not really have to reply directly to these issues. Right now, given the position of the presidents of universities across the state and the Board of Regents, he would say that we would wind up with something closer to our original set of assumptions which were conservative in the first place.

VIII. GOOD OF THE ORDER - The Chairman said that Parliamentarian Don R. Gerlach wished to address the body. The Senate gave its permission.

Dr. Gerlach said that as an old crocodile, he had recently heard reports of a thing that disturbed him a little bit, and he wondered whether the members of the Senate should not be interested in it. It had to do with an academic ceremonial at this University which ever since he had come here in 1962 he had understood involved lining up the faculty in order of their rank and within ranks their length of service. That was a widespread custom in most places, but in recent occasions he had heard that the University Marshall had decided that it was too much bother to plan out who was in what ranks and what the length of service was. Therefore, he had told everyone to march however

they pleased. Perhaps the next thing he would say was do not bother to wear your caps and gowns if you don't want to. Dr. Gerlach thought this would be rather unfortunate.

Dr. Gerlach had also spoken about this with Senator Ruth Clinefelter, a very senior member of the faculty, who was disturbed by this as well. He asked the body to take this under consideration. He thought that one ought to maintain the old ways and not simply do things in a helter-skelter fashion. He was reminded of the time that he had written a note to a previous President of this University for daring to tamper with a tradition we had here, which was a retirement lunch for faculty members on May Day. That was stopped and he had written him a reminder that in the "English Book of Common Prayer" there was a "Service of Commemoration" which called down threats on people who did things wrongly, and he was reminded of this one, "Cursed be he who removes his neighbor's landmarks." Don't remove your neighbor's landmarks. See what the Senate could do about this, if it pleased.

IX. ADJOURNMENT - The Chairman called for a motion to adjourn which was given and seconded. The body approved the motion and the meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.

Transcript prepared by Marilyn Quillen

APPENDIX A

Report of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities Committee

A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 96-7. The committee completed its consideration of the grievance and conducted a review and submitted a report to the President. The President accepted the committee's recommendations.

A grievance was received by the committee and assigned file number 96-4. The committee completed its consideration of the grievance and conducted a review and submitted a report to the President. The President accepted the committee's recommendations.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. Bruce Simmons, Chair

APPENDIX B

Report of Academic Policies and Calendar Committee

Re: Clarification of relationship between Wayne College and the main campus with regard to teaching and scheduling classes.

APCC met Tuesday, January 21, with Interim Dean Sturm and other representatives from Wayne College to address this issue. From that session we report the following:

1. There is agreement that curriculum authority resides with the main campus and that all curriculum matters go through the university curriculum procedure.
2. There is agreement that Wayne College is not authorized on its own to teach upper division (300-400) undergraduate classes. Because of institutional history, there are some exceptions.

3. There is agreement that the main campus home department has curriculum authority over courses taught only at Wayne College.

4. There is agreement that Wayne College should follow the main campus home department in determining the content of courses, including undergraduate courses.

5. There is agreement that there should be close communication and collaboration between Wayne college and the main campus in all matters pertaining to matters of curriculum, course offerings and staffing.

6. There is agreement that the General Education Advisory Committee may be an appropriate and effective body for the cooperation on any course that is part of the general education component.

7. There is agreement that some degree of separation exists between the main campus and Wayne College in the areas of full and part-time faculty hires and assignments. The Wayne College full-time faculty is not understood to be part of the main campus full-time faculty. Similarly, Wayne College finds and hires part-time faculty through their own process.

8. There is agreement that there is some degree of separation in scheduling and staffing classes within the purview and mandate of Wayne College to offer. Wayne College recognizes the curriculum authority of the main campus, but there is no mandatory supervisory review of the Wayne College offerings by the main campus home department.

Interim Dean Sturm and the Wayne College representatives expressed their strong wish to cooperate and collaborate with the main campus faculty in every way. They reported and the committee confirmed many examples of collaboration in curriculum, both past and present. Wayne College welcomes inquiries and invites our faculty to visit Wayne to discuss curriculum and learn more about their enterprise. They hope any questions pertaining to curriculum can be resolved through the spirit and processes of collegial and professional interaction.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. John Bee, Chair

The Minimum Core...*

APPENDIX C



English: 4 units
Math: 3 units
Science: 3 units
Social Studies: 3 units
Foreign Language: 2 units
The Arts: 1 unit

...for college preparation in Ohio

***Some programs may require more extensive preparation in specific subject areas. Check with your guidance counselor and the state university of your choice for additional information.**

Endorsed by the admissions offices of:

Bowling Green State University
Central State University
Cleveland State University
Kent State University
Miami University

Ohio University
The Ohio State University
Shawnee State University
The University of Akron
University of Cincinnati

University of Toledo
Wright State University
Youngstown State University

THE ARTS: A Counseling Guide

Courses in boldface type such as **BAND (MARCHING, SYMPHONIC)** are acceptable to all institutions if taught in a fine arts department in high school.

| | MUSIC | BAND-MARCHING, SYMPHONIC | CHORUS / CHOIR | FUNDAMENTALS OF MUSIC | CLEF CLUB | INSTRUMENT INSTRUCTION | MUSIC | MUSIC APPRECIATION/HISTORY | MUSIC LITERATURE | MUSIC THEORY | THEORY AND COMPOSITION | VOICE CLASS | WIND ENSEMBLE | THEATRE / DRAMA | ACTING / DIRECTING | DRAMA / DRAMATICS | PLAY PRODUCTION | SPEECH / ORAL INTERPRETATION | THEATRE / THEATRICS | DANCE | DANCE (IF PHYS. ED) |
|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------------------|-------|----------------------------|------------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|
| THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY*** | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | • | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| CENTRAL STATE UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | • | • |
| UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | • | |
| KENT STATE UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| MIAMI UNIVERSITY** | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | • | |
| THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | • | |
| OHIO UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| SHAWNEE STATE UNIVERSITY* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| UNIVERSITY OF TOLEDO* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | • | |

✓ Accept.

• Contact University for Specific Information.

• No Arts Requirement.

** Only those courses taught by a fine arts department in high school will be acceptable.

| MULTIDISCIPLINARY ARTS | HUMANITIES-COMB. ART / MUSIC | MULTIMEDIA DESIGN | UNIFIED FINE ARTS | VISUAL ARTS | ADVERTISING ART / DESIGN | APPLIED FINE ARTS | ART IN | ART APPRECIATION | ART ELECTIVE | ART SURVEY | ARTS AND CRAFTS | CERAMICS | COMMERCIAL DESIGN | CRAFTS | DESIGN / VISUAL ORGANIZATION | DRAWING | DRESS / FASHION DESIGN | GRAPHIC ARTS | GRAPHICS | INTERIOR DESIGN | INTRODUCTION TO ART | JEWELRY, ENAMELING | LETTERING | METAL AND FIBER | PAINTING | PHOTOGRAPHY | PRINTMAKING | SCULPTURE | STUDIO ART / PROBS. / FOUNDATION | VISUAL ARTS | VOCATIONAL COMMERCIAL ART |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|----------|-------------------|--------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|--------------|----------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|----------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | UA* |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | BGSU*** |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | CS |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | UC |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | CSU |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | KSU |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | MU** |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | OSU |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | OU |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | SSU* |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | UT* |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | WSU |
| / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | YSU |

***Bowling Green State University will accept the indicated courses if and only if they are taught in an art or fine arts department by a certified art teacher.

For the following courses contact The Ohio State University and Central State University:

Interior Decorating
Fashion and Tailoring
Needle Arts
Drafting

Interior Planning
Clothing and Textiles
Yearbook
Mechanical Drawing
Pottery

Textiles and Fibers
Journalism
Engineering Drawing
Fashions
Stained Glass

TV Production
Vocational Agriculture
Wood Working

- The Post-Secondary Enrollment Options programs are limited and selective. The University reserves the right to accept only as many qualified students as can be properly served.

This procedure should be followed:

- Obtain a post-secondary enrollment options application from the Office of Admissions, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-3001.
- Complete and return the form with the guidance counselor's and parent's signatures and the non-refundable application fee (a one-time charge).
- Information regarding acceptance into the program, registration for classes, and academic advising will be forthcoming in the letter of admission to the post-secondary enrollment options program.

Guest Students (Non-University of Akron Students)

An undergraduate guest student must apply to the Office of Admissions. A graduate student must apply through the dean's office of the Graduate School.

A guest student may not, as a general rule, attempt more than 15 credits in any semester or session and is subject to all rules and regulations of The University of Akron. Guest students must be in good standing at their home school.

The following procedures should be followed when applying to the University as a guest student:

- Obtain a guest student application from the Office of Admissions, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-3001. Complete it and return it with the non-refundable application fee (a one-time charge).
- Receive advice and written approval by the home institution of the coursework for which the student plans to enroll.
- After admission, information regarding registration will be sent to the student. The admissions officers act as guest student counselors.

CONDITIONAL/ UNCONDITIONAL ADMISSION

The University of Akron has adopted a "conditional/unconditional" admission policy for traditional-aged entering freshmen effective Fall 1984. Traditional-aged freshmen are defined as those who have graduated from high school within the previous two years. The policy was established to communicate to students whether they are academically prepared to be successful at the University. The key elements of the policy are:

Entering freshmen who are identified as being academically underprepared will be admitted "conditionally" and be required to complete skill building courses and other prescriptive activities. Conditionally admitted students are those with less than a 2.30 GPA and less than 18 ACT/800 SAT with or without the core curriculum or less than a 2.8 GPA and less than 19 ACT/800 SAT without the core curriculum.

Core curriculum is defined by the following:

| | |
|------------------|---------|
| English | 4 units |
| Mathematics | 3 units |
| Natural Sciences | 3 units |
| Social Sciences | 3 units |
| Foreign Language | 2 units |

Most students choosing state who are undecided about their major begin their college career in the University College. Students are admitted "unconditionally" to the University College if their credentials are above the standards for conditional admission but below the standards for direct admission to an academic program.

All students both conditional and unconditional pursuing an associate's degree will be admitted directly to the Community and Technical College.

Academically talented freshmen will have the option of admission directly to the program of their choice. To be directly admitted, a student must meet certain academic standards such as high school grade-point average, test scores, class rank, and core curriculum. The standards for direct admission are determined by each department.

Criteria for Direct Admission to Degree-Granting College

| COLLEGE/DEPT. | MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| School College of Arts and Sciences | Requirements vary by department |
| Biology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 high school grade point average • 21 ACT - 880 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Chemistry | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 high school grade point average • 20 ACT - 880 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Classics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.3 high school grade point average • 25 ACT - 1080 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Economics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 high school grade point average • 20 ACT - 840 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| English | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.75 high school grade point average • 20 ACT - 840 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Geography and Planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.75 high school grade point average • 20 ACT - 840 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Geology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.75 high school grade point average • 21 ACT - 880 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| History | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.75 high school grade point average • 21 ACT - 880 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Mathematics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 high school grade point average • 22 ACT - 920 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Modern Languages | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 high school grade point average • 20 ACT - 880 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Philosophy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.5 high school grade point average • 25 ACT - 1080 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Physics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 high school grade point average • 22 ACT - 920 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Political Science | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.0 high school grade point average • 21 ACT - 880 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Psychology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.5 high school grade point average • 19 ACT - 800 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |
| Sociology | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 high school grade point average • 18 ACT - 780 SAT • upper 80% of high school graduating class • core curriculum |

University Bulletin Conditional/Unconditional Admission addition of "The Arts: 1 unit":

| | |
|------------------|---------|
| English | 4 units |
| Mathematics | 3 units |
| Natural Science | 3 units |
| Social Science | 3 units |
| Foreign Language | 2 units |
| THE ARTS | 1 UNIT |

As part of its approval, the Senate also directed that the specific high school courses fulfilling this unit be determined by the general Education Advisory Committee in consultation with the College of Fine and Applied Arts.



APPENDIX D

Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost
Akron, OH 44325-4703
216-972-7593 216-972-8699 Fax

January 31, 1997

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. S. Graham Kelly, Associate Provost for Curricular Issues
and Student Affairs

GKgo

RE: February 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

The following curriculum proposals are without objections and have been approved by the Provost:

AS-97-05
AS-97-07
AS-97-08
AS-97-09
AS-97-10
AS-97-11
AS-97-15
AS-97-15A
AS-97-15B
AS-97-15C
AS-97-15D
AS-97-15E
AS-97-21
AS-97-22
AS-97-23
AS-97-24
AS-97-37
AS-97-37A
AS-97-37B
AS-97-41
AS-97-49
AS-97-50
AS-97-51

BA-97-01
BA-97-02
BA-97-03
BA-97-04
BA-97-05
BA-97-06
BA-97-07

January 31, 1997

February 6, 1997 Report on Curriculum to Faculty Senate

Page 2

BA-97-08

BA-97-09

BA-97-12

BA-97-14

BA-97-17

BA-97-18

BA-97-19

BA-97-20

BA-97-21

BA-97-22

BA-97-23

BA-97-24

BA-97-25

BA-97-26

BA-97-27

BA-97-28

BA-97-29

BA-97-30

BA-97-33

BA-97-35

CT-97-15A

EN-97-02

EN-97-04

EN-97-05

EN-97-06

EN-97-08

EN-97-09

EN-97-11

WC-97-02

WC-97-03

WC-97-04

WC-97-05

WC-97-06

WC-97-07

WC-97-08

Unless Faculty Senate acts on these proposals at its February 6, 1997 meeting, they will become record.

ald\curr97\fs970206

APPENDIX E

Report of Research Faculty Projects Committee

MINUTES OF DECEMBER 6, 1996

The Research Faculty Projects Committee met in the McColleston Room of Buchtel Hall on Friday, December 6, 1996, at 8:30 a.m. Members present were: Dr. Stephen Aby, Dr. Roger Bain, Mr. Earl Ertman, Dr. Clayton Fant, Miss J. Fitzgerald, Mrs. Eleanor Klosterman, Dr. D. Malhotra, Dr. William McGucken, Dr. Isadore Newman, Dr. Victoria Schirm, Dr. Phillip Schmidt, Dr. Daniel Sheffer, Chair, Dr. Jerry Stinner, Dr. Mark Tausig, and Dr. Michael Williams. Members absent with notice were: Mr. Andrew Borowiec and Dr. Walt Macior (committee members with projects under review) and Dr. Celal Batur.

There were 17 proposals received for this summer fellowship competition, and they were reviewed in the order received in the Research Office. All proposals were assigned a primary reviewer by Dr. Sheffer.

The committee had been allotted \$109,000, of which \$17,005 was spent on the fall competition. Dr. C.S. Chen allotted an additional \$50,000 to the committee.

Prior to reviewing the proposals, discussion took place concerning participation of committee members, who have submitted proposals in the current review and selection process. Dr. McGucken moved that any member of the committee applying for a grant in a particular competition should absent himself/herself entirely from the review process. Dr. Malhotra seconded the motion. Dr. McGucken stated that he did not feel it appropriate for a committee member to attend the review meeting to vote on proposals when he or she is an investigator in the same competition. Dr. McGucken felt that this could appear as a conflict of interest within the committee. Several members stated that we would then lose the expert opinion of these committee members should they be forced to be absent from the review meeting. The motion was voted upon and failed, 6 to 5. Mr. Ertman then proposed a motion that would allow a committee member with a proposal under consideration in the ongoing competition to be present for discussion of all but his/her own proposal. Further, the committee member would not participate as a primary reviewer nor would the committee member be allowed to vote on any proposal. This motion was seconded by Dr. Aby. The motion passed 8 to 3.

In a memo to Dr. Sheffer, Professors Dowd and Kolcaba requested a two-month time extension. Dr. Sheffer noted that, if approved, the committee gives a one-year time extension. Dr. Newman moved that we accept the request for a time extension, and Dr. Schmidt seconded the motion.

There were 12 proposals funded, totaling \$72,000. (Contact Senate office for complete list of grants.)

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 2 - Fine & Applied Arts | 1 (Art); 1 (Music) |
| 10 - Arts & Science | 1 (History); 2 (Sociology); 2 (Mathematical Sciences) |
| | 4 (Biology); 1 (Philosophy) |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| The available budget for the 1996-97 fiscal year is | \$109,000 (original allotment) |
| | + 50,000 (additional allotment) |
| | - 17,000 (spent in fall) |
| | - 72,000 (spent in summer) |

\$70,000 AVAILABLE

The committee will meet on Friday, March 7th to discuss the spring research grants. The committee will advertise this competition by email.

Respectfully submitted by
Dr. Dan Sheffer, Chair