

1-7-1974

Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, January 7, 1974

John Treacy

Wright State University - Main Campus

Follow this and additional works at: http://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu.

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

CAMPUS COMMUNICATION

Date: January 2, 1974
To: Members of the Academic Council
From: John Treacy, Secretary, Steering Committee
Subject: Agenda of the Academic Council Meeting, Monday, January 7, 1974.

The January meeting of the Academic Council is scheduled for Monday, January 7, 1974, in Room 401, Fawcett Hall, at 3:10 P.M.

The agenda is as follows:

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of December 3, 1973, meeting.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of Steering Committee.
- V. Reports of Standing Committees:
 - A. Curriculum
 - B. Faculty Affairs
 - C. Library
 - D. Student Affairs
- VI. Old Business:
 - A. Approval of the Proposed Academic Calendar 1974-1975.
 - B. Recommendations on O. B. R. Personnel Management Document.
- VII. New Business:
- VIII. Adjournment.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

January 7, 1974

Minutes

- I. The regular monthly meeting for the academic year was called to order by Chairman Pro tem Provost Spiegel at 3:15 P.M.
- II. The Minutes of the December 3, 1973, meeting were approved by voice vote. (On January 9, 1974, Mr. Hess brought out the need for a correction on Page 4, paragraph 3, under Library Committee, which should read -

".the book budget has been approved, with a cut-off date for ordering of April 15, 1974.")

- III. Report of the President, Chairman Pro tem Provost Spiegel reporting.

Dr. Spiegel advised the Council that President Kegerreis is in Columbus, conferring with the controlling board on the release of the \$150,000 planning money for the first medical building, Biological Science Building #2. With the release of these funds, the architectural firm will complete the plans on which they are presently working. These will be put out for bid and if bids are received within the monetary limit, then it will be necessary to go back to the Board of Regents for the release of the two and a half million to complete the first building. We are still going on the assumption that the school is a "fact".

The search for a dean for the medical college continues, with an anticipated choice to be made late this month. At that time an offer will be made to the candidate. The dean will not be expected to join the administrative staff full time until later in the year, but will be hired and available on a part-time basis.

Medical schools seem to remain a political issue between the legislature and the Board of Regents; the University will continue to be as open about developments as it has been. Both President Kegerreis and Provost Spiegel are available for any questions.

The second item brought out concerned educational television, channel 16 in particular. About a year and a half ago, the Ohio Television Commission virtually ordered the University to form a consortium agreement with Central State and Miami. No details were ever worked out; it was not definite whether this would involve only channel 16, or if channel 14 at Miami would be involved, and in general the matter was not pursued until recently. Dr. Tetteimer, our new television man, felt the time was right in Washington to apply for a substantial equipment grant, amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. It was impossible to make such an application without the development of the consortium, the details of which have been worked out, with finalization expected within possibly weeks. Presently it appears that both channels 14 and 16 will be in the consortium.

Academic Council Minutes

January 7, 1974

Page Two

The last item was a reminder that budgets are being prepared. Review at the University level will be begun in the next six weeks, and it has been necessary to turn down some new faculty requests. It does not appear at this time that we will have to revise the present budget under which we are operating.

Enrollment for the winter quarter was better than might have been expected; no crisis situation exists, although there is room for improvement.

Renovations of Millett Hall, Dr. Spiegel reporting.

Bids are again out for renovations. It was determined that the original allocation of space to the students' eating area was inadequate. The alternative decided upon was that the faculty dining room will be delayed for approximately two years, or until the first one and a half medical school buildings are up. At that time enough space will open up in Oelman to move Publications there and space will then be available for the faculty dining room. Should the medical school building progress more rapidly, the faculty dining room will become a reality sooner, since the kitchen facilities will already be there.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Mr. Fritz reporting.

A reminder was given that meetings are held the third Wednesday of every month, and items for consideration should be submitted by Tuesday of that week, or early that Wednesday morning; some matters are brought too late for consideration. The next meeting is scheduled for January 16th. A reminder also that the faculty will meet on February 12th, when a full faculty must be present to consider a constitutional amendment.

Professor McStallworth brought to the attention of the Committee the active part students have had in passing petitions for support of the medical schools and it is suggested that faculty members might have part in passing, or signing petitions, in an effort to decrease some of the negative feelings that have been met.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Larkins reporting.

A reminder was given of the course changes approved, under memo dated December 19th; also mentioned was the Academic Calendar for 1974-1975 that be considered under Old Business.

The Committee placed before the Council two motions, to be reviewed and voted upon at the February Council meeting:

Academic Council Minutes

January 7, 1974

Page Three

1. That the 30-day waiting period in our current operating procedures be considered thirty working days instead of thirty calendar days, in relation to the Registrar entering a course in the course inventory.
2. That the grade of "X" be given when a student fails to complete a course for which he is registered and for which the grade of "I" cannot be given, the "X" being computed as zero points in the grade point average.

Mr. Larkins also brought to the Council two new major proposals, to be considered under New Business, at which time he would ask that rules be suspended that action might be taken by the Council in order to allow these majors to appear in the 1974-1975 catalog.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Swanson reporting.

There was only general discussion at the December 10th meeting since conflicting meetings prevented all except three members from attending. The next meeting is scheduled for this week, January 9th.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Hess reporting.

Interviews are being conducted for an Assistant Dean and various other members of the technical staff; presumably service will improve when these positions are filled.

Modification of the procedures to put books on reserve will be implemented by the spring quarter; books taken to the Library will be processed before those simply listed on paper, being taken care of immediately.

The Library Committee will be represented on the committee being set up by the Provost to study the allocation of library acquisition funds to the various colleges.

Next meeting of the Committee will be on the 29th of January if anyone would care to submit items for review.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Hensky reporting.

Nominated and appointed Jerry Melke as Chairman of the Sub-committee on Student Publications.

VI. Old Business:

- A. Approval of the Proposed Academic Calendar 1974-1975.

Mr. Haughey was recognized and introduced Mr. Don Wilson, student representative to the Calendar Committee.

Mr. Wilson offered to the Council three alternative plans to the Proposed Academic Calendar; plans #2 and #3 eliminated the Presidents Day (holiday), February 17, in order to lengthen the spring break, while all three plans had that aim.

Discussion points centered on:

1. fitting mass registration into the proposed calendars
2. longer winter break due to energy crisis
3. relation of summer quarter to public school calendars
4. number of persons affected by later summer quarter compared to number benefiting from alternative calendar
5. the relationship of the loss of even one class day when looking at evening courses which may meet *only one time a week*

Mr. Fritz moved that Council amend the motion as proposed by the Curriculum Council to Alternative Calendar #1.

This motion to amend was seconded and passed by voice vote; therefore opened to discussion.

Mr. Wade supported alternative #1 in that it offered the full amount of class time.

Mr. Fritz pointed out the need to include in alternative #1 those dates selected for General Faculty meetings (November 12, 1974; February 26, 1975; May 8, 1975).

Mr. Sachs indicated support of alternative #1 in response to student desire for a definite break between winter and spring quarters.

Dr. Spiegel called for a vote on the amendment of the proposed calendar to that of alternative plan #1.

Motion for the amendment carried; Dr. Spiegel then asked for vote on the Proposed Academic Calendar 1974-1975 as amended.

The motion was seconded; motion was carried by voice vote although there were opposing votes.

Copy of the adopted Academic Calendar 1974-1975, Addendum A to the Minutes.

Academic Council Minutes

January 7, 1974

Page Five

B. Recommendations on O. B. R. Personnel Management Document.

Mr. Treacy regretfully acknowledged lack of copies of the report and offered a motion "that the Council accept the report developed by the ad hoc review committee", stating that when the motion was before the Council, Mr. Schrickel, as Chairman of the group, would outline the contents of the report.

Dr. Spiegel pointed out that acceptance of the report by the Council would not necessarily meet the needs of the University at the time of the next meeting of the Task Force; approval of the report was actually needed, with its contained recommendations.

Mr. Treacy agreed to a later amendment of his motion for acceptance of the ad hoc review committee's recommendations; the motion was seconded, and Mr. Schrickel offered his outline of the report, elaborating on all points. (See Addendum B to the Minutes.)

Mr. Treacy commended the committee on the tremendous job they had done in the review and recommendations made in relation to this document. He expressed the feeling that it stressed centralization and mentioned the possibility of a situation developing where a person might be hired to make decisions but would actually have all decisions made for him by a centralized bureau.

Mr. Ribbler brought out that he perceived in his perusal of the document a lowering of the professional integrity of all those within the University.

Mr. Fritz offered two alternatives to Mr. Treacy's motion for acceptance of the report: the calling of a special academic meeting to endorse the report of the ad hoc review committee's recommendations or the blind endorsement of the report by the Council at this time. He further expressed himself as being in favor of the latter by moving to amend Mr. Treacy's motion to "endorse the report as the official position of the Wright State University's Academic Council". In support of this he pointed out that the report would be of value in the challenging of this document by University administrators.

The motion to amend was seconded; in discussion there was further support for the endorsement of the report by members of the Council.

The motion to amend was put to vote, and carried.

Dr. Spiegel then directed voting on the motion to endorse the recommendations contained in the report of the ad hoc review committee; the motion was carried by voice vote without opposition.

Academic Council Minutes

January 7, 1974

Page Six

Mr. Treacy offered a motion that a letter of commendation be presented to the members of the ad hoc review committee on behalf of the Council. The motion was seconded and heartily carried by voice vote. Mr. Treacy volunteered as Secretary of the Steering Committee to follow through on this.

VII. New Business:

- A. Deficiency in the membership of the Committee on Student Publications was brought to the Council's attention by Mr. Bill Roberts.

Membership was to include three students elected during the spring quarter; only one was elected and that person failed to return to the campus in the fall. In effect the Student Caucus has withdrawn its instrumentality from the Committee. Also the Committee did not meet during the past quarter. In actuality, there was no carrying out of the functions of guiding, censoring, directing, or validating of printed matter. The Council was asked to review whether the Student Publications Committee is necessary or if another group of a different sort needs to be formed.

Discussion brought out that the Student Caucus has assumed the responsibility originally allocated to the elective three students. The most recent revisions of guidelines in this area were reviewed.

Mr. Hemsy spoke for the Student Affairs Committee, indicating that the naming of these three students to the Publications Committee had been on the agenda for early fall consideration, but that the Student Caucus had not brought names to them for consideration. The Committee had not, therefore, met, feeling that there might be problems develop simply because students were not represented. Discussion brought out that a number of conflicts exists, such as the Publications Committee submitting its budget to itself for consideration. Mr. Roberts indicated that submitting students' names for inclusion in the Committee would not resolve the conflicts at this time; this was supported by Mr. Haughey.

Dr. Spiegel felt the matter should be taken under advisement; this will be done by Dr. Spiegel with Mr. Fritz and the Steering Committee.

- B. Motions presented to the Council in memo of December 12, 1973, originating with J. E. Larkins, Chairman, University Curriculum Committee.

Mr. Larkins asked that these motions be given further consideration, to be tabled until the next monthly meeting of the Academic Council.

- C. Two new Major proposals in memo of December 12, 1973, originating with J. E. Larkins, Chairman, University Curriculum Committee.

Academic Council Minutes

January 7, 1974

Page Seven

Mr. Larkins asked if rules might be suspended to allow for action on these two proposals at this meeting, thus allowing time for their inclusion in the 1974-1975 catalog.

Mr. Larkins moved to place the Proposed Speech and Hearing Science Major before the Council. This was seconded.

Mr. Treacy moved that rules be suspended for consideration and action on this proposal. The move was seconded.

Dr. Spiegel indicated a two-thirds affirmative vote was necessary to set aside rules, and questioned why it was deemed necessary to bring the subject to action at this time rather than at the coming meeting. Mr. Larkins explained the desire to have the two new majors included in the 1974-1975 catalog, which has an upcoming printing deadline.

Dr. Spiegel asked for hand voting on suspension of the rules; 13 in favor, 6 opposed. The motion failed.

Recount was asked; Mr. Treacy went on record as being present but not voting. Hand count showed 13 in favor, 6 opposed; the motion to suspend rules for consideration of the Speech and Hearing Science Major failed and this item was tabled, to be reviewed under New Business at the next Council meeting.

Mr. Larkins moved to place the Proposed Motion Pictures Major before the Council. This was seconded.

Mr. Fritz moved for suspension of rules for consideration of this Major proposal; this move was seconded.

Count of hand votes for suspension of rules resulted in 14 in favor, 5 opposed. The motion carried; discussion on the Major was opened.

Mr. Fritz queried as to the necessity of having the Board of Regents approval for a new Major; it was the opinion of Dr. Spiegel and Mr. Murray that it would need to be approved at that level. Mr. Fritz expressed the opinion that the Major as presently written would not meet with the Regents approval.

Mr. Treacy indicated the necessity of including in such a request to the Regents a justification of the Major, with information on other schools in the State of Ohio offering such a Major. Dr. Spiegel further asserted the necessity of showing the presence of student clientele for such a Major, whether additional courses would need to be offered, whether additional faculty would be needed to implement the Major.

Dean Harden, present in the audience, asked if going to the Board of Regents was necessary, stating that she felt other Majors had been approved as recently as last year without this.

Dr. Spiegel asserted he would make inquiries into the necessity of acquiring Regents approval.

It was brought out by Mr. Haughey that quite a lengthy discussion on this Major was carried out at the Curriculum Committee level, and that if such Major proposals were required to go before the Board of Regents, some definite format for submitting the proposals was needed.

Dr. Spiegel indicated preparing a proposal for presentation to the Regents was not an impossible task, having just recently gotten approval for Human Factors Engineering, but that it is necessary to anticipate questions that must be answered there before they will extend their approval. The Board expects to know what other schools in the state offer the Major, whether you are in effect competing with other schools, the number of students interested in applying for this Major and whether they are students who are shifting from some other area or enrolling for the purpose of availing themselves of this Major.

Discussion at this point developed around the question as to the degree involved; would this in essence be a degree in Liberal Arts, with or without the notation of Major in Motion Pictures, and at what point in this sequence it becomes necessary to have Regents approval. Dr. Spiegel again assured members that he would make inquiries concerning this proposed Major.

Mr. Wade inquired as to the need for this Major.

Dr. Bassett, present, replied that this is a new and vital art form; it has had new and successful growth on college campuses and, while Wright State would not be the first to offer an undergraduate Major in Motion Pictures, it would be one of the leaders in Ohio. Presently there are 187 students producing some 588 credit hours, demonstrating strong student interest. Noted also was that these were elective and not required. Subsidy programs are no problem. There are also many vocational opportunities available to the student who develops motion picture skills, in education, in industry, in television, in public relations, etc.

Mr. Wade inquired as to how it would be better for those persons now getting these electives together to have a recognized Major.

Dr. Bassett explained that certain areas, such as Biological Science and Business Administration, do not have the structure to offer many hours of electives, but the student could take advantage of the entire series offered under the Motion

Academic Council Minutes

January 7, 1974

Page Nine

Pictures Major, thus increasing his elective hours greatly. Opportunities in industry would be greatly widened by this means. This was verified by Mr. Fritz.

Dean Harden made the comment that it appeared necessary that in the future when courses began falling in line, consideration must be given as to where they were leading - to a new program, a new Major. This should be kept in mind before the entire program was tied together with the possibility of its being rejected.

Dr. Spiegel expressed the thought that the members of the Curriculum Committee were relied upon in this respect.

Mr. Larkins replied to Mr. Wade, in response to his question, that the Curriculum Council was unanimous in its approval of the proposed Major. They had felt it well supported and well documented, and had endorsed it.

Mr. Haughey indicated research on his part had revealed that students in this field could continue in the N. D. E. A. program, with strong possibilities for vocational openings.

Dr. Spiegel then asked for voice vote on the Proposed Motion Pictures Major; the motion for approval was carried without opposition.

VIII. Adjournment motion was entertained, seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

/ei