

5-6-1974

Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, May 6, 1974

John Treacy

Wright State University - Main Campus

Follow this and additional works at: https://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, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Wright State University

Campus Communication

Date: April 24, 1974

To: Members of the Academic Council

From: John Treacy, Secretary. Steering Committee

Subject: Agenda, Academic Council Meeting, Monday, May 6, 1974

Members of the Academic Council will meet at 3:10 P.M., Monday, May 6, 1974, in Room 401, Fawcett Hall.

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of April 1, 1974, meeting.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee.
- V. Reports of the Standing Committees:
 - A. Curriculum (See Attachment B)
 - B. Faculty Affairs
 - C. Library
 - D. Student Affairs
 - E. Ad Hoc Governance Committee (See Attachment A)
- VI. Old Business:
 - A. Approval of amendment to Graduate Council By-laws. (See April A.C. Meeting Minutes)
 - B. Approval of amended Summer Quarter as part of the Academic Calendar 1974-1975. (See April A.C. Meeting Minutes)
 - C. Approval of "Proposal for a University-wide Communication System Between Students and Faculty". (Attachment B to April A.C. Meeting Minutes)
 - D. Approval of the proposed "University Programming Board Charter". (See Attachment C)
- VII. New Business:
- VIII. Adjournment.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

May 6, 1974

Minutes

- I. The regular monthly meeting for the academic year was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Associate Provost Murray at 3:15 P.M.

Note: Items of the Agenda were not followed in sequence.

- III. Minutes of the April 1, 1974, meeting were approved as written.

- IV. Report of the President, Mr. Kegerreis reporting.

Three items of widely diverse nature were covered by Mr. Kegerreis.

As reported in the public press, the Task Force on Higher Education has completed and released its report on the status of higher education in the state of Ohio. It was suggested that Academic Council take note of the report and advise the administration if there are any specific points that should be followed up. Three major recommendations are made by the Task Force; (1) that equal access to higher education be guaranteed to all without discrimination in the state of Ohio, with more support for the handicapped and disadvantaged students; (2) that opportunities for life-long learning in Ohio be expanded, and Wright State is taking the lead somewhat in this concept, with the management of the Kettering Center in Dayton; and (3) that higher education deserves a higher level of state support than it now receives, especially in planning, coordination, and financing. Some educational financial statistics compiled by the Task Force have been of interest to the administration, and not available before the development of this group. One point causing unease to some degree is the recommendation of a larger staff for the Chancellor; the staff there has already doubled in the past year and a half and is expanding. It is hoped that this will result in increased coordination efforts, legislative assistance, or other positive steps for education.

The University has been visited by representatives from the American Medical Association and the Association of American Medical Colleges, primarily to see what medical facilities are in the area and to get an idea of the capacity of the University as the site of a medical school. The results of these visits are as yet unknown to the administration. A team from the Veterans Administration in Washington, two deans of medical schools, and half a dozen staff members familiar with medical education are on campus today. If qualified, it is possible for Wright State to be designated to receive special funds for use in the developmental stage of our medical school, due to the proximity of the large V.A. complex in Dayton. Receipt of such funds would assure early, high quality augmentation of the medical school plan. Tentatively the entering class will be in the fall of 1976, delayed from fall of 1975 because of the difficulties in gaining approval for the school and the arduous search for a dean for the college.

Mr. Kegerreis referred to an article appearing in the Guardian of today's date wherein a Mr. John Wilkins levied charges that "unknown" persons in the administration are receiving kickbacks from private contractors who provide services to the University. In order to operate in an economical manner, Mr. Kegerreis expressed his feeling that he is obligated to the University to provide certain services at as low a cost as possible, and the University is in no way responsible for the wage scale set by private concerns.

Academic Council Minutes

May 6, 1974

Page Two

On the other hand, Mr. Kegerreis pointed out, if Mr. Wilkins has evidence of kickbacks, he (Mr. Wilkins) is both morally and legally obligated to bring this evidence to the proper authorities. Exception was taken to Mr. Wilkins' statement that one purpose of the University was to provide employment opportunities in this geographical area, whereas the expressed primary purpose of the University is an educational, academic one. As representative of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees group, Mr. Wilkins has been fully aware of the procedures and policies for hiring private contractors, in fact that union group had explicitly agreed to the hiring of private concerns for certain janitorial functions. It was further brought out that no Civil Service employee, union member or not, has lost a position because of the outside hiring and that had been a part of the agreement between the University and the union.

II. Introduction of newly elected members of the Council.

Mr. Murray and Mr. Fritz explained that according to the Constitution, new members are to be seated at the meeting following completion of elections; this had been misinterpreted to mean the last meeting of the academic year, whereas this year's election final results were available prior to this May meeting. The specific meeting at which seating is to be accomplished cannot be stated because of the possibility of run-off elections, therefore it takes place at the meeting following completion of the elections.

Mr. Cantelupe moved -

That new members who are here be introduced and welcomed, and inform them that they will not be officially seated until next meeting.

This motion was seconded. Mr. Murray called for a voice vote and that motion was passed unanimously.

Mr. Murray introduced the new members present, and on behalf of the Academic Council welcomed them. Notification will be sent to all new members of their officially being seated at the June meeting.

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

Mr. Fritz reminded members of the upcoming General Faculty Meeting on May 14, and that presence of a quorum is necessary for the scheduled election of the Vice-President-elect of the Faculty, as well as approval of the list of students to be graduated.

The next meeting of the Steering Committee is next Wednesday at 3:00 P.M., and specific items needing consideration should be forwarded to members of the Committee.

Mr. Fritz directed attention to a hand-out, a March 11, 1974, revised copy of the University Promotion and Tenure Document. It is material contained in this revision that is to be considered by members of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Steering Committee, with a view to presenting it for approval to the Council in June. Copy sent to members as Attachment D to the Revised Agenda of April 29, 1974, was sent in error.

Also, year-end reports from the various committees are due at the June meeting.

VI. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Larkins reporting.

Mr. Larkins asked that materials covered by two hand-outs be entered under New Business, for consideration by the members and voted upon at the next meeting:

- (a) Approval of B.A./B.F.A. in Selected Studies.
 - (b) Approval of the Revision/Clarification of Procedures for the University Curriculum Committee.
- Also:
- (c) Approval of P/U grading for HST 399 and letter grade option for REL 470.
 - (d) Approval of the notation of dismissal actions on Wright State University transcripts. (Attachment B, April 24 Agenda - items c and d)

Mr. Larkins further stated that he would ask for suspension of the rules at the time New Business was considered, so that a vote could be taken on the approval of Nursing Education 198, Introduction to Family Nursing Practice. University approval (interpreted as direct vote by the Academic Council) is needed before the course can be approved by the State Board of Nursing.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Swanson reporting.

Mr. Swanson requested removal of Item "A" under New Business, stating that the Committee feels that further revision of the University Promotion and Tenure Document is in order.

When the Committee last met, they discussed with Mr. Ahmad the need for an explanation of coverage in the new liability insurance and that will be forthcoming.

No Committee action or stand was taken on the communication system document presented to them by the Student Affairs Committee, feeling that this system presented was essentially political, not academic. Further information has been requested before consideration will continue.

The Committee has recommended to the Steering Committee the forming of an ad hoc committee to study the feasibility of setting up a Faculty Professional Development Leave program.

The Committee made one formal move: to recommend to the Academic Council, in relation to the proposed revised Promotion and Tenure Document, that all persons serving on all departmental, college and University Promotion and Tenure Committees should be tenured, and that no person should sit on a committee to consider a promotion to a higher rank than that held by the committeemen.

A brief discussion channeled this recommendation to the Promotion and Tenure Committee for possible inclusion in the proposed revised document.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Hess reporting.

Discussion revolved around the question of whether the new medical library would be in a separate building or simply a wing of the present library to eliminate a certain amount of duplication in journal subscriptions, etc. In response to the Committee's inquiry, the Library administration will be submitting to the Committee reasons, in writing, why this is not feasible; a separate medical library as part of the medical sciences administration building is planned.

Mr. Kegerreis commented that he felt the report mentioned would clarify some of the professional and educational problems that would be solved by having such a separateness.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Hensky reporting.

Two items from the Committee will be considered under Old Business today.

A recommendation from the present Committee will be passed on to the next, that a study be made of student compensations and stipends, with a related study of responsibilities in all student areas. This matter came up too late in the year for study by the current members.

E. Ad Hoc Governance Committee, Mr. Castellano reporting.

The written report was Attachment A to the Agenda dated April 24, 1974. Mr. Castellano moved for approval of the three resolutions listed at the end of that report:

1. That no action be taken at this time to change the current governance structure at Wright State.
2. That the records compiled by this committee be preserved for use by the committee to review the Constitution and Bylaws in 1976.
3. That the current Ad Hoc University Governance Committee be dissolved.

Mr. Fritz moved that the Council adopt the report and approve the resolutions.

The move was seconded; unanimous voice vote passed the adoption and approval.

F. Bookstore Committee, Mr. Hagler reporting.

The report from the Committee last year did not bring forth the desired results in that the recommendations were not acted upon. Discussion brought forth the information that in order to get action, recommendations would need to be put in the form of resolutions or motions brought to the Council.

Mr. Hagler referred to an indebtedness incurred by the Bookstore a number of years ago, this indebtedness now retired by profits from the Bookstore. He went on to point out that there is no existing regulation governing the use of profits now made, and suggested that the Bookstore might at this time embark upon a course of price

reduction, the excess monies this year going into a holding fund for possible losses, expansion, etc.

The written report of the Committee is to be made an item on the agenda for next month, and Mr. Hagler indicated that he would return at that time for advisement on how to move their suggestions into the administration area for follow-through.

The Committee had asked last year for information relating to faculty book orders but had received no response. Further, he stated that the Committee had at this time no authority to handle problems of this sort, if indeed problems do exist.

Mr. Murray stated that a recommendation of the Committee on Academic Policy and Procedures is the expansion of the role of the Bookstore Committee, such recommendation being sent to the Steering Committee.

Mr. Hagler stressed the willingness of the Committee to work with any problem sent them, and was assured that Council would act on resolutions or motions presented.

VII. Old Business:

A. Approval of amendment to Graduate Council Bylaws.

For the Graduate Council, Mr. Fritz asked for -

Approval of an amendment of Section VII, 2(b) of the Graduate Council Bylaws to read:

(b) The Chairman of a Standing Committee must have Category II membership on the Graduate Faculty.

A brief discussion brought out exactly what Category II covers; in essence, general continuing faculty meeting specific qualifications, recognized to teach and advise graduate students.

The motion was seconded. Voice vote passed the motion.

B. Approval of amended Summer Quarter as part of the Academic Calendar for 1974-1975.

Mr. Larkins placed before the Council a motion for approval of the amended calendar. Mr. Treacy seconded the motion. There was no discussion from the floor.

The motion was passed by voice vote. (See amended Calendar, Attachment A.)

C. Approval of the "Proposal for a University-wide Communication System Between Students and Faculty".

Mr. Filio placed a motion for approval of the system (Attachment B to the April Minutes).

The motion was seconded and discussion opened.

Mr. Sachs referred members to Mr. Swanson's earlier statement concerning this document, with the feeling that the concept of the system was opposed. It was mentioned that a possible pilot on a small scale could be tried before making the system university-wide. Mr. Sachs went on to state that there had been some statement to the effect that this system was to be on a voluntary basis, yet the present written version states "It is expected that a Feedback Committee will be organized in each class." This would lead to the belief that every class would have this, regardless of how few a number of students were in the class.

Mr. Hemsy answered this doubt by saying that there was nothing written into the document that stated the system must be set up if the students felt no need for it, did not really want it.

Mr. Cantelupe then posed the reversal of the question, inquiring if a faculty member did not want it, would he be compelled to allow this system.

Mr. Hemsy replied there was no mechanism concerning this, but that it would be between the particular faculty member, his department chairman, and the dean of the college, and how strongly the faculty member felt against this.

Mr. Stoesz spoke against acceptance of the system, stating he felt the instigation of such a system should be on an informal basis rather than making the system a mandate through Academic Council action.

Mr. Hess moved that the original motion be amended by deleting the last sentence of the second paragraph, "It is expected that a Feedback Committee will be organized in each class.", and changing the word "assist" to "allow" in the preceding sentence of that paragraph. Mr. Hess explained that in the case of small classes, the class in itself serves as a feedback, and the wording "allow" would eliminate any intervention on the part of the faculty member and it would permit the students to set it up as they wished.

Mr. Treacy seconded the amendment.

Mr. Hughes took exception to the amendment, pointing out that there seemed to be an element of distrust where such a system would need to be set up, and that the amendment did not solve that; further, that he would vote against it.

Mr. Hemsy stated he had two students on hand to speak for the system, and one began to speak; however, Mr. Cantelupe intervened with a point of order, stating he understood that the person speaking was a non-student.

The student stated he is not presently enrolled at Wright State, and the Chairman ruled against non-students speaking before the Council.

Mr. Hemsy checked with the second person and found him also to be a non-student; he apologized to the Council for this point.

Mr. Haughey carried on the thought of the student concerning the system proposed, expressing that some students feel lost in the shuffle of large numbers of students, afraid to stand alone as an individual, and finding it very hard to speak out, especially with the power of a grade over them and the need to pass a certain course.

Mr. Castellano questioned what criteria had been established for the evaluation implied in the document.

Mr. Hemsy asked if Mr. Wade would respond, since he had tried the system in his classes.

Mr. Wade stated he felt that any concern of a student was a valid concern; that is, any thing or circumstance in the class that bothered a student became a concern. This might simply be that instructions were not clear, or any other segment of the class. He stated that he had felt uncomfortable toward the establishment of the committee in his class, had had a somewhat negative feeling toward the idea. However, simply because of this feeling, he did approach the class with the idea. Mr. Wade pointed out that through this feedback, various subjects or concerns of the students were opened to discussion, that in no sense did he have to back down on anything but there was explanation and clarification in a number of areas. (There were 37 students in this class.) Overall he considered it a good experience, enabling him to find out some things that he would probably not otherwise have learned.

Mr. Castellano questioned the need for such a system unless there was a great deal of dissatisfaction demonstrated. He felt, as did Mr. Stoesz, that each faculty member should handle feedback in his own particular way.

Mr. Hemsy replied to this, that it is not a matter of whether the faculty member is in need of the system, but rather that such a system is needed from the students' viewpoint.

Mr. Haughey expressed his feeling that there is a need for such a system, especially in relation to new or transfer students, where students do not have confidence, and this mechanism would make them feel more comfortable toward the instructor and the course material as well. He did state that he felt this should not be a spying type of thing.

Mr. Treacy expressed his lack of a comfortable feeling toward this system, based on previous experience with his own instructors and especially the response of one to his repeated verbalizing.

Mr. Filio indicated endorsement of the system by Student Caucus.

Mr. Merriam expressed opposition to the system as it now stands, based on feedback from his particular department, further stating he felt this was more or less to handle grievances, and there are already grievance committees established.

Mr. Cantelupe expressed the opposition of the chairmen of the departments in the College of Liberal Arts. He questioned specifically the origination of the system.

Discussion brought out that the original proposal had been worked out by students while they were yet enrolled at Wright State, but that they were no longer enrolled at this time, due to graduation, etc. Mr. Hemsy said that there had been considerable revision of the original document, and that he failed to see the problem of whether the originators were indeed enrolled at this time. He directed attention to the proposal itself rather than its origination.

Mr. Sachs also felt that the proposal should stand on its own merits, stating that ideas from outside the University community are used all the time. He reiterated his opposition to the system itself but felt it should be judged as it is, having been submitted by the Student Affairs Committee.

Mr. Fritz spoke in favor of the amendment to the proposal, feeling that it would enhance the workability of the system, and his feeling that such a system could be of help in especially large class groups.

Further points of discussion were:

1. Being a member of the feedback committee might give certain status in the class to those students.
2. The lines of communication developed would essentially be the needed thing, not necessarily that the professional instructor is being told how to conduct his class.
3. The development of an adversary relationship might result from the system.
4. The lack of classroom time for such an implementation was questioned but this question was fielded by Mr. Wade who pointed out that the feedback did not occur on class time.

There was a count of hand voting on the amendment to the proposed communication system: In favor - 15

against - 8

The amendment to the motion was passed.

Discussion returned to the original motion, as amended.

Mr. Haughey questioned if there is duplication of efforts in endeavoring to implement such a system at the same time the Student Caucus is attempting to implement the Faculty Course Evaluation.

Extensive questions arose as to the evaluation involved in this system, since that expression is stated in the purpose and function of the system.

Further discussion relative to the Council's hearing the input from non-students developed. It was pointed out that input through the Committees is an already established avenue.

Mr. Filio moved that rules be suspended in order to hear those non-students present; the motion was seconded by Mr. Sachs.

Hand voting results were: in favor - 9
opposed - 13

The rules were not suspended.

Mr. Castellano asked if open hearings had been held, wherein a great number of students' opinions would be heard; Mr. Cantelupe continued in this vein with his feeling that the system was being offered by a very small group. Private complaints against instructors by students were mentioned, as were private opinions of students on the part of instructors. The office of the Student Ombudsman was pointed as a way for students to be heard.

Voting on the amended motion was called.

A count of hand votes indicated: in favor - 9
against - 13

Passage of approval of the Communication System failed.

- D. Approval of the proposed "University Programming Board Charter". (Attachment C to the Agenda of April 24, 1974)

Mr. Treacy placed the motion for approval before the Council; Mr. Fritz seconded.

Mr. Sachs questioned why specifically a representative from the College of Liberal Arts was named to the Board. This was adequately answered in that the programming concerned in great part the use of the Creative Arts Center, that programs were a part of the curricula of three departments of that college, that the appointment of one person by the Dean of that college would eliminate the need for representatives from each of the three involved departments.

The motion was passed with the show of 17 hand votes in favor of approval of the Charter.

VIII. New Business:

Item A had previously been removed for further consideration. (See latest revision under consideration, Attachment B.)

- B. Mr. Larkins requested the entry of items (a) through (d) noted under Report of the Curriculum Committee.

Mr. Fritz moved for acceptance of these items; the motion was seconded.

Mr. Larkins asked for consideration of approval of Nursing Education 198 at this time, as support for approval of that course by the State Board of Nursing.

Academic Council Minutes

May 6, 1974

Page Ten

Mr. Fritz moved for suspension of rules so the item could be considered; motion was seconded. Two-thirds vote was achieved for suspension of rules by hand votes in the number of 19.

Mr. Larkins asked for approval of NE 198 for three credit hours; this move was seconded.

The Chairman called for a vote on the motion; approval was given by unanimous voice vote.

- C. It was noted by the Chairman that a report from Mr. Hussman had been provided and that this would become an attachment (C) to the Minutes of this meeting. Too, copies of the Minutes were be directed individually to each of the incoming members of the Council.

IX. A motion for adjournment was made at 4:55 P. M., seconded, and passed by voice vote.