

2-3-1975

# Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, February 3, 1975

Barbara Dreher

*Wright State University - Main Campus*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives\\_senate\\_minutes](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](mailto:corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu), [library-corescholar@wright.edu](mailto:library-corescholar@wright.edu).

Date: January 23, 1975

To: Members of the Academic Council

From: Barbara Dreher, Secretary, Steering Committee

Subject: Agenda, Academic Council Meeting, Monday, February 3, 1975

COUNCIL WILL MEET AT 3:10 P.M., IN ROOM 155 OF UNIVERSITY CENTER

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of January 13, 1975, meeting.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee.
- V. Reports of the Standing Committees:
  - A. Curriculum Committee
  - B. Faculty Affairs Committee
  - C. Library Committee
  - D. Student Affairs Committee
- VI. Old Business:
  - A. Approval of Revised Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus (continued; discussion by Article). (Attachment F to June 3rd Minutes; Proposed Amendments Attachment D to October 7th Agenda; Additional Amendments Attachments A and B to November 4th Agenda; Further Amendment Attachment B to December 2nd Agenda; Students Amendments Attachment C to January 13th Minutes) Article IV and Paragraph F of Article VI remain to be reviewed and approved. (Article IV - see Attachment B to Minutes of January 13, 1975; Paragraph F - see 4th from last page of Composite)
  - B. Approval of Revised Bylaws for the University Research Council (see Attachment D to Minutes of January 13, 1975).
- VII. New Business:
  - A. Approval of Proposed Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws instituting University Petitions Committee as a Standing Committee.
- VIII. Adjournment.

# ACADEMIC COUNCIL

February 3, 1975

## Minutes

- I. The regular monthly meeting was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice President Murray at 3:15 P.M., in Room 155 of the University Center.
- II. The following correction was made to the Minutes of the January 13, 1975, meeting:

Page Five, the second paragraph under report of the Student Affairs Committee, the first word of the paragraph should be "The" instead of "Two".

Minutes, as corrected, were approved by voice vote.

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

Mr. Kegerreis' report on budgets, here at the University and the diverse ones under consideration at Columbus, made evident the financial problems and their complexity.

Three budgets related to the Biennial Appropriations Bill are being reviewed at Columbus, with yet a fourth one to be presented by Governor Rhodes. The first budget to which Mr. Kegerreis referred was that submitted by the Ohio Board of Regents, amounting to 1.3 billion dollars, and which he discussed at the Fall Faculty Meeting. As Mr. Kegerreis reminded, this budget had been built upon a complete budget analysis and problem analysis, and to a great extent based on the recommendations of the Task Force for Higher Education. Included had been proposed new programs and an evident attempt to bring the Ohio universities up to the middle range of expenditures per student and other indexes for state universities across the country. In the total of 1.3 billion dollars, Mr. Kegerreis pointed out the most significant item, based on student-based subsidy, the amount of 485 million dollars (per year). That would have allowed for reasonable faculty salary increases, an attempt to reduce class sizes, and some other system improvements.

As required by law of out-going governors, Mr. Gilligan submitted a budget, the second referred to by Mr. Kegerreis. The total amount for higher education was 1.648 billion, a reduction of the Regents' budget by almost 300 million dollars. The student-based subsidy figure thereby was reduced to 798 million dollars for the biennium. The apparent "wait for a better day" philosophy behind this would result in the postponement of new programs and other improvements, and the allowance only of an approximate 8% salary increment. Reductions were also evident in the instructional grant total, family practice departments in medical schools, one-year certificate programs, non-credit education, graduate medical education, and other miscellaneous areas. This was operating on the premise that student fees would not be increased, placing the total burden for increased income on subsidy. Although Mr. Gilligan's subsidy figure was a reduction from that of the Regents, it would still allow for the increment in salaries of around 8%, but would not cope with non-compensatory inflationary costs and many other problems.

A third budget has "emerged" in recent weeks, a further reduction of some areas of Mr. Gilligan's budget, but leaving almost intact the subsidy figures.

By law, Mr. Rhodes will submit his own executive budget next month, the fourth to be legisla-

tively considered. In addition to this, universities may submit input to the legislature.

Mr. Kegerreis said he had just learned that the Education Subcommittee, House Finance Committee, has begun work on scheduling hearings on the higher education portion of the Gilligan revised budget, the hearings to start within a few days. This means the university presidents must now hurriedly prepare themselves to present a strong case for higher education, hoping to augment the budget figures, and above all to prevent further encroachments upon the student-based subsidy figure. Any further cut into university income would cause extraordinary repercussions on all campuses.

Wright State budget preparation has now reached the third phase, hampered considerably by the lack of information regarding eventual income. There appears not to be even a remote possibility of the increase needed to grant a "decent" increase to faculty and staff and to meet the inflationary costs of non-compensatory items. Mr. Kegerreis made mention of the fact that "optimism" evidenced by higher departmental budget requests moved beyond the University's ability to fund.

To make manifest problems related to non-compensatory items, Mr. Kegerreis chose three utility items from those of the campus: gas, fuel oil, and electricity. . . . these three alone cost the University slightly over half a million dollars this year. With the cutback in gas allocation, the resulting switch to fuel oil will further increase the utility total. Ways and means for trimming back on use/costs are being worked out, with some progress accomplished and more yet to be done. Mr. Kegerreis reiterated that this illustration was given to point up the fact that budgetary consideration can affect the life of the University and, at this particular time, affects it to a greater extent than normally. He further expressed his appreciation for all the cooperation the campus community has shown in living with this "lemped" life style and solicited suggestions for further curtailing.

Mr. Kegerreis' closing item was different from budget and yet somewhat similar. The new Auditor of the State of Ohio shows a curious interest in university affairs, particularly because of the unique relationship of his office with the University. The State Auditor's representative has an office on campus, his salary is paid by the University, but he works with the University in a "secondhand" way, in that he reviews what is done and decides whether it is right or not. Also, the new Auditor appears to want to be in a management position, with relation to the universities, and so has issued a "model" contract that he wants every "University employee" to use - setting forth hours to be worked per week, etc. Every effort will be made to educate the Auditor in the complexities of University life which necessitate the complete set of varied contracts now in use.

#### IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Mr. Treacy reporting.

The Steering Committee's budget review of academic units is in progress, presentations having been made to them by the Business College as well as the College of Education. Review of the other academic units will follow; the Steering Committee will report further to the Council next month when the reviews are completed. An item Mr. Treacy mentioned that impressed the Committee was the considerable amount needed for telephone costs.

A major item considered by the Committee was the status of the University Petitions Committee;

its status has not been clear since the approval of the Revised University Faculty Constitution and Bylaws (May 8, 1973). The Steering Committee made certain recommendations concerning the conduct of the Petitions Committee meetings, and received strong response from the various Deans. Therefore, in order to firmly establish the status of the Petitions group, the Steering Committee (under New Business) has offered an amendment to the Constitution, bringing the University Petitions Committee back into Academic Council as a Standing Committee.

Mr. Treacy at this time also requested withdrawal of Item B under Old Business, indicating that J. Walker had advised him of further developments related to the revision of the University Research Council Bylaws. A new draft will be presented to Council at a later date.

Mentioned by Mr. Treacy as being on the agenda for the next Steering Committee meeting is the clarification of the status of the Athletic Council's Constitution, there being some confusion as to whether it had ever indeed been approved by Academic Council. The Steering Committee will report on this at next month's Academic Council meeting.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mrs. Bireley reporting.

The Committee has completed its study of the currently used Course Change form, with the decision to make no recommendation for change at this time in its format.

Courses previously reported to the Council as being challenged have now been cleared, the involved departments having resolved their differences.

Mrs. Bireley also pointed out that three courses on the Committee's monthly list will need specific Academic Council approval since they are included in General Education Requirements; these are Music 111, 112, and 113 (see Attachment A).

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Skinner reporting.

The Committee has prepared a draft statement of policy to be followed in case of a financial emergency or a major reorganization of the University that involves reduction or elimination of University programs (Retrenchment Policy - Attachment B). Hearings will be held (tentative dates) February 19th and 20th; notices indicating time and place will be sent to all faculty members.

Next scheduled meeting of the Faculty Affairs Committee is February 24th, in the Small Conference Room of Allyn Hall.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Zamonski reporting.

The Committee met on January 31st, with discussion on -

The cut-off date for ordering through the Library has been set at April 15th, and the Library is requesting a 25% overage to cover cancellations, discounts, and duplications.

The subcommittee on periodicals security continues its analysis of the problem of mutila-

tion. An inventory of periodicals has been received from the Circulation Department. At this time the group feels it necessary to educate the community in the acquisition, maintenance, and use of periodicals.

A few clear patterns of satisfaction and complaint are developing in the analysis of questionnaires returned by Graduate Program directors. Information related to Library support has been forwarded to the departments for interpretation.

Mr. Zamonski drew attention to the handout distributed before the meeting (Attachment C) and mentioned that the data there supplied could be compared with the figures for Wright State's acquisition budget which appeared in Attachment A to the Minutes of the January 13th Academic Council meeting.

Library Committee will meet next on February 28th, an important meeting because it is at this time the Library Committee has its direct input into the Library budget process.

Mr. Treacy inquired of Mr. Zamonski how the three-M security system is working.

Mr. Zamonski responded that the system has been triggered by several items, including spiral notebooks and briefcases with metal banding, but this has been a matter of fine adjustment and the system is working optimally.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Cornyn reporting.

Mr. Levine has been added as a member of the Committee, to provide additional representation from the faculty and the Council.

Contact has been established and maintained with Mrs. Elizabeth Harden and the ad hoc Food Services Committee. Under discussion are the quality of food and service as well as terms for renewal of the food services contract.

On February 5th the Committee will review for recommendations to the Council the Student Body Constitution for Western Ohio Branch Campus.

To be reviewed also at that time will be the report from the Subcommittee on Student Publications.

Other matters of concern to the Committee are the possibility of the use of the University Center Board's public address system for broadcasting programs of the campus WWSU station and the preparation of a recommendation to the Steering Committee for student representation on the Petitions Committee.

Mr. Murray thanked all the reporting Council members.

VI. Old Business:

- A. Approval of Revised Promotions and Tenure Document for Main Campus (continuing: discussion by Article, paragraph). (Attachment F to June 3rd Minutes; Proposed Amendments Attachment D to October 7th Agenda; Additional Amendments Attachments A and B to November

ber 4th Agenda; Further Amendment Attachment B to December 2nd Agenda; Students Amendments Attachment C to January 13th Minutes) For revised/reworded Article IV and paragraph F of Article VI, see Attachment B to Minutes of January 13, 1975.

Mr. Murray reminded Council that Article IV and paragraph F of Article VI remain for review and approval.

Mr. Gray placed a motion to limit debate on the document to one hour; this motion was seconded and passed.

Mr. Eakins, Parliamentarian, noted time and discussion began.

Recalling from last meeting, Mr. Murray noted that Mr. Skinner had suggested the review of Article IV, than a return to consideration of paragraph F of Article VI, for consistent study of the proposed schedule or calendar for promotions and tenure procedures.

To make a fresh start on discussion of Article IV, Mr. Skinner asked for withdrawal of the proposed amendment to paragraph F, under date of 8-18-74. The second to that motion was also withdrawn.

Referring to the proposed amendments listed as Nos. 1 and 2 in Attachment B to the January 13th Minutes (related to paragraphs C and F of Article IV), Mr. Skinner placed a motion for approval of the two Faculty Affairs Committee's recommendations.

The motion was seconded and, there being no discussion seemingly forthcoming, Mr. Murray called for a vote on approval.

Voice voting appeared to be favorable, but it became evident that not everyone was clear as to what exactly was considered. With no objection voiced, discussion was re-opened by Mr. Murray.

Mr. Treacy questioned implementation of the policy if approved, and asked if the Faculty Affairs Committee had considered putting in a temporary section noting the effective date of the new policy.

Mr. Skinner replied that the uncertainty of approval date of the document made development of such a section difficult, but, yes, the Committee had this in mind. With the drawing near of final approval of the document, it would be possible to establish an implementation schedule, perhaps by administrative stages.

Mr. Murray stressed the logic of this because of the needed approval from Council on the entire document and the need for approval from the Board of Trustees as well.

Mr. Neve asked for reassurance related to the notification date of non-reappointment - May 1 - that this meant the individual would receive another year's contract, thus allowing a full year to look for another position.

Mr. Skinner agreed this interpretation was correct; once a faculty member has been here at least two years, a full year's notice must be given in writing of non-reappointment.

Rather than making the time of notification later, perhaps June 15th, the earlier date was decided upon in order to meet administrative needs of knowing about faculty planning earlier in the year.

Mr. Gray further clarified the matter with an illustration: The probationary period for an Assistant Professor being six years, in April of the sixth year he would have to be granted or denied tenure.

Mr. Skinner agreed that that would be the latest time.

Mr. Gray continued; this would allow the person to work the seventh year at Wright State, that seventh year being the terminal year.

There was no further discussion; Mr. Levine called for the question.

Voice voting, without opposition, carried the motion to amend paragraphs C and F of Article IV.

Mr. Skinner placed a motion for the approval of Article IV as amended:

"IV. Tenure Status of Faculty Members

- A. Definition of Tenure: A grant of tenure shall mean a commitment by the university to a sequence of annual appointments, such sequence being terminable only by resignation, retirement, removal for cause, or financial exigency. Although no contract of employment for more than one year can be made between any member of the faculty and the University, the principle of tenure shall be observed as an act of good faith on the part of the University.
- B. Grants of Tenure: Tenure is granted by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President. The procedure for consideration for tenure is described in the sections which follow:
- C. Probationary Service: At the time of initial appointment a faculty member beginning a period of probationary service at Wright State University shall be furnished in writing a statement indicating the maximum length of the period of such service. A faculty member who does not receive a grant of tenure prior to or during the last year of the stated period of probationary service shall have his appointment terminated, unless a period of terminal appointment not to exceed one year is agreed upon by the President and the faculty member concerned. The maximum length of the probationary period is as follows: Professors, 2 years; Associate Professors, 3 years; Assistant Professors and Instructors, 6 years.
- D. Tenure upon Completion of Probationary Service: Only fully affiliated faculty members at or above the level of Associate Professor shall be eligible for tenure, except in unusual cases where tenure is granted at the level of Assistant Professor. A Professor or an Associate Professor will receive a grant of tenure at the time of reappointment for the year following the expiration of the stated period of probationary service unless notified that it constitutes a terminal year's appointment.



- E. Tenure upon Promotion: Faculty members promoted to the rank of Associate Professor or Professor from within the institution will receive a grant of tenure at the time of promotion.
- F. Notice of Non-reappointment or Resignation: Notice of non-reappointment must be given in writing not later than February 1 of the first academic year's service. Notice of non-appointment of a non-tenured faculty member must be given at least twelve months in advance of termination of employment after the first year of employment. Faculty holding the rank of Professor who are not granted tenure must be notified of non-reappointment not later than the first day of May in the second year of employment; faculty holding the rank of Associate Professor who are not granted tenure must be notified of non-reappointment not later than the first day of May in their third year of employment; faculty holding the rank of Instructor or Assistant Professor who are not granted tenure must be notified of non-reappointment not later than the first day of May in their sixth year of employment. Faculty may be notified earlier than the above dates that they have been granted tenure or that they will be terminated.

Mr. Treacy seconded the motion: there was no further discussion.

The motion to approve Article IV as amended was passed by voice vote.

Moving to paragraph F of Article VI, Mr. Skinner placed a motion for the approval of the amendment of that paragraph (recommendation No. 3, Attachment B to the January 13th Minutes).

Mr. Treacy seconded; discussion was brief -

Mr. Sachs wondered what date is currently being used for having recommendations for tenure to the President.

Mr. Skinner directed attention to the "comments" in Attachment B: No. 2 comment indicates the currently used date to be November 20. Therefore, the amended paragraph sets January 15 for deadline for recommendations other than those pertaining to tenure, the deadline for tenure recommendations being April 15. Mr. Skinner agreed with Mr. Sachs that the date is "pushed up", giving an additional five months to the probationary period.

Mr. Murray asked for voting on paragraph F of Article VI:

- F. Recommended calendar for promotions and tenure procedures: The Provost will set up a schedule of committee deadlines so that the President will receive recommendations concerning faculty who are being considered for tenure at the end of a probationary period by April 15, and other recommendations by January 15.  
The Board of Trustees will announce all promotions as soon after February 1 as feasible, and all grants of tenure as soon after May 1 as feasible.  
Department chairmen will meet annually with their faculty, individually,

to review their progress in the department and the bearing this progress has on consideration for promotion and/or tenure. Each college will establish a procedure whereby annually a performance evaluation will be given to each faculty member and a copy placed in his departmental file to be used for promotion, tenure, and merit salary increment purposes.

Paragraph F as amended, Article VI, was approved by voice vote without opposition.

Mr. Skinner pointed out that two further amendments had been proposed at the January meeting and tabled (Students' Amendments A and B, Attachment C to the January 13th Minutes).

A motion to remove these amendments from the table was heard, the motion was seconded, and passed by voice vote.

Mr. Harvey spoke in support of approval of amendment A, indicating the "stake" students have in the assurance of quality teaching, they being the "consumers" of the University's educational "product". He brought out that while students do complete questionnaires evaluating classroom performance of faculty, their viewpoint should be appreciated in the interpretation of the data so collected. He felt student input would be beneficial to both students and faculty.

Mr. Gray noted the difference in filling a committee position: whereas faculty positions on promotions and tenure committees are filled by "elected" members, the amendment states the student representative will be "selected" by Student Caucus. He asked what criteria would be used in selecting that student.

Mr. Harvey admitted this would depend upon the Caucus in power that particular year, but that, generally, he felt it would depend upon interest in an academic field to the University and performance achieved. He felt the criteria this year would be the achievement of some standard of excellence academically and the acquiring of knowledge concerning the actual business of the University and having thoughts and ideas related to this.

Mr. Gray questioned "continuity" in the carrying out of the criteria, and Mr. Harvey felt that could be built into the amendment by the Council itself.

Mr. Nicholson posed two questions: What competency do students have to enable them to judge faculty in the three categories used in evaluating faculty, namely, teaching, research and service; secondly, are not the questionnaires completed related simply to classes rather than to instructors.

Mr. Harvey expressed the feeling that students would be as competent as any other individuals in evaluating teaching and service, by the student looking at the teaching level rendered, and looking at the service rendered by a faculty member to the community. He readily admitted that students, still at a stage of learning, might not recognize the full significance of research nor all that it entails. He went on to stress that the primary desire was to place students in a position to present effective input on the teaching. He stated he felt students

might evaluate the research by its importance to the University. Mr. Harvey pointed out that tenured faculty do indeed affect a great many more people than their immediate peer group, and that the four years a student spends in company with those tenured faculty could determine to a great extent the balance of that student's life, the point being that those receiving tenure represent an important "stake" in the student's life, a determining factor. He further stated that only students are in the position to know the attitudes present when questionnaires are filled out, and that responses might be varied at different times of the year, or dependent upon the number of questionnaires the person had completed that particular day.

Mr. Nicholson questioned if the classes rather than the instructors' abilities were not the assessment point in the students' questionnaires, and pointed out that various popular classes would naturally have higher ratings than unpopular/required courses. He further asked what perspective a student could bring to the promotions and tenure committee that was not already there, having already expressed that perspective through the questionnaires.

Mr. Harvey replied that representation would guarantee to the students the consideration of their perspective.

Mr. Nussbaum inquired if graduate students would be included in the list from which the student representative would be selected, and, if so, how would they make themselves available for selection.

College representatives would submit the names of those graduate students within their discipline and request those students to make themselves available for the position, Mr. Harvey said; graduate as well as undergraduate solicitation would make up the pool from which the student representative would be selected.

Mr. Nussbaum wondered if graduate students now participate actively in Student Caucus; Mr. Harvey assured him they do.

Mr. Nussbaum questioned if it were Mr. Harvey's understanding that the business of the University Promotions and Tenure Committee was completed by the end of an academic year.

Mr. Harvey agreed that was his general understanding; Mr. Nussbaum asked for input related to this point, from those Council members who had served on that Committee.

Mr. Skinner mentioned that, though the Committee might from time to time meet in the summer, the largest part of their business was completed within the academic year.

Mr. Treacy expressed his interpretation of Mr. Nussbaum's query, that "very frequently, in the most basic and fundamental way, promotions and tenure committees really act as long-range planning agents, for implementing goals through people". Mr. Treacy felt the committees are not short-term groups, but consider processes over a relatively long period.

Mr. Nussbaum asked the "significance" of input from a student selected to serve "one"

year, and whose selection criteria might vary, depending upon who the selection agency is.

The continuing service of the faculty would act as a stabilizing force. Mr. Harvey said, and the intent of the students was not to gain control but rather to add input to a process that now exists. He went on to acknowledge that Student Caucus members now willingly pay deference to those faculty having tenure, and readily concede that they know more about the continuing business of the University, but that the perspective of the students is also valuable to the University. Inquiry through the various colleges had revealed a lack of unifying factors in the evaluating of teaching, bringing forth the desire to assure the consideration of student input, because the students are the "beneficiaries" of the "excellence in teaching" set forth in Wright State's charter, and that should not be secondary to either research or service.

Mr. Gray pointed out that the document tended to move toward elimination of conflict of interests - stressing that members should not be voting on ranks greater than their own - and a conflict of interest would seem to appear in this type of representation. The possibility would exist of a student having an instructor in class during the quarter in which voting upon that faculty member could occur, and this appeared to be greater conflict of interest than having a non-tenured professor voting. He also recalled that Mr. Harvey had said students would not be as qualified to vote in relation to research and service; therefore, in effect, would be making use of only one-third voting power. Finally, he asked for clarification on how one student could represent the opinions of twelve thousand students. He stressed his feeling that student input at the departmental or college level would have much greater impact, that written random and unsolicited input is the students' "most powerful weapon". He felt putting students on the University Promotions and Tenure Committee is "too little, too late".

Mr. Harvey made mention that he had conceded only that the students' viewpoint or appreciation of research would be different from that of a faculty member and that a student would be equally equipped to evaluate a faculty member's service to the University as would anyone else in the University community. Further, he expressed the intent of the student representative to be a measure of expanding student input into the University process. He stated that the student representative was not to be an authoritative voice giving the impression that "all" students felt the same, but instead was to serve as a representative sample, just as the colleges send an individual as a representative of their discipline, not as the embodiment of the discipline. He stated that one student representative is an improvement over none, and that he would bring to the committee a point of view not always "listened to" or "understood". The students are on the receiving end of not only instruction but also research and service, since they carry degrees from that institution; therefore, they should be involved more closely in planning the "product" of the University rather than just being consumers of the product of the University.

Mr. Treacy spoke in support of having a student on the University Committee, although he admitted seeing disadvantages to it. He brought out that a fresh perspective is often offered by students, having experienced this in working with them on search committees. Offsetting the tendency of committees to get into a "rut", students do ask different kinds of questions, not acting in the sense of "control" but offering a perspective that might otherwise have been lacking. He did feel that Mr. Gray had made a valid point in bringing out that input at the departmental and college level was weighed heavily. Mr. Treacy said he felt that behavior

in small groups is modified by relationships one member with another, and so he would support Amendment A in placing a student on the University Promotions and Tenure Committee.

Mr. Skinner spoke, asserting he was speaking partly for the Faculty Affairs Committee and in part for himself. Discussion of the matter had taken place at the meetings of Faculty Affairs, the tendency being to agree with Mr. Gray, that since all processes begin at the departmental level, that students would find that the most effective level for influencing promotions and tenure. He felt to be consistent in the philosophy of not having non-tenured faculty on the University level committee, that students should not be a part of that committee. Relevant to the student input, Mr. Skinner wondered if it could not be written into some part of the document emphasis that departments should take a positive attitude toward obtaining student input, not simply accepting it but actively soliciting it.

Mr. Hughes spoke in support of the amendment: He mentioned there had been no student representation on committees when he was in college, and the main complaint at that time of students was concerned with teaching. . . . who was teaching, how well they were teaching, how long they would be teaching. He expressed the feeling that no matter how many evaluative forms are used, there does not seem to be any direct translation between the attitudes students have regarding teaching and teachers and what actually happens behind the "curtain" of promotions and tenure committee meetings.

Mr. Zamonski agreed with the supporting points made by Mr. Treacy and Mr. Hughes. He questioned what progress had been made toward getting students on the committees at the departmental and college levels.

Mr. Harvey reported no progress at this time - this was proposed in Amendment B. Mr. Harvey continued, giving the reasoning behind submitting Amendment A prior to asking for student representation at the departmental or college level. The feeling expressed, after speaking with a variety of persons, was that by the time recommendations reach the University level, they are somewhat formalized, and the student placed on the University level would pose less of a threat than one on the more primary level. His impression was that recommendations were given the final review at the University level as a part of the growth pattern. It was felt that student behavior could be observed at the University level, reassuring that students are not bringing about a deterioration of University standards. Mr. Harvey asserted that students are willing to go about this in a slow way, assuring themselves as well as faculty that this is the proper way to present effective input.

Mr. Zamonski asked if students have actually approached committees on the departmental and college levels; Mr. Harvey replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Zamonski wondered what responses there were; Mr. Harvey stated there had been two definitely negative responses and that the others had been very cautious.

Mr. Stoesz mentioned the "accountability" of faculty - to the State of Ohio, to subject matter, to their particular discipline, and most importantly, to their "clientele" - the students. He said he would hope the amendments would receive support.

Mr. Levine reminded members of the need for different viewpoints and fresh perspectives,

as brought out by both Mr. Hughes and Mr. Treacy, and stated he felt that this was exactly what he and Mr. Gray had presented as valid points for the inclusion of non-tenured faculty. His feeling of ambivalence stemmed from the inconsistency he felt in the inclusion of students but refusal of Council to include non-tenured faculty members.

Mr. Harvey addressed Mr. Levine: he stated his feeling that both non-tenured faculty and students have valid input, but that the same conflict of interest does not exist with students, they have no monetary or career stake in the voting.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Murray called for voice vote - this was not clear and Mr. Eakins suggested hand voting.

The motion to approve Students' Amendment A failed:

Against	13
In favor	12

Discussion moved to Students' Amendment B:

Mr. Sachs offered an amendment to the amendment, deleting in two instances "College and". the amendment to read -

All other provisions notwithstanding, the Department level Promotions and Tenure Committees may seat one student per committee subject to the rules and regulations that the Departments may choose to require.

This motion was seconded; Mr. Sachs spoke in support of the amendment to the amendment. He said he felt the point brought up by Mr. Levine was a good one, although he disagreed with Mr. Levine's conclusion: the way the document has been formulated sets different standards for each level and by deleting the "College" from the students' amendment, it remained consistent with previous approvals. . . . input by both students and non-tenured faculty was possible at the departmental level.

Mr. Levine asked for clarification on the accepted paragraph E, Article VI, the first sentence of which reads -

All elected members of promotions and tenure committees above the departmental level must be tenured.

His point of reference was that this could, at the discretion of the department, include students as well as non-tenured faculty - so was the students' amendment necessary?

Mr. Murray stated he felt it would be necessary to ask Mr. Harvey "how" that student would become a member of the departmental committee, but Mr. Levine inquired of Mr. Skinner if the implication of the previously quoted sentence allowed for the department to choose student members and if so, would it necessarily need to be written into the document?

Mr. Skinner felt that since there were no restrictions written into paragraph E excluding student members, they could be made members of the departmental committees; however,

he went on to state his feeling that Mr. Harvey wanted to emphasize that student membership would be a possibility, since it is only negatively implied as paragraph E is written. Mr. Skinner recognized the value of Mr. Harvey's proposal, even though it did not change the document formally.

Mr. Harvey spoke against Mr. Sachs amendment, stating that the amendment as originally worded had allowed much leeway for the department and/or college in the placing of a student on a committee, the student to occupy either a voting or a non-voting position at the discretion of the department or college. In either instance, Mr. Harvey stated, the students could demonstrate their ability to add significant input to the promotions and tenure process, and the intention was to leave as much latitude as possible for the department or college.

Mr. Wachtell spoke concerning the amendment as originally offered and stated he felt the key word was "may", giving the colleges and departments the option to decide whether or not they want student participation.

Hand voting was requested on the amendment to the amendment.

The motion to delete "College and" was defeated:

Against	15
In favor	9

Mr. Harvey urged support of the original amendment, making available a good testing ground for experience to decide what the University may do in the future.

Mr. Gray was assured on two points by Mr. Harvey, that the college and/or department would have the option to seat or not to seat a student representative and to make this a voting or a non-voting position. With this assurance, Mr. Gray supported the amendment.

Mr. Treacy opposed the amendment, stating he had seen students get hurt in the "departmental power plays" where they were not being asked to adopt an all-university perspective.

Mr. Neve questioned if departments do not indeed have the privilege of seating students without this amendment, and Mr. Murray replied that Mr. Skinner had agreed this was possible.

Mr. Murray was cautioned by the Parliamentarian that time allotted to the debate was at an end, and Mr. Murray received a motion by Mr. Sachs to continue the debate and finish the item this meeting. Mr. Treacy seconded the motion and the motion carried by voice vote without opposition.

Mr. Gray differed with Mr. Treacy, basing this on the fact that the amendment does offer "choice" to departments and colleges, and his feeling was that as a governing body, the Council should provide choice wherever possible. He felt the amendment would not mean that every department and/or college would be required to seat a student but that they would have the choice.

Voice voting appeared to be in favor of Amendment B, but Mr. Sachs requested a show of

hands.

Students' Amendment B was passed by a show of hands:

In favor	18
Against	7

Mr. Murray reminded Council that debate time had been extended to complete discussion on the amendments just considered; therefore, Council would move to the next item on the Agenda.

- B. Approval of Revised Bylaws for the University Research Council (Attachment D to Minutes of January 13, 1975).

Mr. Treacy placed a motion to table this item, pending further revision.

The motion was seconded, and passed by the majority voice vote necessary to table.

VII. New Business:

- A. Approval of Proposed Amendment to Faculty Constitution and Bylaws instituting University Petitions Committee as a Standing Committee of Academic Council (Attachment A to the February 3, 1975, Agenda).

Mr. Treacy placed a motion for the approval of this item: the motion was seconded, and the item will be presented for action under Old Business at the March meeting.

- VIII. No further New Business was introduced; the meeting was adjourned at 4:53 P.M.