

3-1-1976

Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, March 1, 1976

Glenn T. Graham

Wright State University - Main Campus, glenn.graham@wright.edu

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



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Graham, G. T. (1976). Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, March 1, 1976. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/43

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 library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Wright State University



Dayton, Ohio 45431

Campus Communication

date: February 18, 1976
to: Members of the Academic Council
from: Glenn Graham, Secretary, Steering Committee
subject: Agenda, Academic Council Meeting, Monday, March 1, 1976

Members of the Academic Council will meet at 3:10 P.M., Monday, March 1, 1976 in Rooms 155 A,B,C (Presidential Dining Area), Main Floor, University Center.

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of February 2, 1976 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 Proposed Academic Calendar 1976-1977 (See Attachment A).
 - B. Approval of policy on reclassification of students (See Attachment B, February 2, 1976 Agenda).
 - C. Approval of policy on submission of early grades for graduating students (See Attachment C, February 2, 1976 Agenda).
 - D. Approval of membership of Constitutional Review Committee (See Attachment B).
- VII. New Business:
 - A. Approval of new courses (See Attachment C).
- VIII. Adjournment.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

March 1, 1976

Minutes

- I. The regular monthly meeting was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice Provost Murray at 3:10 P.M. in room 155 of the University Center.

Present:

D. Badaczewski, S. Barone, J. Beljan, K. Boas, E. Cannon, W. Collie, B. Dreher, E. Duffy, S. Dyer, J. Fortman, I. Fritz, R. Frommeyer, G. Graham, R. Gray, K. Kotecha, E. Levine, T. Matczynski, A. Moliterno, C. Montgomery, H. Neve, N. Nussbaum, G. Pacernick, H. Roehm, J. Sayer, D. Schmidt, G. Skinner, E. Stearns, J. Thatcher, G. Torres, J. Zamonski

Absent:

C. Benner, J. Castellano, R. Kegerreis, A. MacKinney, J. Martin, A. Spiegel, B. Yoder

- II. Minutes of the February 2, 1976 meeting were approved as written.
- III. Report of the President.

Mr. Murray advised that the President had asked him to deliver a message to the Council that Judge Rubin, the Federal District Judge, appointed Mr. Kegerreis as Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Task Force to monitor desegregation of the Dayton Schools. In this task, Mr. Kegerreis has requested and is soliciting any recommendations that the Council may have. Any recommendations from your own personal standpoint, or from your own neighborhood, or with respect to the University itself, please forward to Mr. Kegerreis.

- IV. Report of the Steering Committee, Mrs. Dreher reporting.

At the last meeting of the Steering Committee, Mr. Nicholson, Chairman of Faculty Affairs Committee, was the guest and discussed the definitions of affiliation for the Medical School. The proposed Budget Review Committee was also discussed. This was listed as a resolution to the Faculty Retrenchment Policy that was passed at the last Academic Council meeting. The budget review process does include the Steering Committee meeting with the governing representatives and the faculty units deans. The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be on March 10, 1976.

- V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

- A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Whippen reporting.

The University Curriculum Committee has been involved in a dispute between the College of Liberal Arts and the College of Science and Engineering dealing with the granting of credit for Math 102.

Math 102 is a basic algebra course which gives three hours of credit, but stipulates that credit, if used, has to be added on to that required for graduation. Liberal Arts requested that the University Curriculum Committee recommend very strongly that the College of Science and Engineering and the Math Department be requested to allow students in the College of Liberal Arts, or allow all Colleges, to select whether or not they use the credit granted for graduation rather than them adding three hours to graduation requirements. This means the course applies to graduation just as any other course does. The Committee dealt with this issue over a two-months' period, and the Committee directed me to read to you the results of this. There were copies of the minutes of the University Curriculum Committee of February 23, 1976 passed out to this Council today. The motion was made that, "The University Curriculum Committee recommend to Academic Council that each college in the University be permitted to determine the applicability of Math 102 credit hours toward graduation." The motion was rejected with a 4-0 vote with 1 abstention. The explanation behind that is listed in the aforementioned minutes.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, no report.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Wood reporting.

The recent actions taken by the Library Committee at the last monthly meeting were: (1) The Committee agreed with the Library's recommendation to levy fines on graduate teaching assistants for overdue reserve materials unrelated to the process in which they are assisted. (2) The Committee recommended that books be checked out to faculty members for a standard period of eleven weeks. The present policy is that the due date is usually at the end of each quarter, or if the materials are checked out near the end of the quarter, the due date is the end of the following quarter. To replace that, the Committee recommends that the standard period for checkouts be eleven weeks regardless of what time during the quarter they are checked out. (3) The Library Committee recommended that the Library staff consider establishing a display of general interest periodicals near the pillars of the reading area on the second floor of the Library. (4) The Library Committee also recommended a two-year University-wide trial for the approval plan of acquisitions. (5) The Library Committee also recommended that funds realized through the cancellation of certain periodicals early in the year be used for the purchase of three large sets of materials requested by the Art Department, the Department of Chemistry, and the program of Applied Behavioral Sciences.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Page reporting.

At the last meeting of the Student Affairs Committee, two main issues were considered. First, a document (regarding a code of teaching responsibility, a copy of which was received from Michigan State University) was sent to the Student Affairs Committee by the Steering Committee. Wright State currently has no such document or code of responsibility in regard to teaching. It was felt it would be desirable to have such a code formalized and put into the faculty handbook. It was also felt that implementation of such a document should come through the Faculty Affairs Committee, and the document was returned to Steering Committee with that recommendation.

The other issue considered had to do with course evaluations. This has been discussed for some length of time now. A variety of opinions exist in the University on course evaluations in terms of frequency and policies regarding these. Some formalization of this process may be beneficial to the University, so the Student Affairs Committee forwarded to the Steering Committee a proposal that states first, all courses in the University be evaluated every quarter and second, that a commonly agreed upon document would be desirable. Therefore, the Student Affairs Committee is proposing that the 17 item evaluation developed by Science and Engineering, which Student Caucus has been using, be used by the University. Finally, as far as the use of these evaluations, the Committee feels they should be returned to instructors, and with the instructor's consent, be made public by some form of publication of these results, which is to be determined through Student Caucus.

- C. Approval of policy on submission of early grades for graduating students. (Attachment C to the February 2, 1976 Agenda).

A motion was moved and seconded for Motion 1 of the attachment.

Mr. Schmidt asked the Council to recognize Ms. Harden, Chairman of the Commencement Committee.

Ms. Harden pointed out the Commencement Committee is an 18-member committee, and seven of the members are students. The Commencement Committee is not a policy-making committee, it simply is charged with the responsibility of promoting and organizing the commencement exercise. However, it seems that the Committee, particularly last year, was considered as being the representative spokesman by the majority of the student body. The opinion of the students representing the student body was that the majority of the students were unanimous in thought to receiving their diplomas at the commencement. The Committee then charged that this vote be brought to Academic Council. This is an opinion as voiced by the student membership of the Commencement Committee.

Ms. Stearns replied that most students want to receive their diplomas rather than a letter of intent. However, there is a second issue involved. If this motion is passed, it would involve students taking exams after attending commencement, because commencement is on a Wednesday night during finals week. A student may attend commencement and then have to take an exam Thursday morning; in fact, they may be scheduled to take an exam Wednesday night, the same night of commencement. This discourages attending commencement.

Mr. Schmidt said it is the sympathy of the graduating students that they would like to receive a diploma at commencement. People have rallied around to show they do want a diploma, and the letter of intent is not a diploma.

Mr. Falkner advised material has been distributed at the meeting today that shows there are four Ohio state-assisted schools that do not distribute diplomas at graduation. Those who do distribute diplomas at graduation have early exams so the graduation check can be made.

Mr. Fortman pointed out there are two questions in point on Motion 1--- the giving of diplomas at graduation and the early exam question. He asked if there is a way early grades could be eliminated with commencement immediately following exams week, and still give the students diplomas at commencement.

Academic Council Minutes

March 1, 1976

Page Five

Mr. Whippen asked how many days are needed before graduation for grades to be evaluated.

Mr. Falkner advised that five working days are appreciated.

Mr. Whippen replied this means the faculty would be giving finals sometime in the eighth week with twenty percent of the quarter remaining.

Mr. Murray asked to clarify what the Academic Council passed three or four years ago, and why this issue is updated. The motion that was passed, and the policy that was adopted, was not early exams but early grades. There is a distinction, and this left it open to the instructor as to what he wanted to do. It did not require an early examination, but it required an early grade.

Discussion ensued on changing the commencement date from the middle of exam week.

Ms. Harden reminded the Council that the Calendar just passed would make it impossible to fulfill Motion 2, because commencement is scheduled for Sunday following finals on Friday, and in no way could the Registrar have the time to tally and compute the grades so that diplomas could be awarded. The real issue is an issue between faculty and students. An early grade, for the most part, is associated with an early exam. It does not necessarily have to be, but most of the time it is.

Mr. Schmidt said it is quite clear that the students want their diplomas at graduation, no matter when graduation is scheduled. If that requires early grading, then have early grading. It is very important to the students to receive their diplomas at graduation.

Mr. Fritz stated that from his experience on the Commencement Committee, it seems clear the students have very strong feelings about receiving a diploma. He does not feel the letter of intent should be forced on the student.

Mr. Graham spoke against this motion and mentioned there are people beyond senior standing who also cherish these diplomas. He called for the question.

Motion 1 failed unanimously by voice vote.

Motion 2 was moved and seconded.

Mr. Fortman moved an amendment to this motion to read, "In the future, early grading should be eliminated by giving out diplomas in anticipation of grade evaluation at a commencement which is scheduled immediately after exam week." This would answer all the problems; the exams are taken in phase, the commencement is close to the end of the school year, and the students get diplomas.

Mr. Graham asked what is meant by "anticipation of grade evaluation".

Mr. Fortman answered this means the diploma is given to the student before it is certified that requirements are completed. If a required course is failed, the student is sent a letter asking him to return the diploma.

Mr. Graham replied that a small discussion was held in the Steering Committee on this, and the Committee wondered about the legality of the diploma.

Mr. Falkner stated he tried to find something on this but could not. The problem that could occur would be that one employer out of a thousand would accept that diploma, and on the basis of the diploma, hire someone. Would the employer have legal recourse to the University? Mr. Falkner stated he could not get an opinion on that. A transcript would not be sent with the degree posted without actually doing a check. It would be posted in the commencement program that a grade check has to be done before it is legally conferred. It is the third party that we have to be concerned about on a legal basis. There are times where a government agency would accept the diploma. A legal opinion is needed.

Mr. Graham suggested an opinion from the students as to how many would attend commencement if the University had the regular eleven week quarter with commencement scheduled four or five days after that. This would give the Registrar enough time to process the grades so diplomas could be given at commencement.

Mr. Nussbaum spoke against the amendment. He prefers not to teach an extension of the LaSalle Institute, and he would like to see the degree that Wright State offers at the commencement be meaningful. This is a difficult problem for faculty members if they choose to make it a difficult problem. Early grading does not mean early examination, but if early examination is what the faculty member intends, there are a variety of mechanisms available and prior planning can make the situation a little easier to swallow. There is not a need for any change in the existing policy of early grading and submission of those grades to the Registrar in time for evaluation.

The amendment failed by voice vote.

Mr. Levine asked what is the necessity of early grading if we have some intelligent planning of commencement and final examination period.

Mr. Schmidt replied that would mean waiting for commencement at least one and one half weeks after the final exams.

There was much discussion about one week making a difference in the scheduling of commencement.

Mr. Fortman recalled the October, 1975 meeting of the Academic Council when commencement was moved up from Sunday to Wednesday. Two arguments were given; one, the faculty would not be there for commencement, and two, the Music Department could not participate.

Mr. Murray stated this happened two years ago when there were many complaints from the faculty and also from the Music Department that commencement was too late and, therefore, the ceremony did not have music.

Ms. Torres called the question for the original motion.

A roll call vote was called.

In favor of approval of the motion:

D. Badaczewski, S. Barone, J. Beljan, E. Cannon, W. Collie,
B. Dreher, J. Fortman, I. Fritz, R. Frommeyer, G. Graham,
R. Gray, K. Kotecha, E. Levine, T. Matczynski, H. Neve,
G. Pacernick, H. Roehm, E. Stearns, J. Thatcher, G. Torres,
J. Zamonski

Opposed to the motion:

K. Boas, E. Duffy, S. Dyer, C. Montgomery, N. Nussbaum,
D. Schmidt, G. Skinner

There were no members abstaining.

The motion passed by a vote of 21 to 7.

Ms. Dreher proposed an amendment to the calendar. Attachment A to the March 1, 1976 Agenda should have the June 12 commencement scratched and changed to June 19, 1977. (See Attachment A).

The question was called by a hand vote of 18 to 8.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Mr. Murray stated the calendar that was previously approved is now amended.

- D. Approval of membership of Constitutional Review Committee (See Attachment B to the March 1, 1976 Agenda).

Moved and seconded.

Mr. Schmidt asked if it is possible to have a student on the Constitutional Review Committee.

Ms. Dreher replied the Steering Committee felt it was inappropriate to have a token student since this is a faculty constitution.

The motion passed by voice vote.

- E. Mr. Beljan said it is his understanding that at the last Academic Council meeting, the School of Medicine Bylaws were tabled. It was his desire to move that item be taken off the table for discussion today.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Mr. Beljan asked to make a few general comments about the bylaws. First of all, the School of Medicine Bylaws were developed with a very broad-based committee with a variety of experiences in a variety of institutions including Wright State University. The development of those bylaws required many months of careful work, and was adopted by an unanimous vote of the Medical School Faculty at a meeting chaired by Ms. Dreher. Although, technically, the bylaws did not need to come to this body for review, it was done in the spirit of collegiality. We are now in a position where there is need for the School of Medicine to have operant bylaws, and Mr. Beljan hoped to have endorsement of the bylaws at this meeting.

Mr. Roehm replied this was tabled because there was some issue regarding the legality of this. The Council asked that this be looked at and returned to Academic Council, pointing out those areas where there might be conflict to the faculty constitution.

Ms. Dreher responded that the Steering Committee did address this issue at the last meeting on February 11, 1976. Mr. Nicholson was representing the Faculty Affairs Committee, and said they had concern in regard to tenure.

Mr. Levine said he has a report from Mr. Nicholson representing the majority of the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee. The report states, "The Faculty Affairs Committee believes there are numerous ambiguities in the document and will comment in writing to the School of Medicine concerning these areas. However, we believe that the bylaws are contradictory to the University Constitution and Bylaws in the following areas: (1) Definition of fully and partially affiliated faculty members, Article II, Section 1 and 2. (2) Rights to tenure for faculty, Article II, Section 4. (3) Certification of graduation of students, Article IV, Section 5 (B) (2). (4) Repeal of prior rules, Article V, Section 2. We recommend the adoption of the bylaws with the exception of these parts mentioned."

Mr. Beljan replied there was a lot of misunderstanding and confusion in regard to certain elements of these bylaws. First, in regard to faculty titles, there is a motion for amendment to the School of Medicine Bylaws which makes explicit the definitions of fully and partially affiliated members, so that the School of Medicine Bylaws will be totally in concert with the University Bylaws. Issue number two concerning tenure, the bylaws state the Faculty of Medicine, insofar as is possible, supports and is guided by the intent of the 1940 "Principles of Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure, Revised" as published by the American Association of University Professors. The intent of tenure is to provide the environment or conditions which make possible the independence of thought, judgment, and expression with security. Tenure, as expressed in these bylaws, makes explicit the concepts of obligations of faculty as a limit beyond which the privilege or right of security does not extend. On issue number three, the situation of approval for graduates, it is a tradition in the Schools of Medicine for the Faculty of Medicine to pass on its student's qualifications for graduation; and the operating assumption would be that the School of Medicine, acting as a body of Academic Council, would be discharging the spirit of Wright State University's Constitution. Mr. Beljan said the fourth element is a new one which he has not heard about prior to this meeting.

Mr. Fortman asked for a clarification as he does not recall seeing the bylaws in total. The only portion that was brought to Academic Council was the business concerning fully affiliated versus partially affiliated faculty members.

Mr. Beljan replied the thrust of his comment is that is now redundant and unnecessary as the School of Medicine is in compliance with the suggestion of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Murray commented on this one aspect. There are several departments and other units that have bylaws in existence now, and those bylaws have never been presented to this body.

Much discussion followed.

Mr. Beljan said in view of the discussion, he would like to withdraw the bylaws and send them through a different channel.

Mr. Skinner commented if the interaction between the Faculty Affairs Committee and the School of Medicine stops, what may happen a year from now, is that an unfortunate individual is caught in a conflict between the School of Medicine Bylaws and the University Bylaws. He recommended that dialogue continue even though it is a difficult one.

Mr. Beljan replied it is not a difficult one at all. He appreciates the review that the Faculty Affairs Committee has provided, but the School of Medicine is in the posture of a fix on a number of these important items. The other ones are subject to interpretation which can have further dialogue, but a set of bylaws is needed from which to operate. Therefore, Mr. Beljan stated he needs to withdraw them. Dialogue shall continue.

The motion to withdraw the bylaws passed by voice vote.

- F. Mr. Schmidt moved to make an amendment to the Constitutional Review Committee to read, "There be at least one student included in the Constitutional Review Committee, that student to be selected by Student Caucus."

Ms. Dreher said the Council just decided that the Medical School Bylaws are not really its particular business, and, likewise, the Steering Committee felt that the Faculty Constitution is not really student business.

Mr. Schmidt disagreed and felt it is student business in that the constitution that the faculty operates under directly affects the students, and they should have some input into the drawing up of that constitution.

Ms. Torres stated that one student out of eight members only guarantees that you have student input.

The amendment passed by voice vote.

VII. New Business:

Note - Under the Student Affairs Committee report, item V.(D)., a motion was moved and passed to place "Student Course Evaluation" on the Agenda for March 1, 1976 as New Business. (See Attachment B).

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

/po