

2-5-1979

# Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, February 5, 1979

Joseph F. Castellano

*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 18, 1979  
To: Members of the Academic Council  
From: Joseph F. Castellano, Chairer, Steering Committee  
Subject: Agenda, Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, February 5, 1979

Members of the Academic Council will meet at 3:10 p.m., Monday, February 5, 1979, in the Back Section of the University Center Cafeteria.

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of January 8, 1979, Meeting.
- III. Report of the President.
- IV. Report of the Steering Committee.
- V. Report of the Standing Committees:
  - A. Curriculum Committee
  - B. Faculty Affairs Committee
  - C. Library Committee
  - D. Student Affairs Committee
- VI. Old Business: None.
- VII. New Business:
  - A. Proposed Changes in Academic Council Constituency Representation (see Attachment A).
  - B. Recommendation to Academic Council to Approve Courses Proposed for Variant Grading (see Attachment B).
- VIII. Adjournment.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

February 5, 1979

MINUTES

- I. The meeting of February 5, 1979 was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice President Murray at 3:15 p. m. in the Cafeteria Extension of the University Center.

Present:

J. Barton, J. Beljan, B. Bentsen, C. Burkhart, T. Burns, J. Castellano, G. Constable, S. Cummings, P. Doherty, R. Dolphin, K. Eckerle, R. Fox, I. Fritz, R. Glaser, B. Hutchings, R. Kegerreis, S. Klein, L. Lord, L. Low, J. Murray, E. Nicholson, D. Pabst, M. Ritchie, J. Sayer, R. Schumacher, P. Simcox, T. Staton, W. Stoesz, H. Wachtell, E. Wetter, M. L. White

Absent:

B. Barth, P. Horn, K. Racevskis, A. Rodin, B. Tea

Prior to commencing the meeting, Mr. Murray introduced Craig Burkhart to the Academic Council. Craig will be representing the students of WOBC at the Council meetings.

- II. A Motion was presented to have the Minutes of the January 8, 1979 Academic Council accepted. No changes or additions were forthcoming, and the Motion was seconded. The Minutes of January 8, 1979 were unanimously approved.
- III. Report of the President - The President reported on the recent visitation of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools which was here at the request of the University to study Wright State's accreditation at the PhD level. The four member team, headed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs of Iowa State University, with other members from Michigan State, University of Michigan and the University of Nebraska, was very thorough and analytical in its evaluation. The expressions of the team were very complimentary about Wright State's ability to operate at the PhD level. Due to rules of the NCA, specifics of the report can not be divulged until some time in April. President Kegerreis expressed his thanks to Messrs. Murray, Dolphin, Hutchings, Gardier, Kolmen, Sirkin and Beljan, along with many others, who spent much time and effort in preparing the report of this investigation.

In response to the President's report, Mr. Klein read a statement he had prepared which dealt with three issues of internal discord, namely, (1) academic freedom violations, (2) calls for "No Confidence" votes in the President and the Board of Trustees, and (3) alleged administrative paralysis in the Executive Wing.

The first two allegations were discussed in the University Times of January 29, 1979. Regarding the third issue of administrative paralysis, Mr. Klein suggested to the President that the following steps be taken to try and alleviate this situation, i.e., spend more time at the university, more prompt replies to communications, avoid isolation from senior administrators, compromise grievances, and consider the possibility of improprieties in Due Process procedures. In finalizing his comments, Mr. Klein expressed his hope that his remarks would not appear presumptuous to the Council, and would not jeopardize his relationship with the President.

The President responded that he encouraged remarks such as Mr. Klein's, and would welcome them from all factions of the University.

- IV. Report of the Steering Committee: At its January 17 meeting, Mr. Castellano reported that the Steering Committee received a report from Mr. Neve concerning the operations of the General Education Committee. Mr. Neve hoped the Committee would have its recommendations prepared for the Academic Council before the end of the year.

The Steering Committee has also gathered input from the Curriculum and Student Affairs Committees with respect to the Drop Date Policy. The Steering Committee will discuss this at its next meeting, and make a formal recommendation to the Academic Council at its March meeting.

In line with the Steering Committee's goals to streamline the Ad Hoc committees, the elimination of the Controller's Advisory Committee was approved. Further, the Calendar Committee and the Elections Committee were combined into one committee. The Bookstore Committee has been asked to write a report stating its function as seen by the Committee.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

- A. Curriculum Committee: Mr. Glaser reported the Committee met once since the last Academic Council meeting, at which time they approved four courses for variant grading. This recommendation has been forwarded to the Steering Committee, which will in turn be presented to the Academic Council for action at its next meeting. The Curriculum Committee has also been delegated the responsibility of studying the advantages and disadvantages of a Plus and Minus grading system.
- B. Faculty Affairs Committee: In the absence of the Chairman of this Committee, Mr. Pabst commented briefly on the STRS proposal. Open Hearings were held on this topic and based upon those Hearings, representatives of the Faculty Affairs Committee presented the proposal to the President's Advisory Council. After lengthy discussions, the President's Advisory Council made Motions supporting, in general, the recommendations of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Klein noted that the Faculty Affairs Committee was an important element of the Academic Council, and could not understand why such an absenteeism record was evident on the part of the Chairman.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees (Cont'd)

C. Library Committee: No report

D. Student Affairs Committee: Mr. Renas said there would be no report from this Committee.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

NONE

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Changes in Academic Council Constituency Representation

Mr. Falkner stated that on the basis of providing equitable representation of the faculty on the Academic Council, the Committee is recommending that the Medical School representation be increased from 2 to 3, and the Science and Engineering representation be reduced from 6 to 5. On a temporary basis, the School of Professional Psychology will be included in Constituency A with the College of Education and Library Administration. For this coming year, the School of Professional Psychology will not have anyone eligible to run for office.

B. Recommendation to Academic Council to Approve Courses Proposed for Variant Grading

At their last meeting, the Curriculum Committee discussed the merits of variant type grading of the four courses in question, and they all fit into the framework which had been previously set up for variant (optional) type grading. Therefore, the Curriculum Committee does recommend approval.

VII. NEW BUSINESS (Cont'd)

C. (See Attachment A)

Not on the Agenda, but presented for discussion, was a Motion by Mr. Ritchie to have his memo regarding President Kegerreis in a Due Process Hearing forwarded to the Council of Deans for study and evaluation. (Said memo was distributed to each member's seat prior to start of meeting). Mr. Fritz seconded the Motion.

Prior to entering into discussions, the Parliamentarian asked for clarification of the Motion, specifically, was the Council being asked to endorse the contents of the memo. Mr. Ritchie said he was not seeking endorsement, but rather an acknowledgement to have the memo referred to the Council of Deans.

Mr. Wachtell raised the question of the relationship of the Council of Deans to the Academic Council, and further questioned why this material was being forwarded to them.

Mr. Nicholson asked if action could be taken on this item without a Suspension of the Rules to which the Parliamentarian replied that any action except a YES or NO vote could be taken. The Parliamentarian stated that no action was being requested of the Academic Council, but merely the transmittal of a document from one body to another. Mr. Nicholson again questioned how this could be done without a YES or NO vote.

In order to facilitate this situation, Mr. Sayer presented a Motion to Suspend the Rules in order to properly handle Mr. Ritchie's motion. The Suspension of the Rules was seconded by Mr. Beljan. A voice vote indicated the majority were in favor of the Suspension of the Rules.

Returning to a point made earlier, Mr. Sayer questioned the authority of the Council of Deans to act as an investigative body. He further questioned whether this two page memo would provide sufficient information to the Council of Deans for them to do what they were being asked to do.

Mr. Ritchie's rationale for forwarding this memo to the Council of Deans was that this body was accustomed to dealing with such issues, being comprised of members with "cool heads", and further, that this body was able to get the information that was needed to perform their duty.

Mr. Nicholson felt that if the Academic Council were to approve Mr. Ritchie's proposal, it would set a bad precedent, whereby the Academic Council would continually be inundated with requests to forward material from one group to another.

Mr. Fox questioned what sort of response Mr. Ritchie expected to get from the Council of Deans -- a one sentence statement, or a long detailed documentation. Mr. Ritchie said he did not intend to dictate to the Council of Deans how they were to proceed, rather it was his intent that the Council of Deans review the material and respond to Mr. Ritchie with their evaluation.

VII. NEW BUSINESS (Con'd)

It was requested that Mr. Ritchie's Motion be repeated. The record showed the Motion to be that Mr. Ritchie proposed referral of his memo to the Council of Deans for their study and evaluation.

Mr. Castellano felt that based upon the last paragraph of Mr. Ritchie's memo, the Council of Deans is being asked to recommend to the Academic Council whether or not to proceed with the censure of the Wright State Board of Trustees. Mr. Castellano sought clarification of this point if this is not the intent that Mr. Ritchie wished to impart.

By way of clarification, Mr. Ritchie proposed an amendment to his original Motion whereby the last paragraph would be deleted before forwarding to the Council of Deans. Mr. Fritz, as seconder of the original motion, agreed with this change, and seconded the amendment.

A Question was Called on the Motion , as revised, which requests the Council of Deans to study and evaluate the memo prepared by Mr. Ritchie. A voice vote indicated the majority were in favor of closing discussions. A show of hands vote on the Revised Motion indicated the motion failed by a vote of 19 to 7.

In commenting on the previous discussion, Ms. Cummings inquired about a mechanism, or particular procedure, which should be followed in a censure. Mr. Kegerreis responded that any body or person could file a censure against any other person or group at Wright State. There is no specific mechanism which leads to a censure.

Mr. Glaser agreed that the Council of Deans would not be the proper body for referral of Mr. Ritchie's memo, but questioned which would be the appropriate committee. Mr. Murray responded that the Faculty Affairs Committee would be the appropriate designate for a study such as this.

Reiterating his second to Mr. Constable's Motion of Adjournment, Mr. Nicholson asked if the Motion had been recognized. The Chairman, not having heard the original motion, called for a vote on Adjournment, which was agreed to unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

The next meeting of the Academic Council will be Monday, March 5 at 3:10 p.m. in the Cafeteria Extension of the University Center.