

5-12-1981

General Faculty Meeting Minutes, May 12, 1981

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.

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING

SPRING QUARTER

May 12, 1981

I. The Spring Quarter General Faculty Meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by the Vice President of the University Faculty, Mr. Lilburn Hoehn.

II. Minutes of the Winter Quarter General Faculty Meeting were approved with the following correction: page two, item 3, line 8: the word "research" should read "resource."

III. Reports:

A. Report of the Steering Committee: Mr. L. Hoehn, Chairer, gave the following report:

1. The Calendar/Elections Committee completed the study of the semester versus quarter system. Results indicate approximately two-thirds of the faculty favor the semester calendar with nearly the opposite number of students favoring the quarter calendar. The Steering Committee will consider what the next step should be.
2. Academic Council meetings have been approved for next year. New members to the Steering Committee have been elected: James Jacob, Liberal Arts; Henry Andrews, Education & Human Services; and Richard Williams, Business & Administration. They will be serving with Barbara Beeler, School of Medicine; Prem Batra, Science & Engineering; and Jean Sullivan, Nursing.
3. The Faculty Retrenchment Policy was approved by Academic Council at its April meeting and will be going before the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees.
4. The Early Retirement Policy is nearly ready for further discussion within the University community. Reason for delay was to allow for careful analysis of tax implications.

Approval was given to change the agenda of this meeting to indicate the following order:

Administrative Review by Mr. A. Gilliam

Scholarship Drive Report by Mr. E. Pollock

Report of President Kegerreis

Election of the Vice President Elect of the University Faculty

B. Report of President Kegerreis (given later in meeting)

IV. Special Reports:

A. Administrative Review of the President - A. W. Gilliam: Mr. Armistead W. Gilliam, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Trustees, Wright State University, summarized the report of the Administrative Review Committee of the President. Mr. Gilliam began his remarks by noting the limitations on the questionnaires distributed to faculty, students, University and college administrators, and

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 1981

Page two

persons external to the University. Mr. Gilliam also noted that a second limitation related to the percentage of returns of questionnaires obtained. He cautioned that because of these and other limitations, great care had to be taken in interpreting the raw data and drawing conclusions from those data.

The conclusions drawn by the committee were:

1. President Kegerreis has been very effective in relating to and working with individuals and groups external to the University.
2. Data related to student relationships and student involvement in decision making were mixed and did not provide consensus where or if a change was needed in this area.
3. In regard to University personnel matters, the data indicates that some members of the University community felt the President was not as effective as they would like.
4. The committee recommended that immediate and long-range academic and fiscal planning require attention in that a permanent developmental process be established.
5. Many faculty commented negatively about the President's handling of competition within and among colleges and schools. The committee concluded that the President should address directly any problems that exist in this area.
6. The data on the President's performance on problem solving and decision making were too mixed to draw a clear-cut conclusion.

The overall conclusion of the committee was that President Kegerreis performed exceptionally well in the area of external relationships but with respect to other areas, the data were too mixed to merit an overall conclusion.

On the basis of the analysis of the data collected by the committee, the following recommendations were made:

1. President Kegerreis should maintain his current level of external activities.
2. The President should increase opportunities to interact informally with students in order to enhance his visibility with them.
3. President Kegerreis, along with the Board of Trustees, should consider a reorganization of central administrative structure with the possibility of adding an executive vice president or provost. The committee did note, however, that this should be done with caution.
4. The President should take immediate steps to implement a permanent, academic, and fiscal intermediate and long-range planning process and communicate to the University community that process and its outcomes as they occur. It was noted that the President has currently a medium to long-range planning process underway, which was initiated in 1980.

5. President Kegerreis should investigate the perception that discordant competition exists within and among schools and colleges.
6. The committee suggests that the President examine the entire process of problem solving and decision making to determine whether improvements could be made in such factors as timing of decisions and use of advice.

In conclusion, it was noted that the Board has the highest confidence in President Kegerreis.

B. Scholarship Drive: Mr. E. Pollock gave the following report:

The Wright State University Foundation and the Office of Development raised \$35,000 four years ago for the Scholarship Drive as its first effort. This year the University has a goal of \$55,000. To date, \$37,818 has been raised. The closing date of May 15 has been extended until 12:00 noon, Thursday, May 21. Mr. Pollock stressed the importance of scholarship assistance. Without this money, some 141 students would not be receiving scholarship aid this year. The average scholarship award for continuing students is from \$250 to \$500. These students are extremely vital to all at the University. Mr. Pollock urged all to contribute to this effort. Mr. Pollock commended all who have given in the past and recognized that the alumni this year have doubled their contributions with a total of \$21,175. Corporate campaign has realized a total of \$129,341 in cash and pledges. The goal of \$155,000 is hoped to be reached by the end of this fiscal year. A special fund effort was begun this year to benefit the Rike Building and help fund the equipment for the Microprocessing Laboratory for Engineering and Computer Science. This effort has to date achieved \$22,800 and will continue until we realize or come near the goal of \$450,000. Every effort is being made to achieve support from private sources from outside the University but the support from the University community is desperately needed.

III. Reports (Continued):

B. Report of President Kegerreis:

1. President Kegerreis spent some time in Washington to determine if there was a way to increase the attention of congress on the matters of financial aid for students, the National Science Foundation, tentative budget, and the like. Congress adopted the sternest budget cutting available, resulting in a significant loss in student aid packages compared to past years. Since this loss applies to all universities in the country, it cannot be determined how this loss of financial aid to students will affect enrollment.
2. On the state level, the Chairman of the Senate Budget and Finance Committee confirmed that instead of a continuation budget based on July 1, 1980, the continuation budget is going to be closer to the budget on which we are now operating, which is 93 percent of that. Higher education will have some \$52 million less than the state assisted universities had counted on a few weeks ago. This will allow no inflationary adjustments and compounds the problem of budget cutting on campus. The continuation budget should be completed by July 1 but on a lower expenditure base.

3. In August, the General Assembly will begin consideration of new taxes and will pass an appropriations act which will have a specific amount listed for Wright State University which will be based upon no new taxes, and there will be no continuation of the temporary taxes now in operation. That will be at a level of \$200 million below the level of the current, original budget. It is hoped these tax discussions in August will be of benefit to the University, and benefits accrued will be spread among the faculty and the academic programs at the University. This presents a problem at vice presidential, dean, and other levels of attempting to bring this budget into new adjustment.
 4. The Ohio Senate has introduced a new bill, Senate Bill 232, which provides for state subsidy to private colleges based on the number of persons enrolled in those private colleges who are citizens of the state of Ohio. Private colleges would receive a head-count subsidy for every Ohio student enrolled in those colleges equal to half of the subsidy designed to go to state universities. It is estimated that bill would add \$100 million to the expenditures to the state of Ohio at a time when state universities are in their most underfunded state.
 5. President Kegerreis discussed the Research Park. The bill in the state legislature to transfer state land to a local foundation on which Wright State is represented has passed the House and is now in the Senate and may be heard the week of May 18 and will be scheduled for floor debate and vote shortly thereafter.
 6. The President reported on the search for a Vice President for Academic Affairs. Vice President Murray had been asked to continue on a quarter-by-quarter basis until a conclusion had been reached. The search has now been narrowed down to three candidates and is in its final stages.
 7. The University Planning Task Force meets May 13 to consider a set of guidelines for the individual planning units of the University. Once a final document of this sort is produced, the Planning Task Force will be near the end of its task. It has produced a new mission statement and has spent much time building up to this report.
 8. The Ohio Board of Regents will hold their May meeting on Wright State campus at 1:30 p.m., Friday, May 15, and President Kegerreis urged all to attend this meeting.
 9. President Kegerreis introduced John Beljan who gave a film tour of the Frederick A. White Center for Ambulatory Care. Mr. Beljan pointed out that the Center is a University building, and it will provide important health services for this area, as well as providing an outlet for the variety of professional students at the University. The Center will provide comprehensive ambulatory health care services, primarily to Greene County and surrounding areas, and will provide clinical opportunity for students in the School of Medicine, Nursing, School of Professional Psychology, the Allied Health Professional Program, and other health related programs within the University. Mr. Beljan invited all to make use of this fine facility.
- V. Election of the Vice President Elect of the University Faculty: The candidates were introduced: Charles Hartmann, Management; Marvin Seiger, Biology; Allan Spetter, History. There were no nominations from the floor. One ballot vote was taken and Charles Hartmann was elected.

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 1981

Page five

VI. Old Business

Mr. L. Hoehn reported that the Memorial Day Holiday observance was returned to May 25 by the state. Academic Council has approved the observance by Wright State University to agree with the state observance so that Wright State will observe Memorial Day on Monday, May 25, instead of Friday, May 29. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to observe Memorial Day May 25.

VII. New Business.

Approval of the List of Graduating Students. A motion was made, seconded, and approved to approve the list of graduating students.

IV. Special Reports (Continued):

3. Administrative Reviews - President Kegerreis.

1. Review of the Vice President for Student Affairs: The committee found that there seems to be some question as to whether Student Affairs is regarded as nonacademic or an integral part of the educational process. President Kegerreis is considering the committee's recommendations. It was generally found the vice president to be performing the job in an exemplary manner. Most recommendations had to do with the position itself in relation to other central administration vice presidencies and functions.
2. Reviews of the Dean of Science and Engineering and the Dean of Liberal Arts: Both committees have completed their work, and Vice President J. Murray will be meeting with the two faculties of those colleges on May 27 to review the report.

The chairs of the 4 administrative review committees will meet soon with a representative of the original study committee on administrative review and with the President to discuss the general questions about administrative review and forge recommendations, with a larger committee composed of representatives of committees which conducted the four reviews. Primary questions to be considered are: Shall Wright State University establish a policy and conduct administrative reviews on a regular basis and by whom and how frequent?

The possibility of establishing a University policy regarding administrative reviews will be addressed before the end of this quarter. If it is decided this is a policy the University should adopt, a policy will be presented for campus-wide study in time for the Fall Quarter 1981 General Faculty Meeting, and then the Academic Council and the Board of Trustees.

President Kegerreis' comments on the review of the Office of the President was that he was receptive to the recommendations of the committee. President Kegerreis pointed out that the planning process was in being during the review process and the faculty will become involved in the next stage of the planning process when the academic units begin to formulate their plans under the guidelines which the University Task Force is near resolving.

GENERAL FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

May 12, 1981

Page six

C. General Education Subcommittee Report: Mr. S. Renas presented the General Education Subcommittee Report (attachment to the agenda of this meeting), which stated that this committee cannot find a basis of agreement on a proposal for change in the General Education requirements that would be acceptable to the majority of the members. Mr. Renas thanked the committee for their efforts and made mention that it may be advantageous to wait for the University's decision regarding the semester system. Mr. W. Neve addressed the faculty concerning General Education. Mr. Neve recommended letting this matter rest temporarily but taking it up at a later time. He commented that the General Education motor which the University has (which dates back to 1969) is inadequate and needs to be replaced. Mr. Neve urged all to consider the following in the days ahead:

1. Should not be discouraged for failing to accomplish the goals in the time allowed as this is the first major reassessment of past academic decisions which now affect our academic life. Problem is both philosophical and practical and there must be a blending of the overall concept and the implementation of General Education.
2. Must avoid performing more than one major change involving administrative adjustments in the curriculum at one time. This might cause more problems than advantages when it comes to conceptualization and implementation.
3. Must avoid that either the faculty or the administration should play the dominant role in the change; it must be a joint venture. Avoid keeping the various components involved in the teaching of General Education tied to different administrative units at the college level. The units involved in teaching General Education should be combined under a single college. Avoid thinking that it will be possible for those involved in this process to remain neutral privately or publicly.
4. Mr. Neve stressed the General Education Policy should allow for freedom of criticism and inquiry, and will need to encourage imagination.

VIII. Mr. L. Hoehn thanked all who were helpful to him during the past year and passed the gavel on to Mr. Donald Pabst, Vice President of the Faculty. Vice President J. Murray presented a gavel as a token of appreciation to Mr. Hoehn for his service during the past year as Vice President of the Faculty.

Mr. D. Pabst encouraged University faculty to communicate with him and the faculty representatives and urged the faculty to serve on the various committees.

IX. Adjournment:

A motion was made, seconded, and approved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.