

12-3-1973

Academic Council Meeting Agenda and Minutes, December 3, 1973

John Treacy

Wright State University - Main Campus

Follow this and additional works at: http://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.

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

CAMPUS COMMUNICATION

Date: November 19, 1973
To: Members of the Academic Council
From: John Treacy, Secretary, Steering Committee
Subject: Agenda of the Academic Council Meeting, Monday, December 3, 1973

The December meeting of the Academic Council is scheduled for Monday, December 3, 1973, in Room 401, Fawcett Hall, at 3:10 P.M.

The agenda is as follows:

- I. Call to order.
- II. Approval of Minutes of November 5, 1973, meeting.
- III. Report of President Kegerreis.
- IV. Report of Steering Committee.
- V. Reports of Standing Committees:
 - A. Curriculum
 - B. Faculty Affairs
 - C. Library
 - D. Student Affairs
- VI. Old Business.
- VII. New Business.
 - A. Consideration of Academic Calendar.
 - B. Approval of Ad Hoc Review of Personnel Management Handbook; Review Committee charged with presenting recommendations for January 7, 1974, Council meeting.
(Draft copies of the Handbook are available in the offices of the Academic Deans for faculty review; SEE ATTACHMENT A for Committee Charge.)
- VIII. Adjournment.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

December 3, 1973

Minutes

- I. The regular monthly meeting for the academic year was called to order by Chairman Pro tem Provost Spiegel at 3:15 P. M.
- II. The Minutes of the November 5, 1973, meeting were approved by voice vote.
- III. Report of President Kegerreis.

President Kegerreis thanked the group for participation in and support of the inauguration, and expressed his hope that the high level of interest in the University and its activities would continue.

The Governor's Task Force on Higher Education, reorganized as the "Citizens' Task Force", will consider topics and problems in three areas: admissions, finance, and governance. Referring to the latter item, it would be well for members of the Wright State University community to give some thought to the responses of this task force. The committee is considering such questions as whether each university should have its own Board of Trustees, whether regional campuses should have their own chancellors, what changes should be made in subsidy support, whether the State should offer some form of aid to private colleges and universities.

Referring to the flood of press releases regarding progress on the medical program, and the questions encountered by all, progress is being made one stage at a time. Wright State is continuing its search for a dean of the medical college; the selection committee has narrowed the candidates down to fifteen and the fourth individual is on campus being interviewed today. The members of the committee are impressed with the credentials and the philosophy of these candidates. Concluding, President Kegerreis assured the Council he would continue to keep it informed of the progress made at the legislative level on the status of the medical program.

Mr. Stoesz posed the question as to the seriousness of the task force recommendations regarding regional medical centers.

It was brought out by President Kegerreis that the task force had condemned the Wright State proposal and had countered with the graduate education center, giving the reason that Wright State's proposal was too costly. No evidence was given of there having been any research by the task force into the matter nor were there any justifications offered for their decision, whereas Wright State's proposal had taken three years of research to prepare, delving into all available figures on

Academic Council Minutes

December 3, 1973

Page Two

meeting the most urgent medical need, that of primary care physicians. In review, our program is as Spartan as possible, with requirements for accreditation being considered, and is widely admired. The task force has implied that we will have difficulty in getting accreditation, when in fact that has been taken into consideration from the beginning. The graduate medical centers proposal is popular because it gives no indication of cost, thereby giving the implication they cost nothing, whereas the lowest available estimate is twenty-five million dollars, while another responsible estimate is a hundred million for each center - yet our proposal is labeled as much too costly. It is not only discouraging, but infuriating, that this ad hoc committee has received more publicity by far than both proposals for new medical schools in Ohio.

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

Item B under New Business: Reference was made to a document published through the Board of Regents, a personnel management handbook, to be used as guidelines for handling unclassified employees at four-year institutions. Mr. Fritz pointed out that faculty members are unclassified employees; he also pointed out that recently it had been learned that there is another weighty volume on the implementation of those guidelines. The decision was reached that it would be better to respond to these attempts to centralize power in Columbus. Mr. Fritz expressed the opinion of the Committee that it would be best to try to make this document as liveable as possible with the designs of the University; he suggested a full discussion at the February Faculty Meeting.

Mr. Fritz brought to the Council a request from Larry Hussman, representative from Wright State on the Chancellor's Faculty Advisory Committee. Miami University would like the support of that Committee on their move to transfer from the quarter system to an early semester system. Mr. Hussman would like the feeling of the Council before committing our University to a certain stand. Mr. Fritz asked that there be discussion of the matter at this meeting since Mr. Hussman will need to vote on the matter early in January.

Dr. Spiegel pointed out that the January vote would not determine whether Miami University could go to the semester system, but would simply indicate the feeling at Wright State on the matter.

V. Reports of Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee, Mr. Larkins reporting.

Mr. Larkins reminded members that two lists of course changes had been

Academic Council Minutes
December 3, 1973
Page Three

distributed to them, and that at the present time there is discussion by the Committee on two major proposals submitted.

Also, "duplication of courses" is being considered - what constitutes duplication? Members of the Committee will attempt to define this, and any suggestions on definition would be welcome.

Two challenges have come to the attention of the Committee but they are being worked out at the departmental level.

A change in credit on Nursing Education 200 has been approved since there was an error in the original computation.

Item A under New Business: Mr. Larkins submitted a one-year calendar to the Council for consideration, for the year 1974-1975, to be voted upon at the January Council meeting. A one-year calendar was submitted in view of the fact that a one-year catalog has been approved. Mr. Larkins commented that he had had two calls concerning the vacation following the winter quarter, one recommending an extension of that vacation and the other suggesting the exam schedule be adjusted to allow for a shorter spring vacation.

Mr. Larkins requested suspension of the Rules in order that a vote might be taken in response to the following Resolution from the Curriculum Committee:

"Be it resolved that the current procedures be amended to allow a sixty-day waiting period, instead of the current thirty-day waiting period, before the Registrar may enter a course in the course inventory."

Mr. Larkins asked that this be considered under New Business.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Sachs reporting.

The principal item considered at the last meeting of the Committee was the disability insurance plan of T. I. A. A./C. R. E. F. In its present form, the plan is too expensive and there will be further discussion. To be considered at the next meeting, this coming Monday, is the Tenure and Academic Freedom document of the Faculty Handbook now under review. Viewpoints on this would be welcomed.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Hess reporting.

A variety of items were considered at the November 19th meeting, including

the matter of safety: railings for the fourth floor balcony have been ordered as well as for the main stairway. It was brought out that railings were much needed at the third floor as well and a request was sent to the Provost for them.

Dr. Spiegel responded that they had been ordered.

Dean Frommeyer was present, recognized, and commented that railings had also been ordered for the second floor area, thus giving protection at every balustrade. He reminded members that the book budget has been approved, with a cut-off date for ordering of ~~March~~^{April}-15, 1974.

I. D. cards have not yet been received from Addressograph-Multigraph but there are temporary cards so that students may use them in the Library and at athletic events. If the cards are not received this day, arrangements have been made for this Saturday's event.

D. Student Affairs Committee, Mr. Hemsley reporting.

The Committee has received from a small group of students a document entitled "A Proposal for University-Wide Communication System Between Students and Faculty", and they are presently studying that proposal.

VI. Old Business.

There were no items to be considered.

VII. New Business.

- A. A motion was made to place the proposed Academic Calendar for 1974-1975 before the Council for consideration, and voting upon at the January meeting.

The motion was seconded and carried by voice vote.

- B. Approval of an ad hoc review of the Personnel Management Handbook was requested by Mr. Fritz, the report of that Committee to be submitted to the Council at the January 1974 meeting. Mr. Fritz explained that this would in effect mean the endorsement of certain changes to the document before it is accepted and approved.

Dr. Spiegel pointed out that his office has been involved with the task force for over a year, with mounting concern, and that he had welcomed this action in the acceptance of the Ad Hoc Review Committee of the task of reviewing this

quite lengthy document. He further indicated concern that something might happen simply from lack of time for thorough consideration of the contents of the document.

A motion was made to approve the Ad Hoc Review Committee as submitted in the attachment to the agenda.

The motion was seconded and passed by verbal vote.

Mr. Fritz referred at this time to the need to reach some decision to offer Larry Hussman, as to whether to vote at the Faculty Advisory Committee in January for or against the support of Miami University in its desire to transfer to the early semester system.

Dr. Spiegel pointed out that Wright State is on the quarter system because of the favoring of that system by John Millett; further it was brought out that most state universities do favor the semester system and the trend is definitely toward the early semester system. It was explained that subsidies could be worked out, and that perhaps Miami was simply testing the system.

Mr. Treacy placed a motion that Wright State go on record as having a sentiment in favor of going to a semester system; the motion was seconded, passed.

Mr. Fritz moved that the Rules be suspended so that a vote might be taken on this: the move was seconded and passed. Discussion was opened - points included:

1. disadvantages of quarter system in relation to part-time enrollment
2. effects of semester system on the financial aspects of the university
3. time in weeks covered by the early semester system
4. effects on subsidy allocations
5. vacation times between semesters
6. doubt if the Board of Regents would go along with anything not in conformity
7. opposition of Ohio State to the semester system
8. revision of courses required by a transfer of systems
9. educational advantages in relation to systems
10. summer sessions in relation to public schools

The motion placed by Mr. Treacy was clarified to "Wright State University would encourage the Board of Regents to permit any university (not just Miami) to transfer to the semester system" and Mr. Fritz pointed out that this would not necessarily mean an endorsement of the semester system by Wright State

but would open the door to future changes for any university.

The motion as such was seconded and passed by voice vote.

- D. As requested by Mr. Larkins, the motion was placed before the Council to extend to sixty days the waiting period before a course is entered into the inventory. The motion was seconded, passed.

Rules were suspended by motion, seconding, and passing, to allow for discussion and voting on this.

Discussion points were:

1. what brought about the request
2. sixty days would in essence tie up an entire quarter
3. sixty days would hamper departments in their developmental stage in that they could not get wanted courses into the inventory quickly enough
4. perhaps the mechanism of the university hampered movement through the various areas needed for approval
5. that thirty days was too short to allow for full discussion on a course in order to avoid challenges
6. thirty days did not permit adequate time for input from both students and faculty
7. clarification of "thirty days" - actual calendar days, not week days alone
8. the frequency, or lack of frequency, in challenges occurring
9. that sixty days would actually mean waiting that length of time; it would not be possible (as in the case of new departments) to ride a course through in fewer days
10. the offering of forty-five days as a compromise

Dr. Spiegel gave over the Chairmanship to Mr. Treacy.

Mr. Treacy called for a vote on the motion, it was seconded, but voice vote was not clear; therefore, a show of hands was asked.

The motion was restated: to accept the change in procedure proposed by the University Curriculum Committee which would amend the current thirty-day waiting period to sixty days before the entering of a course into the course inventory.

A show of hands was requested; four were in favor of the amendment and the