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Members of the Academic Council will meet at 3:10 p.m., Monday, April 3, 1978 in the Cafeteria, Back Section, University Center.

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of March 6, 1978 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
E. Undergraduate Petitions Committee

VI. Old Business

VII. New Business

A. Election of Steering Committee for 1978-79 academic year.
B. Recommendation to have Wright State University participate in the Ohio Faculty Senate and have the Academic Council approve the nominee.

C. Approval of following courses for variant grading:
   Engineering 111, 112, 113, 114
   (Co-operative Education I through IV)
   (See Attachment A, Agenda, Academic Council meeting of April 3, 1978)

D. Discussion of Senate Bill No. 19 (Amendment to add faculty and students to Ohio Board of Trustees)
   (See Attachment B, Agenda, Academic Council meeting of April 3, 1978).
I. The meeting of April 3, 1978 was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice President Murray at 3:20 p.m. in the Cafeteria of the University Center.

Present:


Absent:


The Motion was presented and approved that the Minutes of the March 6, 1978 meeting be approved as written.

II. Report of the President: The President had no formal report to present, however, he did touch on the following topics:

The University is now in the cycle of capital budget requests which are processed through the Ohio Board of Regents.

The Board of Trustees meeting will be held in 9 days, at which time the President will present preliminary plans in response to the "No Confidence" vote which was generated at the Faculty Meeting of a month ago.

III. Report of the Steering Committee:

The Committee has temporarily ended its weekly meetings with respect to the budget review. They are awaiting additional information which they feel may have a bearing on their final recommendations.

It was mentioned last month that an item would appear on today's agenda concerning a recommendation to create a mechanism for review of undergraduate programs. However, since that time, Mr. Neve, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on Curriculum, has stated his preference to present his recommendations all at one time, rather than in piecemeal fashion.

One item which does require immediate action today is that of variant grading for several engineering courses. At such time that it is presented a Suspension of the Rules will be requested.
Report of the Steering Committee (Cont'd)

In the interim since the Agenda was published, the Student Affairs Committee has approved a recommendation (Attachment A) with respect to the fee for dropping or adding a course. The memo concerning this proposal was placed on the tables prior to the start of today's meeting and will be presented by Mr. Steve Renas for action by the Council in May.

The Steering Committee has received from Mr. Robert Adams, WSU representative to the Chancellor's Faculty Advisory Committee, a report (Attachment B) of the meeting on this state-wide body. Mr. Adams was unable to attend today's meeting, but this information will be attached to the Minutes of the April 3 meeting.

IV. Report of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee: No report

B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Pertaining to Sub-Item (B) under New Business, the Faculty Affairs Committee recommends adoption of the proposal to have Wright State University become a member of the Ohio Faculty Senate. Concerning Sub-Item (D) under New Business, the Committee recommends acceptance of Senate Bill 19 which would include faculty as well as students to the Ohio Board of Trustees. Both of these actions were approved at the Faculty Affairs Committee, and are presented to the Council for their approval.

C. Library Committee: Mary Lou White reporting. In response to complaints that Library shelves are in disarray, four students have been hired to work 60 hours per week to alleviate this problem.

In order to improve the library service, an on-line information system may be employed. The future use of an on-line circulation system may possibly mean the closing of the card catalog system and therefore information would be retrieved through the computer terminals.

There is a consideration at hand to put all periodicals on film.

D. Student Affairs Committee: Steve Renas reporting. The Committee offered no report at this time, but did recommend approval of changing the Drop Fee which will appear under New Business.

E. Undergraduate Petitions Committee: No report

V. OLD BUSINESS

No items carried over.
VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Election of Steering Committee for 1978-79 Academic Year.

There is no action to be taken on this today. It was placed on the Agenda so that it will be a standing item of OLD BUSINESS for the May meeting.

B. Recommendation to have Wright State University Participate in the Ohio Faculty Senate and have the Academic Council Approve the Nominee.

The Faculty Affairs Committee felt participation in the Ohio Faculty Senate would improve the lines of communication between Universities. Considering the inexpensive charge for participation, it was deemed beneficial to all parties concerned. Representation is based on the number of FTE's which currently stands at one for each 5000 FTE's. Wright State would be entitled to 2 - 3 representatives.

C. Approval of Engineering 111, 112, 113, and 114 for Variant Grading

Prior to discussion of this topic, a Suspension of the Rules is requested. The Motion was approved and seconded. All were in favor. Robert Earl made the Motion to recommend approval of Engineering 111 through 114. Motion was seconded. Mr. Earl pointed out that these are full time work experiences on the part of the students which are supervised by the faculty. The course inventory would reflect a PASS/FAIL for these particular courses. All were in favor of adoption of the Motion as presented.

D. Discussion of Senate Bill No. 19 (Amendment to Add Faculty and Students to Ohio Board of Trustees).

The question was asked of Mr. Spiegel why he was against appointing students or faculty to the Board of Trustees. In commenting on his reservations, Mr. Spiegel said he felt placing faculty in a position whereby they would have to go along with, or agree to, or be part of something of which they didn't really approve is not really the answer to the question that this Bill is designed to fulfill. In further commenting on this, President Kegerreis said some legal authorities feel there is an automatic conflict of interest by the appointment of students or faculty to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Constable said most of the faculty he had spoken with were in favor of having a faculty member on the Board of Trustees, but only mildly so. They also discussed how this person should be elected, and the length of time to be served. These same faculty felt that the students should not participate. As proposed in the Bill, a student is to serve for a period of two years, which would require selecting a sophomore student, as well as one who has attained a sense of maturity. They further questioned whether this would be part time or full time participation. It has been experienced in the past that students do not attend meetings of committees to which they are assigned, taking only a passive interest in their responsibility to serve.
Mr. Sideras further commented on this topic by saying that student representation would be cut down to one year. The faculty would be for a two year promotion and would abstain from any vote concerning contracts or faculty pay raises. The selection process would consist of a Trustee Board whereby a group of eight individuals comprised of students, faculty and administrators would interview prospective candidates and submit a list of names to the Governor. The benefit of this would be that selection would no longer be a "politically based" decision, but rather one of merit and definite ability. He further stated that negotiations are in process for dropping Senate Bill 19.

Mr. Sayer drew a comparison to Mr. Constable's comment regarding student participation and time commitment. He suggested looking at our own Academic Council and noticing the number of faculty who have avoided meetings quite often. If what we want to see here is truly less politicism, then it is inherent that all three levels should be involved -- Administrators, Students and Faculty.

This item will appear as a topic of OLD BUSINESS at the May meeting.

E. Proposed Course Drop Fee. Mr. Renas reported that the Student Affairs Committee has examined the issue concerning the fee for dropping a course. Discussions were held earlier in the year by both the Student Affairs Committee and the Curriculum Committee. The Student Affairs Committee dealt with the financial aspects, while the Curriculum Committee was concerned with the academic viewpoint. After extensive deliberations, the Student Affairs Committee proposes a change in the drop fee from $10.00 to $7.00 for dropping one course and remain at $10.00 for dropping two or more courses when they are dropped at the same time. The justification for this is that the Committee wished to have this more in line with the cost of processing the drop form. If this plan is implemented, the annual loss in revenue to the University would be $18,000.

It was mentioned that the action of lowering the fee to $7.00 may have to be reversed in a short period of time in order to meet rising inflation costs. However, it was established that the actual charge for processing a drop form is around $3.00, therefore, the proposed $7.00 fee would be quite ample to cover this charge as well as meet inflation costs.

Mr. Renas further stated that this proposal is intended to bring state supported universities more in line with each other. Operating procedures differ somewhat in that some place "W" on the transcript, as well as having the drop date earlier than 8 weeks. A proposal is currently underway by the Curriculum Committee to place a "W" on the transcript. This would more than compensate for a reduction in the fee in terms of the number of drops.

This item will be acted upon, to either endorse or deny, at the May meeting.

VII. Motion was presented and seconded to adjourn the April meeting.