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Members of the Academic Council will meet at 3:10 P.M., Monday, June 3, 1974, in Room 401, Fawcett Hall.

I. Call to order.

II. Approval of Minutes of May 6, 1974, meeting.

III. Report of the President.

IV. Report of the Steering Committee.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:
   A. Curriculum (See Addendum A)
   B. Faculty Affairs
   C. Library
   D. Student Affairs
   E. Bookstore Committee (See Addendum B)

VI. Old Business:
   A. Approval of revised Article VII, University Promotion and Tenure Document (See Addendum C, revision of May 8, 1974).
   C. Approval of the Revision/Clarification of Procedures for the University Curriculum Committee (Attachment E to May 6th Minutes).

VII. New Business:
   A. Election of Steering Committee members for 1974-1975.
   B. Election of Faculty Representative to the Ohio Board of Regents Faculty Advisory Council.
   C. Approval of amendment to the Athletic Council Constitution and Bylaws.
VII. New Business (continued)

D. Dates of Academic Council Meetings for the 1974-1975 Academic Year:
   Monday, October 7, 1974; Monday, November 4, 1974;
   Monday, December 2, 1974; Monday, January 13, 1975;
   Monday, February 3, 1975; Monday, March 3, 1975;
   Monday, April 7, 1975; Monday, May 5, 1975;
   Monday, June 2, 1975.

E. Promotion and Tenure Document for Western Ohio Branch Campus.

F. Revised University Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus, exclusive
   of Article VII (Attachment D to the Revised Agenda for May - dated April 29, 1974).

G. Reports of Councils:

   1. Graduate Council
   2. Athletic Council
   3. Research Council

Vm. Adjournment.
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

June 3, 1974

Minutes

I. The last monthly meeting for the academic year was called to order by Chairman Pro Tem Vice President Murray at 3:15 P.M.

Note: Items of the Agenda were not followed in sequence but herein are in order.

Mr. Murray reminded the body that newly elected members were present for seating; each introduced himself and his constituency. Mr. Murray expressed for the continuing members a welcome to these new representatives.

II. Minutes of the May 6, 1974, meeting were approved as written.

III. Report of the President, Mr. Spiegel reporting.

The University has progressed to the second stage of building in the biological area (first of the medical school buildings) with the ground-breaking scheduled for June 14. Further on the medical school subject, Mr. Spiegel indicated that some staff and faculty are being hired and there is presently a search for a medical school librarian.

The downtown Kettering Center is now being operated by the University, under the directorship of Mr. Hutzel. Mr. Kegerreis has presented the thought that perhaps the Academic Council might like to hold one of its meetings there during the coming year.

While there has not yet been a dean chosen for the College of Science and Engineering, there has been for the College of Business and Administration - Dr. Sam Barone.

A decision will soon be reached concerning food services for the University for the coming year.

Both Mr. Kegerreis and Mr. Spiegel recognize the need for an informed University community, and would welcome questions concerning the many projects that are underway.

After a series of meetings, it has been determined that there will be a faculty dining room by next year, located in the University Center. Mr. Spiegel referred the body to Mr. Treacy on this particular item.

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

It was indicated by Mr. Treacy that a written report of the Steering Committee's activities for the past year would be forthcoming.

The first meeting of the new Steering Committee (to be elected today) will be held at 3:10 P.M., Wednesday, June 5, in the Small Conference Room, Allyn Hall. The first item of business for that group will be the selection of members for the various necessary committees for the coming year. Mr. Treacy stated there had been good response to the solicitation of volunteers from the faculty ranks. Approval of the membership of the committees will be asked of the Academic Council in October, although it may be necessary for some of the groups to begin their work during the summer.

Mr. Treacy referred members to that portion of the Faculty Constitution covering composition
of the Steering Committee, Section 10 (A). He further indicated that Mrs. Dreher, as newly elected Vice President-elect of the Faculty, fills the stated need for a representative from the College of Liberal Arts, while he, himself, fills the stated need for a representative from the Business College. Therefore, of the four members to be elected today, one must come from each of the colleges of Education and Science and Engineering, and two other than that would be elected without a specific designation of the area to be represented.

Mr. Treacy expressed thanks to all those who have worked toward making the faculty dining room a reality, with thanks too to the Student Caucus' understanding of the need. Control of the area has been delegated to the Vice President of the Faculty; Mr. Treacy will ask the new Steering Committee to form a sub-committee to handle the matter, approval for that group being asked of the Council at its October meeting.

Mr. Neve raised the question as to whether the persons elected to Vice President and Vice President-elect of the Faculty fulfilled the Constitutional stipulation that there must be at least one representative from each of the four major colleges on campus, pointing to (d) of Section 10 (A) as seemingly indicating that those four should be elected for that express purpose, whereas the Vice President and Vice President-elect of the Faculty are not elected with their membership on the Steering Committee as a primary duty in mind. Mr. Neve also pointed out that this elected position was not in any way referred to in the mentioned Section, nor in Section 8 (B) concerned with the Vice President-elect of the Faculty as an ex-officio member of Academic Council.

It was conceded by all that this matter is open to varying interpretations.

Mr. Cantelupe joined Mr. Neve's train of thought, that indeed the two Faculty people represent the "faculty body", not individual colleges.

Mr. Treacy then pointed out precedence, further indicating that if the four elected members of which reference is made in Section 10 (A), (d), came from each of the four major colleges, there would not be opportunity for the possible election of a student to the Steering Committee. Along this line, he brought out that such a student member has served well as a liaison between faculty and students.

Mr. Neve expressed no disagreement with the need for a student member, but felt there should be a clarification of the portion of the Constitution under discussion.

Mr. Sachs asked that the Chairman make a decision on the interpretation at this point.

Mr. Murray ruled that precedent would be followed - Mrs. Dreher representing Liberal Arts and Mr. Treacy representing Business on the Steering Committee.

V. Reports of the Standing Committees:

A. Curriculum Committee. Mr. Larkins reporting.

Mr. Larkins referred members to Addendum A to the Agenda (courses reviewed by the Committee; annual report from the Committee) and a supplemental list of courses handed out at this meeting (Attachment A). He indicated a suspension of rules would be requested when New Business came under consideration, that various curricular items could be cleared
up for the year. In particular a "Proposed Minor in Business" and five courses for the P/A grading system need today's action.

Several items referred to the Committee at too late a date for review will be considered by a sub-committee, for action by the Council in the fall.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee, Mr. Swanson reporting.

Mention was made of three documents: Addendum C to the Agenda (Article VII, P. & T. dated May 8, 1974) and two handed out today - Article VII P. & T. Document dated May 8, 1974 B (Attachment B) and Western Ohio Branch Campus Promotion and Tenure Document (Attachment C). The last mentioned is an item under New Business.

Mr. Swanson pointed out the difference between the two copies of Article VII under the same date - found in paragraph two of page two. Composition of the standing Tenure Removal Committee was increased in number in the B copy to seven primary and seven secondary members, so as to include representatives from areas other than the colleges mentioned therein (Schools of Medicine and Nursing).

Mr. Sachs questioned when the decision on this change had been made, stating he had worked with this Article and was unaware that such a decision had been reached.

Mr. Swanson indicated this action had come at the end of a Faculty Affairs Committee meeting, had been discussed with Mr. Murray, and the copy approved this day by the Council would be forwarded to the Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Committee for approval.

Mr. Sachs pointed out that should such an increase be approved, there would certainly be further revision of that same paragraph needed, quoting the portion dealing with terms of office (which refers to only five members).

Mr. Murray delayed further discussion since the item had been listed under Old Business.

C. Library Committee, Mr. Hess reporting.

The annual report of this Committee was handed out to all members (Attachment D), together with Dean Frommeyer's response to the request that he submit "a report stating the pros and cons relative to locating the medical library adjacent to the present facility".

Mr. Hess very briefly presented the outlook for library funds for the coming year: The increased cost of subscriptions, binding costs and maintenance of the present holdings, standing orders, all decrease the total funds of $400,000 to a balance of $155,000 left for new acquisitions for the entire University. The outlook becomes even less bright when consideration is given to the commitments to developing programs such as the medical school library. The Library Committee, therefore, is drafting a memo to Mr. Spiegel registering their concern, also asking earlier release of at least a part of the funds so that ordering of additional items can be begun.

Another minor item is the recommendation to Deans that a small amount be placed on their budgets to cover replacement of lost, stolen or missing items.
D. Student Affairs Committee.

There was no one present to report; however, the annual report of the Committee was distributed to each member of the Council (Attachment E).

E. Bookstore Committee, Mr. Hagler reporting.

The Committee had been moving in the direction of resolutions or motions placed before the Council for action in the administration of the Bookstore; however, certain administrative changes have been made and the Committee now is in favor of allowing time for the new management to organize and begin functioning.

Therefore, minor changes in the wording of the Committee's annual report (Addendum B to the Agenda) become necessary: On the second reduced page, right hand "d" should read -

"......debt to the University should be retired."
"......the bookstore should have a free surplus......"

Further, on the same page "a" should read -

"......debt to the University should be repaid......"
"......surplus should be available to absorb......"

Mr. Levine stated his department would have liked to have had a more detailed breakdown on the margin of profits for various materials, particularly as related to that department.

Mr. Hagler referred Mr. Levine to that part of the report indicating about a 15% excess of income over expenses - difficulties in acquiring some of the information prevented a more detailed study on the margin of profit.

Mr. Haughey inquired what allowance is made for shrinkage due to stealing, etc.

Mr. Hagler said he felt, unofficially, that 2% would cover that area, but also stated 2% might be the end result of errors rather than loss by other means.

VI. Old Business:


The motion was placed on the floor by Mr. Treacy, seconded, and discussion resumed along the lines developed under "Faculty Affairs Committee Report".

Mr. Sachs explained the difficulties that undoubtedly would develop should approval be given to the May 8, 1974 revision. Neither the Nursing School nor the Medical School have (or would have for a couple of years) tenured faculty to fill the positions created by that version; also, other large and growing areas such as Library Administration would need to be considered for inclusion. Mr. Sachs also pointed out that the Article certainly could be changed at some future time, but that at this time it seemed quite inappropriate to change from the May 8, 1974, revision, submitted as Addendum C to the Agenda.
Mr. Swanson indicated there certainly was no objection to approval of that revision, with
the understanding that updating could take place.

It was moved and seconded that the May 8, 1974, revision, Addendum C to the Agenda, be
approved.

Mr. Sachs indicated the purpose in setting the number at ten for the standing Tenure Removal
Committee was to keep it from being too large to work efficiently, that at this time it had
been felt the four colleges mentioned were indeed large enough to furnish the tenured members
necessary, but that the other academic fields could be represented on the committee.

In response to Mr. Levine's question as to the origination of this document, Mr. Sachs men­
tioned a number of people who had worked with it, including the Board of Trustees Faculty
Affairs Committee, the Steering Committee members, Mr. Spiegel, etc. He provided back­
ground in that the document was originally proposed about two years ago, open hearings were
held, it went through the Faculty Affairs Committee, was approved by the Academic Council.
When presented to the Board of Trustees' Faculty Affairs Committee, they wanted it changed;
more meetings followed and this revision of the Article resulted.

Mr. Levine questioned why only tenured faculty were chosen for the Committee mentioned;
Mr. Sachs replied that it would be inappropriate for someone who had not achieved tenure to
participate in decision-making that might remove from another faculty member that tenure
achieved.

In response to a query, Mr. Sachs outlined some of the changes made in this recent revision -

a. reasons for removal were changed and reworded
b. previously a hearing board was chosen after charges brought
c. previously a hearing must be held; now the Faculty Affairs Committee
decides whether there is indeed enough evidence to warrant a hearing
d. establishment of the standing Tenure Removal Committee is part of the
revision

Mr. Roehm questioned if there was a requirement that one of the Hearing Board be from the
department of the accused; Mr. Sachs indicated no such written requirement is in the Article,
and that the accused does have the right to challenge the seating of anyone on the Hearing
Board.

Mr. Murray called for the voting on -

Approval of revised Article VII, University Promotion and Tenure

The motion carried by voice vote without opposition.


Mr. Levine placed the motion for approval, it was seconded, and discussion opened.

Mr. Treacy questioned if this resembled a program considered several years ago, described
as a degree in general studies; also queried if there had been considered similar programs at other schools.

Mr. Hutzel spoke for approval, stating he had attended a meeting in Cincinnati where this type of program was discussed. He pointed out that this was not an awarding of a degree simply for a collection of "general" studies just gathered together, but rather the student would have in mind certain objectives and would work toward a stated goal: that such a program would not have a great many participants and those participating would not probably be the average students.

Mr. Cantelupe elaborated - this is a two-year program and permits students at upper levels to cross departments, is in a sense a variation on the dual major program.

The degree would be one of B.A./B.F.A. with the notation "Major in Selected Studies".

Mr. Murray called for a vote on approval of the motion, it passed by voice vote.

C. Approval of the Revision/Clarification of Procedures for the University Curriculum Committee (Attachment E to May 6th Minutes).

Mr. Treacy moved for approval, the motion was seconded, and there was no discussion from the floor.

Approval was given by voice vote without opposition.

Note: Through error of omission, the following items were not but should have been listed under Old Business on the Agenda.

D. Approval of letter grading option for Religion 470.

Mr. Treacy placed the motion for approval, it was seconded, and passed by voice vote.

E. Approval of the P/U grading system for History 399.

It was pointed out that this was on a one-term basis only, and that the course, being a Practicum, did not lend itself well to letter grading.

Mr. Cantelupe moved for approval, his motion was seconded, and the motion carried by voice vote.

F. Approval of the notation of academic dismissal on student transcripts.

Mr. Treacy moved that -

The Registrar be instructed to record academic dismissal action on student transcripts.

The motion was seconded; consideration began.

Mr. Larkins indicated that the Curriculum Committee had reviewed and approved this
action.

The thread of discussion centered on a weighing of the numbers of students who might well benefit from such a notation as opposed to those who might definitely be hurt by such notation, and involved students primarily carrying less than a 2.0 average. Acceptance by Ohio State University of students with such an average would entail a review of their admission, possibly non-admission because of the uncertain status of the student.

Mr. Falkner responded to questions clarifying the situation: By omitting the notation, no other school would know the status of the student. Few students are subject to the academic action involved, since a student must have dropped below 2.0 for two quarters running, such action must originate with the instructor, the department and college dean, and further, the student has the right to petition against such action and even to have it removed from his record. Whereas the number of students against whom action is taken is small, there are approximately 900 students in good standing whose average drops below 2.0. Mr. Falkner did not disagree with Mr. Motes and Mr. Levine in their feelings that such a notation might certainly be hurtful to the student receiving this on his transcript, even a number of years in the future, and could indeed keep him from entering another school.

Mr. Cantelupe pointed out that the use of the notation would be helping more students than it would be hurting.

Mr. Murray called for a vote on the motion; it was passed by voice vote.

G. Mrs. Bireley moved for suspension of the rules so that action could be taken on five courses presented by the Curriculum Committee for approval of the P/U grading system option.

The motion was seconded, with hand voting results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In favor of suspension</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several abstentions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mrs. Bireley placed the motion for -

Approval of the P/U grading system for HPR 102 and HPR 104 and approval of the P/U grading system option for ED 405, ED 450, and AED 429.

Mr. Treacy spoke against the approval of P/U grading in general, stating his feeling that any course taught in the University should require a responsible evaluation by the faculty member; Mr. Stoesz replied that the work involved in arriving at a decision in P/U grading can be very responsible and that such grading need not be an approximate evaluation.

Mr. Murray called for a vote on the motion.

There was some voice vote opposition, but the motion carried.

VII. New Business:

A. Election of Steering Committee members for 1974-1975.
The Chairman ruled that there would be separate elections for each member.

Mr. Treacy asked for the names of two nominees from the College of Science and Engineering.

Mr. Sachs nominated John Martin and the nomination was seconded. No further nominations were offered.

A motion was heard and seconded to close nominations.

The Chairman ruled that Mr. Martin had been elected to the Steering Committee by acclamation.

Mr. Treacy asked for two nominees from the College of Education.

Mrs. Bireley nominated Eugene Wade, the nomination was seconded, and again there were no further nominations offered.

Mr. Murray ruled that Mr. Wade would be Education's representative on the Steering Committee, by acclamation.

Mr. Treacy indicated nominations were open for the two remaining positions on the Steering Committee, nominees to be from any of the constituencies on Council.

Nominated were: E. Nicholson
               E. Levine
               R. Harvey

Written voting was accomplished, ballots collected and counted.

The results of the voting indicated the two remaining Steering Committee members for 1974-1975 are:

   E. Levine from Liberal Arts
   R. Harvey from Student Caucus

B. Election of Faculty Representative to the Ohio Board of Regents Faculty Advisory Council.

   It was explained that there was no May meeting with the Chancellor, and that the next meeting of the Board of Regents was scheduled for Wednesday of this week.

   Further, any faculty member could be nominated for this position.

   L. Hussman was nominated, the nomination was seconded, and no further nominations were offered.

   Mr. Hussman was approved as Faculty Representative; it was acknowledged that he has ably filled that post, and would be informed of the continuing need for his abilities indicated by his election.

C. Approval of amendment to the Athletic Council Constitution and Bylaws.
Mr. Benner indicated there was no amendment at this time to present, rather a quandary: The tentative amendment had concerned itself with whether an Athletic Council member could succeed himself; through the process of offering this item for the Academic Council's consideration, Mr. Benner had been informed that the Athletic Council was operating under a constitution not approved by the Academic Council.

Discussion developed on this latter point. Mr. Benner stated he was not actually sure to whom the Athletic Council is responsible, even after talking with a number of persons in the administration.

Mr. Sachs pointed out that the University Faculty had approved a Constitution wherein that Council, together with other Councils, were indicated to be subordinate to the Academic Council; he felt this document must have been approved by the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Treacy referred members to that portion of the Faculty Constitution, Article IV, dealing with Councils.

Mr. Benner indicated there was needed a clarification as to whether the Athletic Council is directly responsible to the President of the University (as apparently originally set up) or to the Academic Council. At this point in time, the clarification of whether an Athletic Council member can succeed himself appears to be secondary.

Mr. Murray assured Mr. Benner that this item would be directed to the new Steering Committee for discussion and listed on the October Agenda under Old Business.

D. Approval of the dates for Academic Council meetings for the 1974-1975 academic year.

Mr. Treacy, for the Steering Committee, asked approval of the dates shown in the Agenda; the first Monday of October, November and December 1974, February, March, April, May and June 1975, and the second Monday of January 1975. Motion was seconded.

A motion was placed to suspend the rules for action on this item at this time, the motion was seconded, and passed by unanimous hand vote (31).

Mr. Murray asked for voting on approval of the schedule of meetings and the motion was passed without opposition.

E. Mr. Swanson, for the Faculty Affairs Committee, asked that the Promotion and Tenure Document for Western Ohio Branch Campus (Attachment C) be entered as an item for consideration and action under Old Business at the October meeting.

This motion was seconded, and the item approved for acceptance.

F. Mr. Swanson, for the Faculty Affairs Committee, directed attention to the handout dated May 24, 1974 (Attachment F), as the latest revision of the Promotion and Tenure Document for Main Campus (exclusive of Article VII considered separately).

Mr. Treacy moved for acceptance of this item for the October Agenda, the move was seconded.

Mr. Sachs brought out that Mr. Skinner had proposed a change in this revision [Article IV (F)]
to conform dates to the standards of A.A.U.P.

Mr. Murray pointed out that such proposals should be directed to the Faculty Affairs Committee and that there would be ample time before the October meeting for this document to be reviewed by the new Faculty Affairs Committee.

Mr. Treacy assured the Council that this would be referred to the newly selected committee.

The document was approved for acceptance for the October Agenda.

G. Reports of the Councils:

1. Graduate Council, Mr. MacKinney reporting. (Attachment G)

Attention was directed to the coming accreditation process. Emphasis was placed on the important part of that project to be handled to a great degree during the summer quarter - that of compilation of information by departments, programs and colleges - necessary before analysis can be begun in the fall. In this vein, a meeting of all departmental chairmen, deans, and any other interested persons, will be held at ten and two, Thursday of this week, for the purpose of reviewing the process to be followed. Involved will be the Registrar, Assistant Registrar, Steering Committee, and all members of the University community.

It was conceded that such a review of the entire institution would be a difficult task but rewarding.

2. Athletic Council, Mr. Benner reporting.

Mr. Benner briefly covered the activities of the Council in relation to the Ohio Athletic Association and to N.C.A.A., and stated that a written report would be available soon.

Mr. Hess inquired about the status of soccer; Mr. Benner replied that they were hopeful of a return of that sport but there are difficulties in recruiting someone who can handle implementing the sport properly.

3. Research Council, Mr. Walker reporting. (Attachment H)

Mr. Walker briefly covered the items noted in the Council's final report, stressing the need for involving departmental chairmen and the Steering Committee in discussion to consider restructuring of the Research Council toward fulfillment of its original mandate of being an advisory body to the President and administration on matters of research.

Mr. Treacy noted this would be an early item for consideration by the new Steering Committee.

H. Mr. Faily moved for suspension of the rules so that a proposed Minor in Business (Attachment I) could be acted upon, an effort to clear up academic matters before the summer quarter when Academic Council does not meet.

The move was seconded; hand voting results were -