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to: All Faculty Members

from: Jacob H. Dorn, Chair, Agenda Committee

subject: WINTER QUARTER FACULTY MEETING, Tuesday, February 21, 1978, 3:30-5:00 p.m., Medical School Auditorium

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes of Fall Quarter Faculty Meeting, November 15, 1977

III. Committee Reports:

A. Report of the Steering Committee
B. Report on Make-up of Class Time Lost Due to Closings
C. Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Curriculum

IV. Old Business:

Approval of Motion to Censure Dr. Andrew P. Spiegel
(See Attachment A)

V. New Business:

A. Approval of "Proposal for Certification and Disposition of Academic Council and Wright State Faculty Actions"
(See Attachment B)

B. Approval of "Proposed Academic Calendar, 1978-79"
(See Attachment C)

C. Approval of Recommended "Promotion and Tenure Policies: Interrupted Service to the University" (See Attachment D)

VI. Announcements and Special Reports: Report of President Kegerreis and Question and Answer Period

VII. Adjournment
GENERAL FACULTY MEETING  
WINTER QUARTER  
February 20, 1978

I. The Winter Quarter General Faculty Meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by the Vice President of the University Faculty, Mr. Jacob Dorn.

II. The Minutes of the Fall Quarter Faculty Meeting, November 15, 1977 were approved as written.

III. Committee Reports:

Prior to discussion under this topic, Mr. Dorn suggested that due to the extensive agenda for today's meeting, time limits should be placed on each point of business, as follows:

Not shown on today's agenda, but to be incorporated into the meeting, are comments by Mr. O. E. Pollock (Two Minutes) and Mr. Sherwin J. Klein (Three Minutes).

Item A "Report of the Steering Committee" and Item B "Report of Make-Up of Class Time Lost Due to Closings" will be incorporated into one report for 10 minutes, and Item C will be reported on for an additional ten minutes. OLD BUSINESS will be limited to 30 minutes, and the three topics under NEW BUSINESS will be limited to 10 minutes each for a total of 30 minutes. Report of the President has no time limits placed on it.

Mr. Pollock spoke on the Scholarship Program which was distributed as a handout (Attachment A) to all attendees. The main point discussed was how to attract and hold superior students. Mr. Pollock sought volunteers to help in the program as outlined.

Mr. Klein's comments cautioned the faculty to use discretion in their remarks at the faculty meetings, taking note that what they say may be held against them.

Report of the Steering Committee. Mr. Dorn reported that the Steering Committee met with Mr. Herbert Neve, Chairman of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee, and his committee was encouraged to continue the review of general educational requirements.

The Steering Committee has been delegated the authority to make up a plan for lost class time; however, most faculty have made internal adjustments; and there is no need at this time for the Steering Committee to intervene. However, they will take action as necessary if there should be any additional time lost due to the weather.

After lengthy discussions between the Steering Committee and the Board of Trustees regarding Obscenity Guidelines, a recommendation was presented to the Board to have two members of the Faculty Affairs Committee appointed as observers with the option to participate.
This was approved and Paul Pushkar and James Sayer were appointed as those representatives. A new revised set of Obscenity Guidelines which have been widely disseminated were presented to the Academic Council on February 6, and were subsequently approved by the Board of Trustees on February 8.

The Steering Committee has been meeting in its capacity as the Budget Review Committee to advise the Administration. Most of the discussion has centered around salary policy and faculty raises for 1978-1979, capital expenditures which include Library acquisitions, and allocations for the University's non-academic departments and programs.

Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Curriculum. In explaining the work of the Committee, Mr. Neve said they have had 12 meetings since September, which also included the process of Open Hearings, three of which were held early this year. A Mandate has been given to the Committee by the Academic Council which states: "To examine all operations concerning curricula including potential rewording of the statements in the Curriculum Committee Constitution and ByLaws." The major portion of the Committee's work has been spent in a periodic review of undergraduate academic programs, as called for in the Constitution. Another topic which was brought up in the Open Hearings was that of General Education. This was also mandated in the Constitution and specifically states that general education requirements shall be studied by this Committee and appropriate action shall be recommended to the Academic Council. Another aspect which the Committee has been working on is that of Unified Reporting. This concerns the division of the Curriculum Committee into three areas: Baccalaureate Level Committee, Graduate Committee and Medical School Committee. It is hoped that these three may eventually be combined into a unified report which would be submitted on the affairs of the curriculum.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

Approval of Motion to Censure Mr. Andrew P. Spiegel. The Resolution states "When a furor was created by the discovery that there was a privileged class of administrators who continually received reduced parking rates, our Provost responded to the furor by enlarging the privilege. Such action was so clearly arrogant and ... that I move that Mr. Spiegel be censured for his action."

Item was opened for discussion as it did not require being Moved again or seconded. At this time, Mr. Ritchie presented a substitute Motion that the faculty expresses no confidence in Mr. Andrew P. Spiegel as Executive Vice President and Provost. The Motion was seconded. Discussion followed.

Mr. Racevskis asked for a clarification of the motive and wisdom behind the new Motion. He further stated he hoped the University would not be swayed by this irresponsible reasoning of the people behind this Motion. Mr. Silverman saw this Motion as an opportunity to evaluate the administration on its effectiveness. He further said that the faculty grades the students and the students evaluate the professors. He would
IV. OLD BUSINESS: (Continued)

like to see this expounded one step further to evaluate the administrators. When an administrator receives a vote of "No Confidence" he would like to see that person be able to rejoin his colleagues without any criticism.

Ms. Torres retorted that if Mr. Spiegel is engaged in a power play, then it is the faculty who have given Mr. Spiegel the power to wield.

In speaking on the pattern of administrative decision making, Ms. Harden referred to one which was arbitrary, abusive, sometimes insulting, and always unsound. The "parking issue" only served to spark the dissent which has been growing for quite some time. In commenting on the Obscenity Guidelines, she considered them an embarrassment to the community. Another point of major criticism is the over-centralization of power at Wright State. Administrative appointments are being abused and mishandled.

Mr. Dolphin, who serves as a consultant evaluator for North Central Association, co-chaired the self-evaluation of the NCA report which Ms. Harden referred to in her comments. The NCA team felt very positive about this Administration, and that this institution, especially for its age, is a very good institution.

Mr. Battino reinforced the "No Confidence" motion by citing the memorandum on research contract overhead rates, which are currently at 58% on this campus, with the average in the state being 63%. The Research Council recommended not exceeding 65%, but Mr. Spiegel chose 70%. This can do nothing but sabotage the research efforts at this university.

Mr. Hemmer said he does not favor standing in judgment of others and vice versa. If someone is to be evaluated, then the rules of that evaluation should be made known in advance. If mistakes have been made, at least give the person another chance to "shape up."

In commenting on this discussion, Mr. Britton said he was a new professor on campus, and asked, from all the foregoing comments, how does one who is unfamiliar with the situation determine what is fact and what is not.

Mr. Piediscalzi said that over 11 years ago there was no Provost or Vice President. Pressure was put on the President to hire one, which he did. This same Provost, who today is being evaluated, was the force behind the practice of having faculty participation in the budget review. He also felt a need to upgrade the academic program and was instrumental in the Honors Program. Also to his credit were equitable funds and opportunities for research across the University. If indeed all the aforementioned allegations are true, then they should be investigated by a committee, but these discussions have turned into a character assassination without due process.
Mr. Castellano, speaking as a member of the Steering Committee, reiterated the importance of the Budget Review Committee and noted that Mr. Spiegel has always been very helpful in providing material requested by the Committee.

Mr. Skinner agreed with the idea of evaluation of the administrators, and to bring in new people with fresh ideas. However, he did not feel that this was the time or the place to vote "Yes" or "No" on this question. He would recommend that everyone think seriously about this and present their ideas which would be presented to the Provost and made public as well.

Mr. Walker then asked if Mr. Skinner would like to put this into the form of a substantive Motion, at which time Mr. Sayer clarified that Mr. Ritchie's Motion is already on the floor in discussion. To comply with the Parliamentarian's statement, a Motion was presented as follows: Amend the AAUP Motion to read that a committee be formed to evaluate the performance of the Provost and all other administrators, the Provost on down.

Seeking further clarification on this Motion, Mr. Dorn said the Faculty Affairs Committee is currently involved in similar evaluations, and was this what Mr. Walker had in mind. Mr. Walker rephrased his Motion to state

That this body asks the Vice President of the Faculty to appoint a committee of senior tenured faculty members to evaluate the performance of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The Parliamentarian again stated that this is not acceptable as an amendment to the Substitute Motion due to the fact that this is not intended as an amendment to the Ritchie Motion, but is a new Motion unto itself. In order to secure the results of his Motion, Mr. Sayer suggested the following wording be used:

The primary amendment put forth by Mr. Ritchie, as well as the original motion presented by Mr. Haber, be committed to study and recommendation by a committee to be appointed by the Vice President of the Faculty in consultation with the Steering Committee.

This Motion was moved and seconded. Voice vote was unanimous in voting on this Amendment.

Following further debate and discussion, Mr. Walker withdrew his Motion completely. Motion then considered was the Substitute Motion by Mr. Ritchie on behalf of the AAUP. All were in favor of voting on this Motion and the ballots were distributed. A "YES" vote meant No Confidence in the Executive Vice President and Provost. A "NO" vote means to disapprove passage of this Motion. The YES vote would not automatically pass the motion, but rather replaces the original motion, and another vote would be required on the main motion as revised by the substitute motion.

The Chair suggested that due to the lateness of the hour, items A and C under New Business could be deferred to the Spring Meeting. All were in favor of this suggestion. New Business was carried on during the voting.
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V. NEW BUSINESS

A.) Approval of Proposed Academic Calendar.

Ms. Gaw made the motion that the Academic Calendar for 1978-1979 and 1979-1980 be approved as presented, noting that the 1979-1980 calendar is only tentative, or a working calendar. A unanimous vote was given in favor of the Calendar.

Anne Shearer invited the faculty to participate in the second annual Faculty and Staff Development Conference which is being sponsored by the Educational Opportunity Center in cooperation with the Dayton Miami Valley Consortium. The workshops will be held March 3 and 4 at the University Center on campus.

Return to OLD BUSINESS.

Tally of the votes are as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitute motion is again open for discussion. All were in favor of voting on the Main Motion. A YES vote meant NO CONFIDENCE in the Executive Vice President and Provost. A NO vote meant one opposed that position.

While ballots were still being processed, Mr. Battino informed the faculty of a workshop in Computer Assisted Instruction which will take place on March 7. Experienced personnel will be on hand to offer assistance during this 2 1/2 hour presentation.

B.) Academic Council Actions.

While still awaiting final count of the ballots, the motion was moved and seconded that Item A under New Business should be presented and discussed. All were in favor of this Motion. Mr. John Ray presented this topic which concerns classifying the various Actions, Amendments and Resolutions of the Faculty. This plan would be instituted under a "cross reference" system for quick retrieval. Mr. Ray moved adoption of this policy, which passed by unanimous vote.

C.) Promotion and Tenure Policy.

A vote was also approved to have Item C presented at this time pertaining to the Promotion and Tenure Policy. Mr. Tiernan explained that no written documents existed on this Policy prior to now, and in consultation with AAUP, reasonable guidelines were attained which are now being presented for approval. Adoption of this Tenure Policy were accepted by a wide margin.
Return to OLD BUSINESS.

### Final Count of Ballots on Main Motion

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstention</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Main Motion as amended carries.

VI. The Motion was presented at 5:15 p.m. to adjourn the meeting. Motion was approved and seconded.