

Academic Affairs Committee

MINUTES

November 12, 1971

Present were V. A. Richley, G. A. Dobbert, E. E. Eskinizer, R. Kreutzer, F. Rosenberg, M. Simon, J. A. Scriven, J. Hederick, M. Brunner, D. DeSalvo, and Miss Pochiro, Vice President of Student Council, guest.

In view of the fact that in the Senate meeting of November 5 a ruling was made that all committees of University bodies are considered by the State of Ohio to be closed meetings, but that individual committees could decide on their own to what extent they would open their meetings to other than their own members, the Chair made this the first order of business. After some discussion E. E. Eskinizer made the following motion, namely, that the question of persons requesting to attend committee meetings who are not members of the committee shall be decided by the committee on a meeting-to-meeting basis. The motion was seconded by R. Kreutzer and carried unanimously.

The Chair then introduced Miss Pochiro formally to the committee, whereupon she was asked what her business before the committee was. She explained that as Vice President of Student Council she was interested in learning about the workings of all University committees and to report back to Student Council. The members generally endorsed her endeavor as being highly commendable, and M. Simon moved that Miss Pochiro be invited to attend today's meeting. It was seconded by E. E. Eskinizer and unanimously passed.

Chair then briefly reported on the Senate's reaction to the report regarding one-hour exams being given to students in the week preceding Final Week. He stated that the Senate's reaction was rather mixed, with some members expressing fears regarding their academic freedom, and others considering examinations preceding Final Week to be an excellent educational tool. The Chair therefore felt that too strong a motion before the Senate would find the committee "bleeding all over the place", and therefore great care should be taken in preparing a survey of students being subjected to one hour examinations preceding Final Week. Chair then presented a simple outline of the questionnaire which he

would submit to the committee before its next meeting. He suggested that the questionnaire should be administered by the faculty members of the Senate and departmental chairmen. This would roughly cover about 5,000 students, which could certainly be considered a representative sample. J. Foderick and Dean Scriven raised questions as to duplication of replies to the questionnaires, since the same students could be asked several times by various instructors administering these questionnaires. To forestall such a possibility it was suggested that the instructor administering the questionnaires be instructed to ask those students who had already replied in a previous questionnaire to refrain from participating. As a matter of course, complete anonymity is guaranteed to both students and instructors.

Chair then asked whether the committee would like to tackle the question regarding the evaluation of audit grades, as raised in a communication by the Chairman of the English Department on October 29, 1971. The members, in spite of the advanced hour, agreed to begin discussion thereof. A lively debate developed on the subject, with the committee being fairly split down the middle. One side felt that the grade of audit was the student's business if he felt like attending a class, and that attending the class was analogous to a season ticket holder of the Symphony who, having paid his money, could choose to attend or not as he wished. This view also was very strongly supported by the student members on the committee. The other side felt that since the audit grade appeared on a student's record and therefore seemed to indicate that the student, while not having done all the work required for a grade, nonetheless would have absorbed a considerable amount of the material; that, however, this impression was entirely erroneous if the student simply registered for the audit without ever attending more than one or two meetings. Therefore it was suggested that the audit grade be simply abolished. The question was directed to Dean Scriven, namely, would not the University lose money in terms of the State's contribution to the student if the audit grade would be abolished. Dean Scriven replied that the State contributed only to students working towards a degree, which was generally understood to be for actual academic credit. As far as evaluation of transfer credits were concerned, no attention whatsoever was paid by his office to any audit grades; and he personally said that he had on his staff a person who had somewhere around 190 audit credits, and another who had 12 hours of real credit, and that as an employer he valued the record of the latter person far more highly than that of the former. G. A. Delbert then suggested a motion to the effect that audits were really a

fiscal matter rather than an academic matter, and therefore not of the committee's business. Motion was withdrawn because of lack of second. Dean Scriven then moved that consideration of this matter be tabled to the next meeting. Seconded by Dobbert and carried unanimously.

The Chair then adjourned the meeting to November 19 at 3:00 p.m. in the same place.

Respectfully submitted,

GAD:jd

G. A. Dobbert, Secretary