

MINUTES

Of The Meeting

OF

THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Tuesday, October 30, 1979

12:30-2:00 p.m.

Room 2067, Cushwa Hall

Present: Dr. Baldino Dr. Khawaja
 Dr. Edgar Dr. Munro
 Dr. Hahn Dr. Richley
 Dr. Hill Dr. Scriven
 Dr. Hovey

ACTIONS

1. Dr. Hill called the meeting to order. He asked the pleasure of the committee concerning the minutes of the last meeting, October 23, 1979. A change was made prior to calling the meeting to order. (Page 3, paragraph 9, Dr. Baldino's statement, the word "graduate" changed to read "associate.") Dr. Hahn moved approval of the revised minutes, and Dr. Baldino seconded. They were approved unanimously.
2. Dr. Hill called attention to the draft for transmittal to NEH; two corrections were made in the second paragraph.

Dr. Baldino referred to the last page of Quinby's Statement, number 2. He questioned what "approval" means.

Dr. Hill said he thought he could quote Dr. McCracken accurately in that he thinks there should be some other procedure for approval of the Pilot Program and other "trial" programs.

Dr. Khawaja said he thinks we should have in our minds some procedure whereby experimentation could be done with safeguards. He thinks this is something that could be discussed later, rather than now, when it would only confuse the issue.

Dr. Baldino said he does not want to discourage this innovative program, but that we should be concerned with standards.

Dr. Khawaja gave an example *of a particular proposal to NSF* ~~in the past~~ when, ~~if he had gone through all the curriculum divisions, the proposal would have never gone through, which would not have met the agency deadline if he had submitted it to all of the Curriculum Committee.~~
Dr. Hill suggested that the committee deal with the two drafts or decide that they do not want to.

Dr. Baldino said he feels very strongly that this program needs to be looked at, but he does not think there should be pressure on

the committee to come to some decision. He suggested a priority be set up.

Dr. Edgar said what Tom is asking for is something which is not provided for in our University procedures.

Dr. Hahn said, suppose the NEH does not provide the funds, but the program is put into action anyway; what happens then?

Dr. Hahn said it is not clear to him the difference between a Pilot program and any other program.

Dr. Hill asked if the committee felt strongly enough to send some kind of supportive statement to McCracken.

Dr. Munro asked, what exactly does this term "program" mean; exactly what are we approving?

Dr. Khawaja said, we are not approving the program; we are saying it is a commendable program. That approval would be granted upon satisfaction of the recommendations made in the draft. He suggested using the word "proposal" rather than program.

Dr. Hahn said he does not see how approving a temporary program is going to bring in new courses.

Dr. Richley made reference to the draft to NEH; he moved approval of the draft for transmittal to NEH, as corrected. Seconded by Munro.

Dr. Hahn called for an amendment. He moved that the amendment be made to the second paragraph, third sentence.

Dr. Hovey said he may vote against it because he does not agree that it should be directed to a certain population of students, and he doubts that they will be able to get enough students to enroll in this program.

A vote was then taken. Dr. Hovey abstained, and all others were in favor to submit the draft to Dr. McCracken for transmittal to NEH.

- 3. Dr. Baldino suggested one small change in the memo to McCracken; the words "that at least" to be inserted in the opening paragraph.

Dr. Baldino then moved approval of the revised draft, and Dr. Richley seconded the motion. Unanimously carried.

- 4. Drs. McKean and Loch were invited in at this time and introduced to committee members.

Dr. Loch was asked to give a short history on the Proposal for a Continuing Education Unit.

Dr. Loch said that the process began 3½ years ago and a proposal came to this committee in January of 1979.

Dr. Hill said, it went directly to the Senate, and they felt that the Academic Affairs Committee should be involved. He said, what we have currently is a substantial revision.

Dr. Baldino indicated what his objections were to it. He referred to page 3, Section B, and said that a more definitive spelling out would be helpful.

Dr. Loch said that if it is not, it is an error; because it was intended to extract everything from the policy statement.

Dr. Munro, referring to page 5, felt that ten days was a little short a time period to be given.

Dr. Loch said they were concerned that it would delay the marketing process, if much time was given.

Dr. Munro asked for "two weeks" to be considered.

* Dr. Hovey asked, referring to the last two statements on page 6, ~~why do we need CEU records here when there is a "national bank"?~~
raised questions as to where CEU records would be kept.
 Dr. Loch said we would have to maintain a record basis here as well as having an ACT.

Dr. Loch said, some courses would not call for a CEU to be kept.

Dr. Richley asked about the trend of its using CEU's since the committee was last visited by him.

Dr. Loch said, Central State is the only state institution in Ohio that does not award the CEU, other than Y.S.U., at this time. He said he has not heard any complaints about record keeping from his colleagues.

Dr. Baldino returned to the question raised by Hovey earlier. He referred to page 19 and 20 in the booklet on Continuing Education. He said a short but important statement was not included in the proposal.

Dr. Scriven had two comments. He ^{stated} recalled that the record keeping would be a part of the Academic Administration. Also, he mentioned the fact that only academic deans can object. (page 5, A and B) He wondered if at the present time could not anyone object and why there would be such narrow authority allowed.

Dr. Loch said the reason was so that each school could use its own management system rather than open all doors. He said that it seems to him that this gives a great deal of latitude to the academic deans.

Dr. Edgar suggested deleting the statement in Part A of page 5 in order to eliminate the confusion about it.

Dr. Richley also suggested this.

Dr. Hovey asked how many courses per quarter would he speculate will be involved.

Dr. Loch said, 50 or 60. He also said he projects it will increase.

Dr. Edgar suggested taking out the words about the "academic deans," on pages 5 and 6.

Dr. Hill asked if his intention was still to circulate to academic deans, only.

Dr. Loch said, yes.

Dr. Hill asked for other questions or comments from the committee.

Dr. Scriven brought up the time limit issue, and Munro again advised it be changed to ten working days. It was then changed in the proposal.

Dr. Hill thanked Drs. McKean and Loch, and they left the room.

5. Dr. Richley moved approval of the Proposal for the Continuing Education Unit, as revised. Second was by Dr. Baldino.

Changes were made in various places in the proposal to conform with the discussion. (See proposal for revisions.)

Dr. Hill also pointed out errors in spelling and writing mechanics in the document.

Dr. Munro asked if they could be regarded as editorial corrections. There was agreement to correcting editorially.

The vote was called. Dr. Baldino voted no, Dr. Hill abstained on the basis of concern for additional editing needed, and all others voted in the affirmative. The motion was carried.

The meeting was adjourned.