

*Lee. Jones*

ACADEMIC DEANS' COUNCIL  
Minutes of Meeting of October 19, 1971

Present: Dr. Edgar, Deans Aurand, Charignon, Krill, Miller, Paraska, Robinson, Scriven, Yozwiak; guest, Dr. Eshelman.

1. An informal discussion was held concerning difficulties encountered with implementing the new Statute of Limitations policy. It was pointed out that nothing appears on a student's transcript explaining the policy. Scriven promised to look into the matter.
2. The minutes of October 12, 1971 were approved.
3. Charignon expressed concern that the University Curriculum Committee had not yet undertaken a review of the general education requirements. He reports that it has been reported to him that the chairman of that committee appears to be reluctant to initiate the review. Edgar reported that he attended the first meeting of that committee and noted that the chairman did read the letter that asked for this review. The committee became involved with revising the form for course changes to include the signature of the dean of the School.
4. Preliminary Data Sheets for Summer 1972 were due in Edgar's office on October 18. Not all are in yet--deans who have not complied were requested to act promptly.
5. Faculty Load Reports for Fall 1971 are to be turned in to Dr. Foster's office as soon as possible.
6. Edgar commented on the arbitrator's report on the Poddar case. The ruling was favorable to the University. Further developments are to be determined when the University's lawyers meet with Judge Battisti on October 21.
7. The report, Operational Policies for the Media Center Services, was discussed. Dr. Eshelman was present to answer questions. He indicated that the policy was aimed at centralizing control of audio visual aids but that the policy is not meant to be restrictive. AV equipment could be loaned out on a long term or a short term basis to individual departments.
  - a. Scriven asked for meaning of term "television monitor". Eshelman replied that it was a "receiver". Scriven was concerned that the former term might appear to include computer output screens. He was assured that this was not the intention.
  - b. A question was asked about existing AV equipment that departments might have. Eshelman responded that such equipment will be carried on the inventory of the Media Center and will be maintained by the Center.
  - c. Robinson asked how the policy would operate in conjunction with obtaining Media equipment through special grants. Eshelman thought that it would be proper for the Media Center to be consulted on such proposals. It was pointed out that such consultation would have to be done with a minimum time delay for most proposals.

At this point, Scriven moved for acceptance of the report and Krill seconded. The discussion continued.

- d. Robinson was concerned with statements in the second paragraph of the General Policy section concerning the Center not rendering any service to those not connected with the University. He asked whether the Center could assist public school programs under direction of our faculty. Eshelman responded in the affirmative and stated that any faculty members could use the Center's services in connection with his talks, programs outside of school, etc.
- e. Robinson raised a question on point of Equipment budgeting (p. 4) regarding the budgeting of all funds for AV Equipment to the Media Center--he felt the statement should include "consultation with the dean" rather than with departments. Eshelman agreed. Further, if not all funds requested by the Media Center are obtained, a consultation with the deans should be held to determine priorities.
- f. Robinson questioned procedure on p. 5 concerning the fact that video tapes should be "stored, cataloged, and circulated by the Center". He felt that this may not always be desirable--for example, video tapes of student teachers ought to be retained in the School of Education office. Eshelman replied that it is difficult to control tapes if not in the Center, but that he felt something agreeable to Education could be worked out. He stated that he is in favor of storing materials as close to where it is needed.

It was suggested that this philosophy might be incorporated in the policy.

- g. Paraska requested that Media Center prepare a form to be circulated so that each department's needs can be determined well ahead of budget time. Eshelman agreed to do this.
- h. More opposition was expressed to the statement referred to in (d) above. The consensus seemed to be that the sentence in regard to outside organizations ought to be deleted.
- i. Krill questioned possible abuse of one-way glass wall recording studio and warned of possible violations of law because of violations of privacy. He stated that he would prefer that this not be part of policy.

Aurand wanted to consult with Eshelman concerning several other points on the report and moved to "table the motion to accept the report". Krill seconded. Motion to table passed. Policy with revisions incorporated will be considered at next meeting.

8. Aurand reported results of Committee on Credit by Examination and moved acceptance of the report. Charignon seconded. After several attempts to correct wording and Scriven's suggestion that he would have more information on the question by next week, Scriven moved to table the motion to accept. Miller seconded. The motion to table passed.

Meeting was adjourned about 3:00 p.m. The next meeting will be October 26, at 1:00 p.m.