

TO MEMBERS: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEEDATE October 30, 1968FROM Acting Recorder, P. F. Botty**SUBJECT** MINUTES of Meeting held October 21, 1968 at 4 p.m. in Central Hall, Room #2:**PRESENT:** Chairman Behen, Dean Edgar, Professors Alleman, Bridgham, Botty, Crisp, Dillon, Fortunato, Hare.

1. Chairman Behen requests members to submit pertinent matters for discussion and, upon polling members for choice of alternate dates, announces a joint meeting with the Academic Council for Monday, November 4 at 4 p.m. Notice to be issued by Vice President Coffield to consider the draft of the policy statement on withdrawals, incompletes and suspensions.
2. The Chairman reported on his consultation with President Pugsley concerning the position of North Central on the J.D. degree:
 - A. NC makes no ruling on the degree, leaving its form of recognition to the individual institutions.
 - B. It is customarily regarded in the same manner as that of M.D. or D.D.S.
 - C. The J.D. does not count as work toward a Ph.D.
3. The Chairman read two letters:
 - A. One dated 10-4-68 to President Pugsley from Chancellor Millett advising us to "forget" or "ignore" the matter of the J.D. degree
 - B. Another of 9-23-68 to the President from former President Howard W. Jones explaining the nature of the former Law School, the factors attending its closing, the excellent performance on Bar Exams and in practice of the graduates and commenting on the values to us and our alumni in granting the J.D. degree.
4. The balance of the meeting was given to further discussion of the J.D. degree with the following summary conclusions:
 - A. Much expressed reservation about its merit, on principle; but
 - B. A practical recognition of its current widespread, almost universal, use as a first degree by approval of the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law schools, thus making a strong precedent;
 - C. There is no evidence that the practice has influenced other professional degrees;
 - D. Failure to follow such strong precedent would serve as an unfair penalty to graduates of our former Law School who have passed the Bar Examinations, and there is certainly much to be said for correcting an existing injustice both for the welfare of our former graduates and for the public relations involved.
5. Finally, recognizing the fact that the Law School has been discontinued for almost a decade, that the current Faculty's knowledge and authority in this matter may be questioned, it was recommended that the substance of our deliberations be forwarded to the residual legatees of the former administration--the present Board of Trustees. Dr. Behen requested Professors Fortunato and Hare to so do.
6. Meeting was adjourned.

PAULINE E.  BOTTY, Recorder Pro Tem