

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE
19711

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
303 HULLIHEN HALL
PHONE: 302-738-2829

March 24, 1976

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty Members

FROM: E. Paul Catts, Vice President
University Faculty Senate



SUBJECT: Regular Senate Meeting, April 5 and 12, 1976

In accordance with Section IV, paragraph 6 of the Constitution, the regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate will be held on consecutive Mondays of April 5 and April 12, 1976, from 4-5:30 p.m. in room 110 Memorial Hall.

Note: Because of the length of this Agenda the Executive Committee believes that at least two meeting dates will be necessary, April 5 and April 12.

AGENDA

- I. Adoption of the Agenda
- II. Approval of the Minutes of the last regular Senate meeting on March 1, 1976.
- III. Announcements:
 - A. Senate President T. E. D. Braun
 - B. Discussion of the Student Health Service Program by Dr. Marjorie J. McKusick, Director of the Student Health Service.
- IV. Old Business

Report from the Committee on Student and Faculty Honors (V.J. Fisher, Chairperson) with two alternative resolutions to the motion, dealing with decentralization of honors quotas with provision for a general minimum GPA requirement, which was returned to the Committee at the last regular Senate meeting. (Attachment 1)
- V. New Business
 - A. Recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education (J.J. Pikulski, Chairperson) to approve the Bachelor of Arts Degree in Educational Studies. (Attachment 2)

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommend the establishment of a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Educational Studies.

- B. Report and recommendations from the Ad Hoc Committee on Governance (L. Mosberg, Chairperson). (Attachment 3; to be distributed)

Note: The recommendations concerning proposed changes to the Faculty Constitution require action by the Faculty Senate prior to the Spring General Faculty meeting.

- C. Resolution from the Rules Committee (M.R. Recke, Chairperson) to delete reference to the Committee on Campus Life from the charge to the Nominating Committee:

RESOLVED that the phrase "and the chairperson of the Coordinating Committee on Campus Life" be deleted from the charge to the Nominating Committee in the Bylaws and Regulations of the University Faculty Senate (Section I-15).

- D. Two related resolutions from the Coordinating Committee on Education (J.J. Pikulski, Chairperson) as follows:

1. RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends the deletion of the Associate in Applied Science Degree from the offerings of the College of Agricultural Sciences.
2. RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate approves the offering of the Associate in Science Degree in Agricultural Sciences. Requirements for this degree shall be 60 credit hours, at least 30 of which represent coursework in agriculture and related subjects.

- E. Recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education (J.J. Pikulski, Chairperson) to change the name and status of the Division of Urban Affairs.

RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate recommends that the status and name of the Division of Urban Affairs be changed to the College of Urban Affairs and Public Policy.

- F. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Retrenchment (G.A. Cicala, Chairperson). (Attachment 4; to be distributed when available)
- G. Report from the Committee on Student Life (A.A. Branca, Chairperson) with a recommendation that the Faculty Senate approve the revised University Policy Concerning Alcoholic Beverages and recommend its adoption to the Board of Trustees. (Attachment 5, parts a and b)
- H. Resolution from the Committee on Student Life (A.A. Branca, Chairperson) that the Faculty Senate endorse and forward to the President of the University the Committee's recommendation that a Standing Committee to Regulate the Use of Beverage Alcohol on the University of Delaware Campus, with an appropriate set of charges, be established. (Attachment 5, part c)

- I. Such items as may come before the Senate. (No motion introduced at this time may be acted upon until the next meeting of the Senate.)

Attachments are in the hands of your Senators. Distribution also includes one copy for each ten faculty members of each department.

EPC/b

Attachments:

1. Report from the Committee on Student and Faculty Honors:
 - a. Alternative resolutions
 - b. Arguments
 - c. Survey by Records Office (Dr. Mayer)
2. Proposal for Bachelor of Arts Degree in Educational Studies
3. Ad Hoc Committee on Governance, report and recommendations
4. Ad Hoc Committee on Retrenchment, report and recommendations
5. Committee on Student Life
 - a. Report
 - b. University Policy Concerning Alcoholic Beverages
 - c. Recommendations
 - d. Proposal for Standing Committee on Use of Beverage Alcohol
6. Administrative Reorganization of the Division of Urban Affairs

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Committee on Student and Faculty Honors

Report on Honors Degree Requirements

Alternative Resolutions

The following resolution is endorsed by the Committee:

RESOLVED: That the one percent of any graduating class who attain the highest over-all indexes will receive degrees With Highest Honors; the remaining students in the highest five percent will receive degrees With High Honors; and the remaining students in the highest thirteen percent will receive degrees With Honors. Numbers of students eligible for honors in each category will be rounded to the nearest whole number. Applicable ties will be moved to the higher category. Wording as currently used in the commencement programs and on diplomas and transcripts will be continued. Students graduating in the class of 1976 will receive honor degrees in accordance with the requirements in the 1974-76 catalog. The revised requirements will apply thereafter.

The following is an alternative resolution:

RESOLVED: That the one percent of any graduating class within any undergraduate college who attain the highest over-all index will receive degrees With Highest Honors, with a minimum index standard of 3.750; the remaining students in the highest five percent will receive degrees With High Honors, with a minimum index standard of 3.500; and the remaining students in the highest thirteen percent will receive degrees With Honors, with a minimum index standard of 3.250. Numbers of students eligible for honors in each category in each college will be rounded to the nearest whole number, except that no number will be rounded to zero, provided minimum indexes are met. Applicable ties will be moved to the higher category. Wording as currently used in the commencement programs and on diplomas and transcripts will be continued. Students graduating in the class of 1976 will receive honor degrees in accordance with the requirements in the 1974-76 catalog. The revised requirements will apply thereafter.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Committee on Student and Faculty Honors

Report on Honors Degree Requirements

Arguments for and against decentralization of authority to select honors recipients.

Arguments FOR Decentralization (V.J. Fisher):

1. It eliminates the chances of a particular college having few or no honor graduates because that college grades hard and/or requires or encourages students to take difficult courses.
2. It stimulates students to achieve excellence if they are in colleges that now tend not to have honor graduates.

Arguments AGAINST Decentralization (E.H. Rosenberry):

1. It assumes that lower grades are the result of higher standards, although it is at least as plausible that they may result from poorer student performance.
2. It assumes that open academic competition is somehow unfair to the specialized student, when the fact is that a variable but always considerable proportion of every student's work is taken in the great "general education" pool of the University's comprehensive curriculum.
3. It addresses itself to the protection of the professional or pre-professional student whose special interests are defined by membership in a professional college; but it fails to provide equivalent protection to students whose equally distinct specializations are masked by membership in the College of Arts and Science.

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE
19711

ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT
FOR STUDENT SERVICES
116 HULLIHEN HALL
PHONE: 302-738-2135

MEMORANDUM TO: Committee on Student and Faculty Honors

Dr. Fisher	Professor Langenfeld
Dr. Costello	Dr. Rosenberry
Dr. Kennedy	Dr. Watson
Dr. Levin	Dr. Church

FROM: Robert W. Mayer *WM*

RE: Computation of Honors By College (Suggested
Alternative)

DATE: 2/24/76

As was suggested at the hearing conducted by the committee for review of proposed revisions into the system for awarding degrees with honors, I have applied the percentage system (essentially top one percent highest honors, next four percent high honors, and next eight percent honors) to each college, rather than on a University-wide basis as proposed in the committee's recommendation. Calculations were based on baccalaureate degree recipients awarded degrees at the annual commencement in June, 1975.

HIGHEST HONORS

The following table shows the number, percent, and cumulative index range of students by college who would receive the degree with highest honors when the percentage system is applied by college, when the percentage system is applied University-wide (the committee's recommendation), and the actual distribution of degrees with highest honors in the 1975 graduating class. It will be noted that when the top one percent of the graduating class was calculated on a University-wide basis, 24 students would have become eligible for the degree with highest honors. Because of rounding, when this percentage was applied on a college basis the number of highest honors would have totaled only 23 students. Furthermore, one percent of the baccalaureate degree recipients in the Division of Health Science was less than 1, so even in the

alternative method of calculation no degree with highest honors would have been awarded to a degree recipient in this Division.

TABLE I

Highest Honors

<u>College</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Graduates</u>	<u>Index Ranges</u>
----------------	---------------	-----------------------	---------------------

Percentage Method by College

AG	1	1.0%	3.976+
AS	10	1.0%	3.934+
BE	3	1.0%	3.811+
ED	4	1.0%	3.937+
EG	1	1.0%	3.960+
HE	2	1.0%	3.861+
HS	0	0	-----
NU	2	1.0%	3.864+
Total	23	.98%	3.811+

Percentage Method University-Wide (Committee Recommendation)

AG	1	.8%	3.923+
AS	13	1.3%	3.923+
BE	0	0	-----
ED	4	1.0%	3.923+
EG	3	2.1%	3.923+
HE	1	.6%	3.923+
HS	0	0	-----
NU	2	1.2%	3.923+
Total	24	1.0%	3.923+

Actual Distribution - 1975 Graduating Class

AG	0	0	-----
AS	41	4.0%	3.50+
BE	0	0	-----
ED	0	0	-----
EG	3	2.1%	3.50+
HE	0	0	-----
HS	0	0	-----
NU	1	.6%	3.50+
Total	45	1.9%	3.50+

Under existing policies, the actual number of degrees with highest honors awarded to the 1975 class was 45 (1.9 percent of the graduating class), and the minimum grade index was 3.50 (plus a score of 650 on the Undergraduate Program Examination). Using the system recommended by the committee, 24 students would have qualified for highest honors (1.0 percent of the graduating class), and the minimum grade index for highest honors in this class would have been 3.923. Highest honors degrees were awarded

to students in the College of Arts and Science, the College of Engineering, and the College of Nursing. Under the system recommended by the committee, highest honors degrees would have been awarded to students in all colleges except the College of Business and Economics and the Division of Health Science.

When the percentage system was applied on a college basis, 23 students would have qualified for highest honors (.98 percent), and the minimum grade indexes for qualification ranged from 3.976 in the College of Agricultural Sciences to 3.811 in the College of Business and Economics. Although all colleges would have had degree recipients with highest honors (with the exception of the Division of Health Science), the number of highest honors degree recipients would have decreased in the College of Arts and Science and the College of Engineering. The number would have been the same in the College of Agricultural Sciences, the College of Education, and the College of Nursing. The number would have increased in the College of Business and Economics and the College of Home Economics.

HIGH HONORS

Table II shows the number, percent, and cumulative index range of students receiving the degree with high honors when the percentage system was applied on a college basis, when it was applied University-wide (committee recommendation), and the actual degrees awarded with high honors. The number of degree recipients who would have received high honors under the system proposed by the committee and the percentage system applied by college is the same - 95 students.

TABLE II

High Honors

<u>College</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Graduates</u>	<u>Index Ranges</u>
<u>Percentage Method by College</u>			
AG	5	4.0%	3.679 - 3.975
AS	41	4.0%	3.761 - 3.933
BE	13	4.0%	3.476 - 3.810
ED	16	4.0%	3.703 - 3.936
EG	6	4.0%	3.690 - 3.959
HE	6	4.0%	3.640 - 3.860
HS	1	4.0%	3.862+
NU	7	4.0%	3.631 - 3.863
Total	95	4.0%	3.476 - 3.975

Table II Continued

<u>College</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Graduates</u>	<u>Index Ranges</u>
<u>Percentage Method University-Wide (Committee Recommendations)</u>			
AG	3	2.3%	3.709 - 3.922
AS	59	5.8%	3.709 - 3.922
BE	6	1.9%	3.709 - 3.922
ED	16	4.1%	3.709 - 3.922
EG	2	1.4%	3.709 - 3.922
HE	4	2.5%	3.709 - 3.922
HS	1	4.2%	3.709 - 3.922
NU	4	2.4%	3.709 - 3.922
Total	95	4.0%	3.709 - 3.922

Actual Distribution - 1975 Graduating Class

AG	3	2.3%	3.25+
AS	103	10.1%	3.25+
BE	6	1.9%	3.25+
ED	4	1.0%	3.25+
EG	7	5.0%	3.25+
HE	6	3.8%	3.25+
HS	1	4.2%	3.25+
NU	6	3.6%	3.25+
Total	136	5.8%	3.25+

In the 1975 graduating class, 136 students received the degree with high honors (5.8 percent), and the minimum grade index was 3.25 (plus a score of 600 or higher on the Undergraduate Program Examination). When the committee's recommended system was applied, 95 students would have been eligible for high honors, and the range of grade indexes in this class would have been from 3.709 to 3.922. The number (and percentage) of degrees with high honors would have remained the same in the College of Agricultural Sciences, the College of Business and Economics, and the Division of Health Sciences. The number (and percentage) would have decreased in the College of Arts and Science, the College of Engineering, the College of Home Economics, and the College of Nursing. The number and percentage would have increased in the College of Education.

When the percentage system was applied by college, the number of degrees with high honors remained the same in the College of Education and the Division of Health Science. The number decreased in the College of Arts and Science, and the number increased in the College of Agricultural Sciences, the College of Business and Economics, the College of Engineering, the College of Home Economics, and the College of Nursing. The general effect of the percentage systems would be to reduce the number of high honor degrees awarded in the College of Arts and Science and to increase the numbers awarded in the other colleges,

but this is most pronounced in the application of percentages by college. It also should be noted that the lowest minimum index for high honors, found in the College of Business and Economics, is 3.476, just above the minimum of 3.470 for the degree with honors in the system recommended by the committee (see below).

HONORS

Table III shows the number, percentage, and cumulative index range by college of degrees awarded with honors. The total number of degrees with honors remains the same, whether percentages are applied University-wide or by college.

TABLE III

Honors

<u>College</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>% of Graduates</u>	<u>Index Ranges</u>
<u>Percentage Method by College</u>			
AG	11	8.0%	3.323 - 3.678
AS	82	8.0%	3.560 - 3.760
BE	25	8.0%	3.180 - 3.475
ED	31	8.0%	3.430 - 3.702
EG	11	8.0%	3.533 - 3.689
HE	13	8.0%	3.486 - 3.639
HS	2	8.0%	3.598 - 3.861
NU	13	8.0%	3.384 - 3.630
Total	188	8.0%	3.180 - 3.861
<u>Percentage Method University-Wide (Committee Recommendation)</u>			
AG	8	6.0%	3.470 - 3.708
AS	101	9.9%	3.470 - 3.708
BE	8	2.5%	3.470 - 3.708
ED	30	7.7%	3.470 - 3.708
EG	13	9.3%	3.470 - 3.708
HE	14	8.8%	3.470 - 3.708
HS	3	12.5%	3.470 - 3.708
NU	11	6.7%	3.470 - 3.708
Total	188	8.0%	3.470 - 3.708
<u>Actual Distribution - 1975 Graduating Class</u>			
AG	20	15.0%	3.25+
AS	190	18.6%	3.25+
BE	27	8.5%	3.25+
ED	90	25.6%	3.25+
EG	22	15.7%	3.25+
HE	38	23.8%	3.25+
HS	6	25.0%	3.25+
NU	27	16.4%	3.25+
Total	430	18.3%	3.25+

In the 1975 graduating class, 430 students (18.3 percent) were awarded degrees with honors, and the cumulative index range was 3.25 and higher. When the percentage system was applied University-wide, a total of 188 student (8.0 percent) would have been eligible for the degree with honors, and the minimum index, based on this class, was 3.470.

When the percentage system was applied on a college basis, the number of honors degree candidates remained the same, totaling 188. The number of honors degree recipients was reduced in the College of Arts and Science, the College of Engineering, the College of Home Economics, and the Division of Health Science. The number was increased in the College of Agricultural Sciences, the College of Business and Economics, the College of Education, and the College of Nursing. Under this system 37 students in the College of Arts and Science who would have qualified for honors under the University-wide computation would have been excluded from honors in the college-based calculation. At the same time, 27 students in the College of Business and Economics, 25 receiving honors and two receiving high honors, would qualify for honors recognition in the college-based computation, but would not have been honors recipients under the University-wide computation. Similarly, five students in the College of Agricultural Sciences, four students in the College of Education, one student in the College of Home Economics, and six students in the College of Nursing would have qualified for honors in the college-based computation, but would not have been eligible for honors in the University-wide computation.

More importantly, in the college-based computation, it was necessary to include eight students whose cumulative indexes were below 3.25 in order to obtain 8 percent (25 students) for honors recognition in the College of Business and Economics. The minimum index for honors recognition in the College of Business and Economics would have been 3.180. In fact, no student qualifying for honors in the College of Business and Economics would have been eligible for honors recognition in the College of Arts and Science, the College of Engineering, the College of Home Economics, and the Division of Health Sciences. Moreover, two students qualifying for high honors in the College of Business and Economics would not have been eligible for honors in the Division of Health Science, and one of these students would not have been eligible for honors in the College of Arts and Science or the College of Engineering.

If, as was suggested during the hearing, some minimum grade index should be imposed for honors recognition and if it were set at 3.25 (the current minimum index), then only 17 students in the College of Business and Economics would have qualified for honors. This would have reduced the percentage of students receiving honors in the College of Business and Economics from 8 percent to 5 percent.

OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. It is clear that there are differences from college to college in grade distributions and grade index distributions. But there also are differences within colleges. For example, only 21 percent of the students in the 1975 graduating class who received the Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies in the College of Arts and Science had honors recognition, whereas 37 percent of those receiving the Bachelor of Science had honors recognition. Within the College of Business and Economics, 36 percent of the students receiving the Bachelor of Arts had honors recognition, but only 5 percent of those receiving the Bachelors in Business Administration had honors recognition. In the College of Education, 75 percent of those receiving the Bachelor of Music had honors recognition, but none of those receiving the Bachelor of Science in Business Education had honors recognition. In the College of Engineering 29 percent of those receiving the Bachelor of Electrical Engineering had honors recognition, but only 18 percent of those receiving the Bachelor of Mechanical Engineering were recognized with honors, and none of those receiving the Bachelor of Engineering Administration had honors recognition.

While it is possible to speculate about the causes of these differences, there is very little supporting evidence. Only a portion of the course work in any degree program is taken within the academic department of the major field, or, except in the case of Arts and Sciences, within the college in which the degree is earned. At least 40 percent of those receiving the Bachelors degree change major and/or college at least once. While there are differences in the average admission credentials (high school class rank and grade averages, SAT scores), these variables also correlate differently with end-of-year freshman year performance for each curricular grouping. There have been studies of other student attributes which suggest that certain kinds of students are attracted to each of the degree programs, suggesting that students in some curricula may value grades and academic achievement more than students in other programs. It also is probable that there are differences in grading standards from one academic department to another.

In short, since the causes of the observed differences in performance by major, department, and college are undetermined, it is questionable whether the system for awarding degrees with honors should attempt to mitigate such differences.

2. The actual distribution of honors degrees awarded to the class of 1975 shows clearly a disproportionate distribution to certain colleges. This is particularly true with regard to recognition of highest honors, but also applies to the distribution of degrees with high honors and honors. For example, 33 percent of baccalaureate degree candidates in the College of

Arts and Science received honors recognition, but only 10 percent in the College of Business and Economics. Students from only three colleges (Arts and Science, Engineering, and Nursing) received highest honors recognition.

The percentage system as proposed by the committee removes the bias in honors recognition which it is believed has been introduced by use of the Undergraduate Program Examinations. The result is a more proportionate distribution of honors recognition among the colleges. The application of the percentage system by college equalizes the percentage of students receiving honors recognition in each college, but it leads to substantially different standards of performance required for honors recognition.

In fact, the college-based calculations are similar to the present policies for honors recognition, in that both introduce an "external" variable - in the case of the present regulations the "external" variable is the Undergraduate Record Examination score; in the case of the college-based computations it is the college in which the student is enrolled.

3. Essentially, the college-based system results in an increase in honors degrees in the College of Business and Economics and a decrease in the College of Arts and Science - changes in the other colleges and divisions tend to be minimal. It should be noted, however, that if a "floor" or 3.25 were established as the lower limit for honors recognition, the percentage of honors recipients in the College of Business and Economics would be reduced to about 10 percent, so that, at least in the 1975 class, this system still would not result in an equal distribution among the colleges.

RWM:bs

Bachelor of Arts in Educational StudiesA Proposed New Degree Programin The College of Education

The purpose of this document is to propose the establishment of a program leading to a new degree -- the Bachelor of Arts in Educational Studies. The primary goal of the program is to provide interested individuals the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and methodologies necessary for the systematic study of the educational phenomenon in general and its psychological, sociological, economic, and political aspects in particular.

The historical roots of the modern College of Education are the Normal Schools, originated to meet a specific need, i.e., the training of classroom teachers. Though our society has experienced traumatic social, economic and technological changes in the past 25 years which have materially altered societal demands on the contemporary College of Education, its primary mission has remained essentially that of its Normal School predecessors. It is our belief that the proper role of the College of Education includes more than the traditional teacher education function; it also includes a systematic study of the American educational enterprise for the purposes of better understanding this complex phenomenon and acquiring the kinds of information necessary for rational decision-making in this area.

Rationale for a Bachelor of Arts Degree

The creation of a new degree, rather than a new program under an existing degree, is proposed for two reasons: (1) there exists an academic discipline of Education worthy of study in its own right which provides the content of the proposed program and (2) the program, as conceived, is similar in substance and

purpose to programs traditionally leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree.*

The case for the claim that there exists an academic discipline of Education has been made quite convincingly by Marc Belth, Education as a Discipline (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1965), John Walton and James Kueth, editors, The Discipline of Education (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963), and John Walton, Introduction to Education: A Substantive Discipline (Toronto: Xerox College Publishing, 1971). While the criteria for verifying the existence of a discipline are not uniformly acknowledged, the criteria most commonly applied are satisfied in the case of Education. First, there is a subject matter of importance -- the focal point of which is the process of schooling -- and, second, there exists a set of methodologies for systematically studying and eventually explaining the important and interesting phenomena in this area. Because the complex phenomenon of Education has historical, philosophical, psychological, sociological, economic and political dimensions, some of its content and methodologies are shared in common with a number of traditional disciplines. In a very real sense, the discipline of Education stands in relation to the disciplines of history, philosophy and the behavioral sciences as engineering does to physics and chemistry or as medicine does to the biological sciences.

Non Teacher-Certification Education Programs at other Institutions

The precedent for undergraduate degree programs not leading to teacher certification in Education has already been set. The institutions currently offering or planning to offer programs or specializations in this category include Emory University, the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, the University of Washington (Seattle), the University of Massachusetts, the University of Maryland, Syracuse University and Ohio State University. These programs have been created for a variety of reasons, a common one being the realization that the role of the contemporary College of Education can no longer be restricted to the traditional teacher education function. The two most fully developed among these are the programs at the University

* See Appendix D, Question 1 for more information on this point.

of Illinois at Chicago Circle, where the focus is on educational policy, and at Emory University, where the emphasis is similar to that proposed in the present document.

Some Potential Benefits of this Program

In addition to fulfilling its primary goal of developing scholars of education, we anticipate several other possible benefits deriving from the proposed program: (1) an increase in scholarly dialogue and research focusing on educational problems and issues, (2) the establishment of an alternative undergraduate path to a variety of graduate specializations, and (3) the establishment of the University of Delaware and its College of Education as a center for scholarship in Education.

In relation to the first point, we anticipate a number of students in this program pursuing either a double major or an interdepartmental major with the second discipline being outside the College of Education. Although both the double and interdepartmental majors entail substantial work in disciplines outside education, there are fundamental differences between them, e.g., the amount of program flexibility, the locus of responsibility for coordinating and integrating scholarly activities across discipline boundaries, and the criteria which must be met to successfully complete each type of program. Specific details concerning these differences are contained in subsequent sections of this document. One possible outcome of such multidisciplinary programs will be an increased dialogue among participating faculty and students representing the various academic disciplines about contemporary educational problems and issues. Mechanisms which may be used to facilitate such dialogue include interdepartmental sponsorship of senior year research/field experience projects and the establishment of colloquia focusing on contemporary and anticipated problems and issues in education.

Secondly, this major will provide an alternate route for students wishing to

-4-

enter a variety of graduate level education programs or subsequently to obtain teaching certification. Such an undergraduate option does not currently exist at this University. Additional comments relevant to this point are made in the next section on Career Alternatives.

Finally, with this program the University of Delaware and its College of Education have the opportunity to assume a position of leadership in an area of concern to all segments of our society. In addition to providing scholars capable of and willing to formulate and research the important questions in this discipline, this program will provide the opportunity for individuals in non-educational tracks to become better informed about the Educational enterprise and its role in our society.

Career Alternatives *

Because of its multidisciplinary, scholarly, problem-solving orientation, the proposed Educational Studies major, unlike many other university majors, should actually broaden the career opportunities available to students rather than confining them to a single discipline. In addition to the career options traditionally available to students in various non-education disciplines, graduates of the Educational Studies program will have several additional alternatives:

- A. Admission to graduate programs in Colleges of Education, including Educational Administration, Guidance, Counseling, Educational Psychology, Social Foundations of Education, Educational Research and Evaluation, and Computer applications in Education. In addition, the majors will also be in a position to pursue further graduate work in the non-education discipline with which they are associated. For example, a student taking a double major in Educational Studies and Political

See Appendix D, Question 3 for additional information concerning this topic.

Science may choose to pursue an advanced degree focusing on the study of Education as a political institution.

- B. Entrance to the teaching profession. While students are not expected to obtain certification through the proposed major, some students may develop an interest in teaching through their individual research projects and subsequently seek the necessary certification.
- C. Employment by Professional Support Organizations. School boards, central administrative offices in local school systems, and the professional staffs of individual schools are an employment source for highly trained individuals with research talent within the field of education. Budgeting, testing, forecasting and other managerial activities are areas where program graduates could perform competently.
- D. Employment by state educational and welfare offices and various other social welfare agencies connected with educational programs. In this regard, the federal government through the national, district and local offices of the H.E.W. and N.I.E. represent areas of employment.
- E. Employment in a variety of occupations (private, quasi-public and public) where research and design skills are needed. In the educational sector these would be represented by schools, colleges, universities and educational research foundations. In the private sector, job potential exists in such diverse fields as educational publishing, educational television, and various other educational resource organizations.

The Educational Studies Program

The B.A. degree in Educational Studies is awarded to students who complete at least 124 credit hours of work as described below, demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language, and satisfy the general University requirements listed under

Academic Regulations in the Undergraduate Catalog. The Educational Studies program is predicated on the following assumptions:

- A. The four traditional foundations areas (i.e., Historical, Philosophical, Psychological and Sociological) are of equal importance and indispensable to all students in the program.
- B. A firm grounding in content, modes of inquiry, and methodological tools is essential.
- C. Sufficient flexibility is required to permit students to pursue either a single, double, or interdepartmental major program.

The program emphasizes foundational and methodological courses in the early years with a shifting emphasis to more integrative activities at the upper levels.

The Credit-Hour Distribution

The 124 credit-hour requirement is distributed as follows:

A. Educational Studies major (9 three credit-hour courses)	27 hours
B. Group Requirements	44 hours
C. Senior Research Project and/or Internship	3 - 9 hours
D. Second Major and/or electives	<u>50 hours</u>
Total	124 hours

Academic Activities Required by the Educational Studies Major

We believe that all Educational Studies majors should develop a common core of knowledge basic to the understanding of the discipline of education. As a result, the following courses are required:

Psychological Foundations of Education	(EDF 209)
Philosophical Foundations of Education	(EDF 240)
Historical Foundations of Education	(EDF 247)
Sociological Foundations of Education	(EDF 258)

Educational Studies majors are expected to develop methodological skills necessary to conduct theoretical and empirical research on educational issues and problems. Therefore, the following two courses are required:

Modes of Inquiry: Empirical and Non-Empirical Methodologies	(EDF 377)
Educational Measurement and Evaluation	(EDF 365)

(Comparable courses offered by other departments may be substituted with permission of the Chairman of the Department of Educational Foundations.)

Educational Studies majors are expected to develop a theoretical framework for viewing methods of instruction and the historical and recent curriculum development trends in education. The following two courses are designed to meet this objective and, hence, at least one of these is required:

Theory and Practice in Curriculum Development	(EDC 369)
Theories of Instruction	(EDC 368)

The upper levels of the program focus on the analysis of critical problems confronting education, and the application of theoretical perspectives and methodological skills through participation in designed research projects and/or planned internship experiences. A senior seminar, which provides the mechanism for integrating previous course work and the outcome of their research/internship endeavor, is also incorporated in this phase of the program. The required courses are:

Research Project/Internship	(EDF 469)
Senior Seminar	(EDF 475)

In addition, students are required to take one of the following courses:

Issues and Problems in Education	(EDF 468)
Educational Technology	(EDF 4xx)
Comparative Education	(EDF 4xx)
Legal Issues in Education	(EDF 4xx)

or other courses to be developed.

Notes regarding the content and/or structure of these required activities are presented in a later section of this proposal.

Group Requirements

The Group requirements of the B. A. in Educational Studies degree are as follows:

- Group I. Humanities and Arts: 15 credits with at least 6 credits from one department and at least 3 from each of two others.
- Group II. History and Social Sciences: 15 credits with at least 6 from one department and at least 3 from each of two others.
- Group III. Natural Science and Mathematics: 14 credits from at least two departments. M 221 (or M 241), and M 222 (or M 242), M 249 and PHL 205 are strongly recommended.

Second Major and/or Elective. The remaining 41 credit-hours may be used as electives or to acquire competency in a second discipline (see the section on Degree Options).

Language Requirements. Proficiency in a foreign language (ancient or modern) is required. This proficiency may be demonstrated by one of the following:

- A. Completing four years of high school study of one language or two years of study of each of two languages with an average grade of "C" or better.
- B. Achieving scores on the language placement tests which indicate intermediate level proficiency.
- C. Passing the appropriate intermediate language course.

Single majors may satisfy this requirement by demonstrating proficiency in at least one computer language.

Degree Options

Within the framework of this program, there are three degree alternatives:

- A. The single major option enables the student to take 41 credit hours of course work on an approved elective basis. At least 13 of these credit-hours must consist of courses taken outside of the College of Education which contribute directly to the Educational Studies major. Some examples of courses satisfying

this requirement are: Child Development (PSY 325), American Minorities (SOC 361), Science and Society (PHL 207), Urban Politics (PSC 355), Economics of Poverty and Discrimination (EC 382), American Culture (ANT 202), and Afro-American People and Issues (BS 205). A more comprehensive list of acceptable courses is provided in Appendix B of this proposal. Many of these can also be used to satisfy the various Group Requirements.

B. The interdepartmental major option requires the student to take a minimum of 51 credit hours from closely related fields, one of which is Educational Studies. A minimum of 21 credit hours must be taken in each field or in appropriate subject-matter areas. Programs of this sort are handled on an individual basis and require early cooperative planning on the part of the students and faculty advisors in the departments involved. This type of major must be declared before the student has completed 60 credit hours of academic work.

C. The double major option requires the student to satisfy the credit hour requirement (usually 30 or more) in a second discipline of his choosing.

The availability of these three options provides a considerable amount of flexibility to the student for structuring the type of program most suitable to his personal academic aspirations.

Upon the approval of the B. A. in Educational Studies program, the following courses, projects and seminars will be developed by the Department of Educational Foundations:

1. Introduction to Educational Measurement and Evaluation (EDF 365) will focus primarily on the principles of norm- and criterion-referenced measurement and their applications in an educational environment.

2. Theories of Instruction (EDC 369) will be a new course designed to develop the theoretical basis for instructional methods and practices. This course will be developed by the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

3. Theory and Practice in Curriculum Development (EDC 368). This will be a new course designed to introduce students to modern, innovative curriculum plans and their relationships to existing learning and instructional theory. It may involve field trips to exemplary curriculum project sites. In final form, this course should be attractive to pre- and in-service teachers as well as Educational Studies Majors. It is anticipated that this course will be developed by the faculty of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

4. Modes of Inquiry (EDF 377) will be developed from the current EDF 607 offering. It will focus on a variety of empirical and nonempirical research techniques. The purpose of this offering is to teach students how to formulate research questions and appropriate research strategies.

5. Issues and Problems in Education (EDF 468). The educational studies major is brought into focus by highlighting contemporary educational issues and

problems. The Research Project/Internship (EDF 469) activity is viewed as a natural outgrowth of research interests stimulated and enhanced by participation in this course.

6. Research Project and/or Internship (EDF 469). Before the senior year and with the approval of their advisor(s), students will develop either a senior research project or a plan for a senior educational internship. This will enable each student to gain experience in using his newly acquired knowledge and skills within a meaningful context. Efforts to establish internship arrangements with organizations like the Delaware Department of Public Instruction, selected school districts, educational publishing firms, and selected governmental agencies have already been initiated. Flexibility for double and interdepartmental majors is maintained and students will be encouraged to pursue their interests with the advice of faculty from the departments with which they choose to affiliate.

7. Senior Seminar (EDF 475). The senior seminar is viewed as the conclusion of the student's involvement in the educational studies major. In this seminar, the entire major is given shape and meaning in both summary and evaluative fashion. It affords students the opportunity to present and/or defend their research or internship activities from the previous semester and to discuss significant, contemporary problems and issues in Education.

Budgetary Considerations

Initially the program will be limited to 25 students per year. Present faculty resources are sufficient for implementation of the program, and additional resources will be generated through internal reallocation.

Note: The following Appendices to this proposal are available in the Senate Office:

- A. Courses which Apply to the Group Requirements for the B.A. Degree from the College of Arts and Science
- B. Courses Directly Relevant to the Educational Studies Major and, Hence, Recommended as Electives or to Satisfy Group Requirements
- C. Example of Double Major B.A. Program in Educational Studies and Psychology
- D. Questions and Answers

University Faculty Senate
Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance

REPORT

Introduction

The Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Governance was created by legislation of the University Faculty Senate in 1973. The Committee was charged to consider the area of faculty involvement in University governance and to report any recommendations to the Senate. The Committee has undergone considerable change in membership since its creation and the following report is primarily the result of Committee deliberations over the past six months.

The Committee's aim has been to (a) delineate the governance responsibilities of the Faculty, (b) determine whether the Faculty has devised effective mechanisms for meeting these responsibilities, and (c) to recommend changes in these mechanisms where, in the opinion of the Committee, the present mechanisms are ineffective or inappropriate. To a large extent the recommendations to follow consist of proposed changes in the Faculty Constitution and the Senate Bylaws. In a few cases recommendations are made which propose changes in operating procedures involving the Faculty and Administration or between the Faculty and Board of Trustees. In the remaining recommendations proposals are made with the purpose of gaining clarification of existing Faculty responsibilities.

The Committee's primary source for determining Faculty responsibilities in University governance has been the Board of Trustees' Bylaws. In this connection the Committee view has been that the responsibilities granted the Faculty by Trustee Bylaws are, for the most part, sufficient for the Faculty to play a major role in the governance of the University. However, the Faculty's involvement in governance has been hindered by (a) a lack of clarity of the meaning of some portions of the Trustee Bylaws (b) a lack of coordination between Faculty, Administration and Board of Trustees (c) a failure to properly use existing Faculty mechanisms to satisfactorily discharge the Faculty's responsibilities and (d) a failure, in some cases, to devise appropriate mechanisms to satisfactorily discharge the Faculty's responsibilities. While the recommendations to follow do not represent a complete remedy to all these problems, the Committee agrees that the recommendations do represent an important thrust in that direction. The Committee further agrees that Faculty involvement in University governance will only be as effective as the effort and seriousness the Faculty devotes to this task. Governance of a University is a serious, time-consuming business. It requires thoughtful, decisive and timely decision making. It requires a full grasp of the problems and full knowledge of the information required to provide solutions to problems. To be taken seriously as an important partner in the governance of the University the Faculty must be willing to make a commitment by its actions to such efforts.

To play a more active and effective role in meeting its responsibilities the Faculty, or its representative bodies, needs information on which to base judgments and recommendations. The sharing of relevant information by the Administration and Faculty is prerequisite to timely and meaningful input by the Faculty in University governance. Academic policies and budgetary

- 2 -

constraints interact and the responsibility for policy decisions must be viewed as a mutual effort even though the ultimate decision will be made by the Board of Trustees. By such mutual effort the development and implementation of University policies will take place with the concerted support of Faculty, Administration and Board of Trustees. It is in this spirit that the Committee makes the following recommendations.

Recommendations

1. The Trustee Bylaws state that "the Faculty shall formulate rules and regulations for the government and discipline of the student body." The Trustee Bylaws further state that the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration "shall establish and administer the Student Judicial System consistent with the philosophy formulated by the Faculty."

There is no reason that the delegation by the Trustees of the responsibility to establish and administer the Student Judicial System to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration should in any way mitigate the faculty's responsibility to legislate in all areas of student conduct and discipline; only the punitive and enforcement functions have been transferred to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration. Thus, the Committee makes the following recommendations.

- a. To accomplish its legislative responsibilities, the Faculty (through its Senate) must continually study and monitor the adequacy of the Code of Conduct. The primary responsibility for this function is presently assigned to the Senate Committee on Student Life.
- b. Since the Trustee Bylaws delegate to the Faculty the authority to formulate rules and regulations for the government and discipline of the student body, the Committee interprets the Trustee Bylaws to include the government and discipline of students in the residence halls. Thus, the Committee recommends that the Senate's Committee on Student Life examine the Code of Conduct as to its appropriateness for the government and discipline within the residence halls.
- c. In light of the recent change in Trustee Bylaws concerning the Student Judicial System the Faculty must specify its philosophy for a Student Judicial System and monitor whether the existing Judicial System is consistent with that philosophy.
- d. To monitor the consistency between the existing Judicial System and the Faculty's philosophy, the Committee recommends that the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration should report periodically to the Senate on any changes that are made in the Judicial System.
- e. Since the Judicial Policy Board and the Student Judicial System have been removed from the Senate Bylaws, and since portions of those Bylaws delegate certain Faculty responsibilities to the Judicial Policy Board and certain student groups, new legislation for delegating certain of these responsibilities should be enacted by the Senate.

Recommendations (Continued)

2. The Board of Trustee Bylaws specify that "the Faculty shall provide for the establishment of the curricula and courses in the several colleges and divisions" and that "the Faculty shall determine the requirements for degrees." The Committee agreed that the Faculty mechanisms for discharging these responsibilities are generally satisfactory. However, the Committee also agreed that the Faculty does not now have an adequate mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness of new degree programs approved by the Senate. To help solve this problem the Committee makes the following recommendation.

Any new undergraduate or graduate degree program must obtain University Faculty Senate approval as follows:

- a. Provisional approval to initiate the program for a trial period of from two to four years;
- b. A review and evaluation of the program at an appropriate time during the provisional period. The Provost shall have responsibility for initiating this evaluation in consultation with the appropriate Senate committees;
- c. Senate recommendation for approval as a permanent degree program shall be based on the review and evaluation report.

3. The Board of Trustee Bylaws state that "the Faculty shall determine the educational and academic policies of admission." While the Committee agrees that the Faculty has discharged this responsibility adequately through the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standing, the execution of policies affecting the size and composition of the student body are not adequately monitored by the Faculty. Thus, the Committee recommends that:

The Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standing review annually the implementation of admissions policies.

4. The Trustee Bylaws state that "the Faculty shall recommend policies concerning awards, prizes and scholarships." At the present time no Senate committee is specifically charged with recommending policies concerning scholarships. The Committee, therefore, makes the following recommendation:

The charge to the Senate Committee on Student Life should be changed to include review of policies concerning undergraduate scholarships.

5. The Trustee Bylaws state that "the Faculty shall be given the opportunity to consider and make recommendations on proposals originating outside the Faculty concerning changes in the University organization before final action is taken by the Board of Trustees." However, the Committee could find no formal statement as to the meaning of the term "changes in University organization." To clarify this Faculty responsibility the Committee recommends adoption of the following definition.

Recommendations (Continued)

"Changes in University organization," as this phrase is used in Trustee Bylaw II-D, shall be understood to include: the establishment or abolition of academic departments, colleges and divisions; the transfer of a department or division from one college to another; and the establishment or abolition of administrative offices which are directly concerned with academic matters.

Changes in the internal organization of academic departments, colleges, divisions and administrative offices shall not be construed as requiring Faculty consultation, nor shall transfers of individual Faculty members from one department or college to another.

6. At the present time the Senate has no formal mechanism to monitor the proper execution of the policies approved by the Senate. To help rectify this situation, the Committee makes the following recommendation.

The Committee recommends that the President of the Senate transmit a copy of the Senate action to the University President and to the appropriate administrative officer(s) within five days of Senate action. The appropriate administrative officer, in consultation with the President, shall submit within 30 days a plan and timetable for the implementation of the action to the President of the Senate. In the event that in the administrative officer's judgment the action cannot be implemented then it is the responsibility of the Senate to provide a plan for implementation or to revise the policy in whatever manner is needed so that a feasible plan for implementation is possible.

7. The Committee considered a number of ways in which the Faculty, particularly through its Senate, could become a more efficient and forceful voice in University governance. To this end, the Committee recommends the following changes in the Faculty Constitution and Senate Bylaws.

A. Recommended changes in Faculty Constitution

1. Recommendation: Add to Paragraph 3, Section IV, the following:

The Senate shall in its Bylaws provide for the definition of nonfeasance of elected senators and for their replacement, and for the replacement of any senator unable to serve.

Purpose: To provide the Senate with a mechanism to replace elected Senators who are not adequately performing their responsibilities or who are unable to serve.

2. Recommendation: Amend Para. 6, Section IV by the deletion [. . .] and additions:

The Senate shall hold at least one regular meeting each month during the academic year (September through May). The Senate may by the wish of two-thirds of its membership increase the schedule of regular meetings.

Purpose: To allow the Senate to increase the schedule of regular meetings when deemed advisable.

Recommendations: Faculty Constitution (Continued)

3. Recommendation: Amend similarly Para. 7, Section IV to read:

At [the] a regular May meeting, the Senate shall elect a President, a Vice-President, and a Secretary from the [elected faculty senators] full-time voting faculty of the University, to serve for one year as voting members of the Senate and to conduct the election of their successors. (No further amendment to the Para.)

Purpose: To increase the pool of potential officers of the Senate and thus increase the likelihood of electing the best qualified individuals as officers of the Senate.

4. Recommendation: Amend Para. 2, Section IV to read:

Each Unit shall [be allotted] elect a number of senators. . . . (No further amendment to the Para.)

Purpose: To provide for the election of Senate officers without interfering with the units' elections of Senators. This recommendation is applicable only if Recommendation 3 above is adopted.

B. Recommended Changes in Senate Bylaws

1. Recommendation: Add to Section I, a new Paragraph:

3. That the Senate may function as an effective representative agent of the University Faculty, elected senators shall promptly notify the Secretary of the Senate of any temporary disability to attend regular Senate meetings, or otherwise discharge their responsibilities. Any elected senator's absence from two consecutive regular meetings of the Senate without such notification shall constitute a nonfeasance of the office, and the seat of that senator shall be vacant. The Secretary of the Senate shall immediately notify the senator's unit of the vacancy, which shall be promptly filled by special election in a manner to be provided by the unit. The Secretary of the Senate shall also be responsible to notify units of the need to replace senators disabled from serving by protracted illness, leave of absence, or sabbatical leave.

Purpose: This recommendation is an application of the proposed change in the Faculty Constitution concerning the definition of nonfeasance of elected senators and to provide for their replacement.

2. Recommendation: In Section C (Standing Committees) add the following paragraph to the charge to the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee shall meet at least once weekly during the academic year (September to May), and shall include on its agenda provision for appropriate written acknowledgment of all proposals, comments, questions, or other memoranda directed to and received by the Senate. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Senate to assure the efficient filing of all such correspondence, as well as of adequate minutes of Executive Committee meetings.

Purpose: The purpose of this recommendation is to provide for a more efficient operation of Senate business by the Executive Committee.

3. Recommendation: In Section L (Responsibilities and Powers of Officers), add the following paragraph following the present fourth paragraph:

The agenda of every regular Senate meeting shall include (1) a list of matters currently before every standing committee of the Senate; (2) an item of "Committee Business" to provide opportunity for discussion of any such matter; and (3) an item giving the opportunity for remarks by the President of the University or the Provost.

Purpose: To increase the communication between Senate committees, the Administration, the Senate and the Faculty at large.

4. Recommendation: In Section C (Standing Committees), add the following as a paragraph following the first paragraph of the section entitled General Provisions Regarding Committees:

In addition to the annual report, the chairperson of each ad hoc and standing committee shall submit to the Secretary of the Senate a brief statement of matters currently pending before that committee, and an estimate of the time when final committee action will be taken on each such matter. Such reports shall be submitted no later than the 15th of each month of the academic year (September to May), so that they may be listed on the agenda of the next following regular Senate meeting. It shall also be the responsibility of the chairperson of each ad hoc and standing committee of the Senate to provide the minutes of each meeting of the committee to the Secretary of the Senate.

Purpose: To insure that the Senate is fully aware of the activities and progress being made by Senate committees.

- 7 -

5. Recommendation: In Section L (Responsibilities and Powers of Officers), add the following paragraph following the one added in 3 above:

Reports or recommendations from standing or ad hoc committees of the Senate shall, when included on the agenda for a Senate meeting, identify the chairperson of the committee, who shall be responsible to be present at the meeting, or to provide for the presence of an alternate. In the absence of the sponsoring committee chairperson or alternate, the presiding officer of the Senate shall declare the report or recommendation stricken from the agenda.

Purpose: To insure that proposals on the Senate agenda from Senate committees are adequately explained and deliberated by the Senate before Senate action is taken.

6. Recommendation: Amend Section III, Standing Committee System of the Faculty and its Senate:

Executive Committee

This Committee shall include the President of the Senate, the Vice-President of the Senate, [and] the Secretary of the Senate, and the past President of the Senate.

Purpose: To insure some continuity on the Executive Committee.

C. Recommended Operating Procedure for Resolution of Conflicts Between the Senate and the Administration

It shall be adopted as standard procedure in those rare instances where a proposal concerning matters within the purview of the University Faculty (as specified in the Trustee Bylaws) on which two-thirds of the full membership of the Senate shall have voted against the proposal at a regular or special meeting of the Senate, such a proposal shall not be implemented until and unless additional steps as detailed below have been taken:

- a. A full memorandum of the Senate debate leading to the vote shall have been delivered to the President of the University and the appropriate administrative officer(s) by the Secretary of the Senate within 5 days of the vote; and
- b. The Senate Executive Committee shall have met with the appropriate administrator(s) in an effort to resolve the issue(s); and in the event of failure to do so
- c. the appropriate administrator(s) and the President of the Senate shall have presented the reasons for continued disagreement to a second meeting of the Senate; and
- d. a second vote on the matter shall have opposed it by two-thirds of the Senate membership; and
- e. the Senate position shall have been transmitted to the Board of Trustees by the President of the University.

- 8 -

RESOLUTIONS

The Committee submits the following recommendations as Resolutions for Senate action.

1. RESOLVED, that the Senate recommend to the University Faculty adoption of the following changes in the Faculty Constitution:

- a. Add to Para. 3, Section IV, the following:

The Senate shall in its Bylaws provide for the definition of nonfeasance of elected senators and for their replacement, and for the replacement of any senator unable to serve.

- b. Amend Para. 6, Section IV by the deletion [. . .] and additions:

The Senate shall hold at least one regular meeting each month during the academic year (September through May). The Senate may by the wish of two-thirds of its membership increase the schedule of regular meetings.

- c. Amend similarly Para. 7, Section IV to read:

At ~~[the]~~ a regular May meeting, the Senate shall elect a President, a Vice President, and a Secretary from the ~~[elected faculty senators]~~ full-time voting faculty of the University, to serve for one year as voting members of the Senate and to conduct the election of their successors. (No further amendment to the Para.)

- d. Amend Para. 2, Section IV to read:

Each Unit shall ~~[be allotted]~~ elect a number of senators. . . .
(No further amendment to the Para.)

2. RESOLVED, that the Senate Committee on Student Life examine the Code of Conduct as to its appropriateness for the government and discipline of the student body within the residence halls.
3. RESOLVED, that the Senate specify its philosophy for a Student Judicial System and monitor whether the existing Judicial System is consistent with that philosophy.
4. RESOLVED, that the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration should report periodically to the Senate on any changes that are made in the Student Judicial System.

Resolutions (Continued)

5. RESOLVED, that since the Judicial Policy Board and the Student Judicial System have been removed from the Senate Bylaws, and since portions of those Bylaws delegate certain Faculty responsibilities to the Judicial Policy Board and certain student groups, new legislation for delegating certain of those responsibilities should be enacted by the Senate.
6. RESOLVED, that any new undergraduate or graduate degree program must obtain University Faculty Senate approval as follows:
 - a. Provisional approval to initiate the program for a trial period of from two to four years;
 - b. A review and evaluation of the program at an appropriate time during the provisional period. The Provost shall have responsibility for initiating this evaluation in consultation with the appropriate Senate committees;
 - c. Senate recommendation for approval as a permanent degree program shall be based on the review and evaluation report.
7. RESOLVED, that the Senate Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Standing review annually the implementation of admissions policies, including those affecting the size and composition of the student body.
8. RESOLVED, that the charge to the Senate Committee on Student Life be changed to include review of policies concerning undergraduate scholarships.
9. RESOLVED, to adopt the following definition of "change in University organization" as used in the Trustee Bylaws:

"Changes in University organization," as this phrase is used in Trustee Bylaw II-D, shall be understood to include: the establishment or abolition of academic departments, colleges and divisions; the transfer of a department or division from one college to another; and the establishment or abolition of administrative offices which are directly concerned with academic matters.

Changes in the internal organization of academic departments, colleges, divisions and administrative offices shall not be construed as requiring faculty consultation, nor shall transfers of individual faculty members from one department or college to another.
10. RESOLVED, that to monitor the proper execution of the policies approved by the Senate the following procedure be adopted:

A copy of the Senate action must be transmitted by the President of the Senate to the University President and to the appropriate Administrative officer(s) within 5 days of the Senate action. The appropriate

- 10 -

Resolutions (Continued)

administrative officer, in consultation with the President, shall submit within 30 days a plan and timetable for the implementation of the action to the President of the Senate. In the event that in the administrative officer's judgment the action cannot be implemented then it is the responsibility of the Senate to provide a plan for implementation or to revise the policy in whatever manner is needed so that a feasible plan for implementation is possible.

11. RESOLVED, that the following changes be adopted in the University Faculty Senate Bylaws:

a. Add to Section I, a new paragraph:

3. That the Senate may function as an effective representative agent of the University Faculty, elected senators shall promptly notify the Secretary of the Senate of any temporary disability to attend regular Senate meetings, or otherwise discharge their responsibilities. Any elected senator's absence from two consecutive regular meetings of the Senate without such notification shall constitute a nonfeasance of the office, and the seat of that senator shall be vacant. The Secretary of the Senate shall immediately notify the senator's unit of the vacancy, which shall be promptly filled by special election in a manner to be provided by the unit. The Secretary of the Senate shall also be responsible to notify units of the need to replace senators disabled from serving by protracted illness, leave of absence, or sabbatical leave.

b. In Section C (Standing Committees) add the following paragraph to the charge to the Executive Committee:

The Executive Committee shall meet at least once weekly during the academic year (September to May), and shall include on its agenda provision for appropriate written acknowledgment of all proposals, comments, questions, or other memoranda directed to and received by the Senate. It shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Senate to assure the efficient filing of all such correspondence, as well as of adequate minutes of Executive Committee meetings.

c. In Section L (Responsibilities and Powers of Officers), add the following paragraph following the present fourth paragraph:

The agenda of every regular Senate meeting shall include (1) a list of matters currently before every standing committee of the Senate; (2) an item of "Committee Business" to provide opportunity for discussion of any such matter; and (3) an item giving the opportunity for remarks by the President of the University or the Provost.

d. In Section C (Standing Committees), add the following as a paragraph following the first paragraph of the section entitled General Provisions Regarding Committees:

Resolutions (Continued)

In addition to the annual report, the chairperson of each ad hoc and standing committee shall submit to the Secretary of the Senate a brief statement of matters currently pending before that committee, and an estimate of the time when final committee action will be taken on each such matter. Such reports shall be submitted no later than the 15th of each month of the academic year (September to May), so that they may be listed on the agenda of the next following regular Senate meeting. It shall also be the responsibility of the chairperson of each ad hoc and standing committee of the Senate to provide the minutes of each meeting of the committee to the Secretary of the Senate.

- e. In Section L (Responsibilities and Powers of Officers), add the following paragraph following the one added in c above:

Reports or recommendations from standing or ad hoc committees of the Senate shall, when included on the agenda for a Senate meeting, identify the chairperson of the committee, who shall be responsible to be present at the meeting, or to provide for the presence of an alternate. In the absence of the sponsoring committee chairperson or alternate, the presiding officer of the Senate shall declare the report or recommendation stricken from the agenda.

- f. Amend Section III, Standing Committee System of the Faculty and its Senate:

Executive Committee

This Committee shall include the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the Senate, [and] the Secretary of the Senate, and the past President of the Senate.

12. RESOLVED that the Senate adopt and recommend to the President of the University the adoption of the following operating procedures for resolution of conflicts between the Senate and the Administration:

It shall be adopted as standard procedure in those rare instances where a proposal concerning matters within the purview of the University Faculty (as specified in the Trustee Bylaws) on which two-thirds of the full membership of the Senate shall have voted against the proposal at a regular or special meeting of the Senate, such a proposal shall not be implemented until and unless additional steps as detailed below have been taken:

- a. A full memorandum of the Senate debate leading to the vote shall have been delivered to the President of the University and the appropriate administrative officer(s) by the Secretary of the Senate within 5 days of the vote; and
- b. The Senate Executive Committee shall have met with the appropriate administrator(s) in an effort to resolve the issue(s); and in the event of failure to do so

Resolutions (Continued)

- c. the appropriate administrator(s) and the President of the Senate shall have presented the reasons for continued disagreement to a second meeting of the Senate: and
- d. a second vote on the matter shall have opposed it by two-thirds of the Senate membership; and
- e. the Senate position shall have been transmitted to the Board of Trustees by the President of the University.

Submitted by the ad hoc Committee on Governance:

Prof. Dale Bray
Prof. Paul Catts
Prof. Leon Campbell
Prof. Ludwig Mosberg, Chairperson
Prof. Lauren Smith
Prof. Judith Van Name
Prof. Penny Ziegenfuss

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Ad Hoc Committee on Retrenchment

PROGRESS REPORT

April, 1976

The following preliminary statement of progress was prepared to apprise the Senate of the present conclusions of the Retrenchment Committee. This statement was based on many hours of gathering data, some of which is available in the Senate Office, and many hours of discussion. The faculty responsible for this statement are: Willard Baxter, Gordon Bonner, Paul Catts, Donald Crossan, Andrew Hepburn, Carol Hoffeecker, and George Cicala, Chairperson.

* * * * *

It is clear that the issues surrounding the invoking of financial exigency or extraordinary financial circumstances as a justification for the termination of an individual contract or the elimination or reduction of a unit within a college or an academic division require a presentation of evidence that the action is the result of demonstrably bona fide, University-wide financial exigency. Clearly much of the concern that exists in this community relating to these issues surrounds the use of financial exigency as an easy excuse for dismissal.

The courts have held that more than a casual showing of an institution's accounts, as may be useful for promotional purposes, shall and must occur in such a justification, and that such decisions should be subject to challenge by both individuals and the larger community of scholars.

The Committee on Welfare and Privileges has proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook section dealing with termination and non-renewal (III-N). The intent of these proposed changes is to provide procedural guarantees to an individual faculty member, assuring that member's right to be heard. The Committee on Welfare and Privileges should be cautioned that the burden of proof of exigency rests with the administration in the justification of its actions. We note that financial exigency carries with it the existence of imminent necessity. This means to us that the expansion of programs in any area or discipline is immediately precluded with the declaration of bona fide, University-wide financial exigency whenever such expansion makes use of unrestricted University funds; the initiation or expansion of self-supporting programs would not come under this restriction.

- 2 -

A proposal for reduction or elimination of a unit within a college or academic division in the name of financial exigency requires, in our belief, an evaluation by the University Faculty. Clearly, Faculty responsibility has been recognized by the By-Laws of the Board of Trustees in that the Faculty has the delegated responsibility "to formulate and administer the academic and the educational policies of the University. . ." (2-II, p. 24). Within this broad charge are the more explicit charges that the Faculty shall "provide for the establishment of the curricula and courses in the several colleges and divisions" (2-II-C, p. 25) and

"It shall be the privilege of the faculty:

1. To make recommendations to the Board of Trustees concerning the disestablishment of any degree. . . .
2. To consider matters of general interest to the University and make recommendations thereupon to the President for transmission to the Board of Trustees.
3. To consider and make recommendations for proposed changes in the University organization."

(2-II-E, p. 26)

We believe these statements support our contention that the Faculty has a responsibility related to retrenchment due to financial exigency as it affects academic matters.

Furthermore, close involvement of the Faculty in decisions resulting from financial exigency is necessary to assure the closest possible coordination between fiscal and academic retrenchment. In any litigation that might result from the elimination of faculty positions in which the institution claims financial exigency, the University's position will be stronger if there has been early and meaningful faculty involvement, through an elected Standing Committee charged with the review of academic priorities and retrenchment proposals. Such involvement shares the responsibility for the decision and reinforces a good-faith agreement of the existence of bona fide financial exigency.

This Committee should be broadly based. It should consist of members selected by the Senate Committee on Committees and should assure University-wide representation. One elected faculty Senator should chair the Committee, and a faculty representative from COPE and a representative of the Provost's Office should be members.

The responsibility of this Committee would be to consider the needs of the entire University community and to provide a broadly based perspective. In doing so we wish to assure that consideration be given to total community involvement and contribution by the unit or units in question.

The Committee on Retrenchment is now developing a recommendation which will describe the composition and charge and the procedures to be followed in cases of retrenchment.

UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Committee on Student Life

REPORT: Student Use of Alcohol on Campus

The Committee on Student Life herewith presents the results of its review of present policies and procedures regarding student use of alcohol on campus, and recommendations for changes in policies and the institution of programs to reduce alcohol abuse and financial waste and dangers that accompany alcohol abuse.

The Committee's efforts resulted in the following:

1. The "University Policy on the Consumption of Alcohol on Campus," dated July 21, 1971 and the "Proposal for the Revision of University Policy Concerning Alcoholic Beverages, dated February 18, 1971, were updated and combined into a single "University Policy Concerning Alcoholic Beverages," dated March 1976.
2. The Committee on Student Life supported the organization of a campus-wide committee with representation from faculty, students and service and administrative offices, with Mr. David Butler as chairperson. This committee is engaged in seeking and implementing means to curb alcohol abuse. The name of the committee is "The Committee on Responsible Drinking." It is divided into three sub committees which are concerned with (1) treatment, (2) preventive education and (3) media.
3. The Committee on Student Life developed a number of recommendations related to use of alcohol on campus.
4. The Committee on Student Life proposed that a standing committee be established whose responsibilities would be limited to the maintenance, review and implementation of alcohol policies and the development of new programs and procedures to curb and reduce abuse of beverage alcohol by students.

AAB/b

4/5/76

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE
NEWARK, DELAWARE

UNIVERSITY POLICY CONCERNING ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES

March, 1976

The Policy:

"UNAUTHORIZED POSSESSION, USE, MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION OR SALE OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON OR IN UNIVERSITY PROPERTY IS FORBIDDEN. University policy, consistent with state, county and city laws, restricts on-campus use of alcoholic beverages in specified areas."

The Philosophy:

The University of Delaware strives to offer members of the University Community the same rights and responsibilities as those afforded to members of the larger community.

Explanation:

I. "Unauthorized" use will involve:

- A. possession, use, manufacture or distribution in areas other than those enumerated in Section F of this policy; and/or
- B. illegal possession, use, manufacture or distribution under the provisions of federal, state and city law.

II. The University reminds all members of the University Community that violators of state law regarding the consumption, sale, possession or manufacture of alcoholic beverages are subject to legal action as follows:

4 Delaware Code paragraph 904 makes it unlawful to purchase alcoholic liquor for or give it to a person under 20 years of age, and also makes it unlawful for a person under 20 years of age to consume alcoholic liquor or to have it in his possession. Both offenses are punishable by fine and consequently, by definition, are crimes against the State so that anyone who assists a person committing such a crime in order to hinder or prevent his apprehension, trial or punishment, would be an accessory after the fact.

Violations of 4 Delaware Code paragraph 904:

A fine of not less than \$100.00 nor more than \$500.00 for the first offense and fines of not less than \$500.00 nor more than \$1,000.00 for subsequent offenses.

The punishment for being an accessory after the fact is a fine of not more than \$1,000.00 or imprisonment for not more than three years or both.

III. Student violations of this policy shall be referred to the University Student Judicial System and/or civil authorities.

- IV. Alcoholic beverages may not be possessed, consumed, or distributed in any University facility or property under the jurisdiction of the University unless the area has been designated by the President of the University or his designee as one where alcoholic beverages may be used.
- V. Individual transportation ("brown bagging") of alcoholic beverages into any function approved for the consumption of alcoholic beverages and where alcohol has been provided by the sponsoring group is not permitted.
- VI. Alcohol shall not be served at functions connected with academic programs or immediately preceding or during business meetings of any University organization or those groups authorized to hold meetings on the campus.

Implementation of the Policy:

I. Off-Campus Activities:

The University accepts no responsibility for the use or distribution of alcoholic beverages at off-campus social functions sponsored by University-related organizations or individuals.

All persons planning or attending such an off-campus activity should be aware of the alcoholic beverage laws which apply to the situation. Each person participating in the activity assumes responsibility for his own actions.

Violations of pertinent alcoholic beverage laws will be handled by law enforcement authorities having jurisdiction over the specific location where the event is being held.

II. On-Campus Activities:

The use of alcoholic beverages is prohibited except when and where explicitly permitted by University policy.

A. University Organizations:

University Organizations shall have the opportunity to serve alcoholic beverages at social functions held in approved University locations to those of legal age. The procedures listed below must be followed to obtain the use of University facilities for such functions:

1. Functions sponsored by University student organizations and held in University facilities at which alcoholic beverages are to be served must be registered (See F below). Such functions must be limited in attendance to members of the organization and their invited guests.
2. Groups in good standing as sponsoring organizations (i.e., free of censure or restriction that would prohibit that organization from sponsoring said function) who are thereby entitled to use University facilities and desire to serve alcoholic beverages at private events scheduled in University facilities will be permitted to do so upon submitting written guarantee that the proper procedural safeguards have been adopted by them so that state and local beverage laws and University regulations will not be violated. At the time any reservation for service and consumption of alcoholic

beverage is made, a person authorized to sign for the group making the reservation must complete and sign a notice form which states that the group is using the University facilities for a private party or meeting limited in attendance to members or guests of the named person, group, association or organization as authorized in conformance with federal, state, city ordinances and University regulations.

B. Residence Halls:

1. Individual Actions -

- a. Students of legal age and their guests of legal age may possess and consume alcoholic beverages on an individual basis in the privacy of their residence hall rooms.
- b. The possession and consumption of alcohol shall not infringe upon the privacy and peace of other individuals. Any such infringement shall be considered a violation of the Code of Conduct and shall be dealt with in the manner prescribed in the University Student Judicial System. In all such situations the consumption of alcoholic beverages will be considered as aggravating rather than mitigating the situation.
- c. The Office of Housing and Residence Life shall continue to provide procedures for permitting students to select to live with someone who does not wish to use alcoholic beverages in their room.

2. Group Functions -

Possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages in any areas other than individual rooms is forbidden, however the Office of Housing and Residence Life may establish procedures for the dispensing of alcoholic beverages for group functions in other areas of the residence halls.

C. Fraternal Organizations:

The principles outlined above apply equally to these living units. The Inter-Fraternity Council under the direction of the Office of Housing and Residence Life shall establish procedures whereby individual fraternity houses shall implement and enforce this policy.

D. Faculty, Professional, or Staff Organizations:

1. Functions sponsored by University faculty, administrative, or staff organizations at which alcoholic beverages are to be served must comply with the procedures outlined in Section F.
2. No person employed by the University shall possess or consume alcoholic beverages on the campus except at social functions at which the serving of alcoholic beverages has been duly approved, registered as prescribed, and to which the individual has been invited. Staff who have their residence on the campus may possess and consume alcoholic beverages in their private residence.

E. Off-Campus Groups in University Facilities:

Group social activities sponsored by off-campus groups at which alcoholic beverages are to be served must restrict their function to only those areas and times recognized by the University as appropriate. These off-campus groups in University facilities must comply with the restrictions noted herein.

F. General Procedures:

1. Organizations holding social functions sponsored or sanctioned by the University have the opportunity of serving alcoholic beverages in certain areas of the following: Christiana Commons Buildings, Clayton Hall, Dining Halls, Pencader Dining Commons, Faculty Dining, Blue and Gold Club, Goodstay, Student Center, Wilcastle, and other areas designated by the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration.
2. Functions at which alcoholic beverages are to be served must be registered with the person in charge of the facility in which the event is to be held. The registration officers are as follows:
 - a. Christiana Commons Building -- Associate Director of Residence Life (3-5 Courtney Street)
 - b. Clayton Hall, Goodstay, Wilcastle -- Associate Director of Continuing Education for Conferences (John M. Clayton Hall)
 - c. Faculty Dining Room, Pencader Dining Commons, and Dining Halls -- Associate Director of Food Service (503 Academy Street)
 - d. Blue and Gold Club -- Manager, Blue and Gold Club (44 Kent Way)
 - e. Student Center -- Associate Director of the Student Center
3. Events at which alcoholic beverages are served/sold must be sanctioned by the Vice President for Student Affairs and Administration. To be sanctioned, an officer of the organization requesting the privilege to serve alcoholic beverages must submit to the person in charge of the facility in which the event is to be held a written guarantee that the proper procedural safeguards have been adopted, that all local, state and federal laws and regulations will be followed, and that the group using the University facilities intends to limit attendance to members and bona fide guests invited prior to the holding of the event.

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE USE OF
BEVERAGE ALCOHOL ON CAMPUS

1. Provide funds and professional support necessary for the development of an educational program in the area of alcohol abuse. Funding is needed for the purchasing of educational materials such as posters and pamphlets. It would also be helpful to have funds to use in the training of paraprofessionals to work with individuals who are experiencing problems with their use of alcohol.
2. Institute a responsible drinking program which teaches students alternative means of using alcohol. As part of this program we should institute a wine tasting course and a bartending course. The approach to these courses would include stress on the responsible use of alcohol, the responsibilities of a host/hostess who offers alcohol to others, and factual information about the effects of alcohol.
3. Funds should be provided for the development of "trigger films" for use in stimulating discussion of alcohol problems within student groups. The talents of our theater department and our IRC could be used in developing these films.
4. Make provisions for the serving of food and alternate beverages in our pub, and in events that occur on the campus including those for faculty, professional, and staff members.
5. Efforts should be made to intensify the training of individuals in supervisory positions to work with employees who are having alcohol problems.
6. A survey should be conducted on campus of those related departments in order to determine what information is being taught to students concerning the use and abuse of alcohol. Specifically, Psychology, Sociology, Nursing, Home Economics, and Physical Education should be polled. In addition a credit course in the area of the impact of alcohol could be developed.
7. The Review should be encouraged to print advertisements for alcoholic beverages only if those advertisements stress the responsible use of alcohol.
8. The current committee on responsible drinking should be encouraged to continue its efforts. The informal nature of the group should be maintained, however, and modest supporting budget provided.

AAB/b:Senate Committee on Student Life
2/27/76

A Proposed Standing Committee on Use of Beverage
Alcohol on the Campus of University of Delaware

The recent relaxation of rules governing the storage, transportation, or consumption of beverage alcohol on campus and the availability of beverage alcohol on the campus of the University of Delaware have increased the similarities between life in the University Community and life in the larger community outside.

The availability of beverage alcohol and the freedom to consume alcohol legally on campus provide occasions for important learning and training experiences. The opportunity to use beverage alcohol would appear to generate favorable circumstances for the acquisition of acceptable drinking habits as well as the ability to exercise reasonable control over periods when, in the individual's best interests and in compliance with existing regulations, he should abstain from use of beverage alcohol.

But the presence of alcohol on campus is not without serious dangers to the physical and mental health of those few who fail to realize the advantages of the positive opportunities to learn responsible drinking. There is therefore, in the presence of available beverage alcohol, the need to exercise caution and control against irresponsible drinking. In addition to the personal dangers such misuses of alcohol lead to excessive increases in maintenance costs of University buildings and property as well as occasional but gross and wanton destruction of University property. Another inevitable concomitant of alcohol abuse is the usurpation of rights of other members of the University community to reasonable protection from interference with ongoing scholastic and academic pursuits.

It is with respect to the need for caution and control that: A. a detailed policy setting forth acceptable and unacceptable conditions for consumption of beverage alcohol on campus has been drawn up; and, B. a proposal is presented that a standing committee be established to insure consistent implementation of the alcohol policy and continuous surveillance over practices and quantities of beverage alcohol consumption on campus. Further charges to the proposed standing committee should include periodic review of services, facilities and programs aimed at containment of alcohol abuse and mitigation of the undesirable effects of alcohol abuse where it occurs, and insuring that those services, facilities and programs be kept perpetually active, vigorous and up-to-date.

CHARGES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE

Name: The name of the committee shall be The Committee to Regulate the Use of Beverage Alcohol on the University of Delaware Campus.

Composition: The Committee shall consist of nine members drawn from the following campus groups, agencies or organizations.

1. A representative of the Student Health Service
2. A representative of Security
3. A representative of Food Service
4. A representative of V.P. for Student Affairs and Administration
5. A representative of the Office of Housing and Residence Life
6. A representative of the Center for Counseling
7. Manager or Managers of Campus facilities which sell beverage alcohol
8. A representative of Student Government of College Councils
9. A representative of University of Delaware Coordinating Council

CHARGES TO THE PROPOSED STANDING COMMITTEE

1. Conduct a review of existing policies relating to beverage alcohol at least once a year.
2. Recommend additions or changes to existing policies where appropriate.
3. Evaluate existing programs directed toward education of students about dangers of alcohol abuse.
4. Initiate, where appropriate, new educational programs.
5. Eliminate ineffective programs and practices.

AAB/lb: Senate Committee on Student Life

2/27/76

ADMINISTRATIVE REORGANIZATION OF THE DIVISION OF URBAN AFFAIRS

(from a memo to Provost Campbell from C. Harold Brown, 1/16/76)

Recent changes in the structure of the University's administration make this a propitious time to consider alterations in the Division of Urban Affairs' organizational status. The Division has changed dramatically over the past 15 years, and it is time to reconsider the administrative structure established in 1961. The Division should become a college of the University, with direct administrative responsibility to the provost.

As you will recall, the Division was established as one of six university-based urban affairs programs funded by the Ford Foundation in 1966. As a measure of the Division's success, Delaware's program was one of only two to receive supplemental Ford Foundation grants. In its early years the Division concentrated on public service and applied research activities in the Delaware region. Its concern with extension activities was a major reason for the administrative location of the Division under the Office of the Vice President for University Relations. Moreover, division status seemed appropriate since no regular ongoing teaching program was pursued at this time.

Over the past ten years the Division's role in the University has significantly expanded. Our earlier commitments to public service and applied research have been reinforced and institutionalized. We carry out a comprehensive research program focusing on public policy issues related to urban problems. Our public service efforts have become a nationally-recognized model for urban-related extension activities. Added to this has been a developing program of graduate education in urban affairs and public policy leading to master's and doctor of philosophy degrees.

As its functions have expanded, the size of the Division staff has grown. The responsibilities of the Division are carried out by 45 staff members, including 15 faculty, two joint appointees, and 10 professional staff. Their activities span the full range of concerns at the University in teaching, research, and service. At the present time the Division has approximately 60 graduate students actively enrolled in its programs. In addition, should the master's in public administration be approved, graduate enrollments are expected to total 90 students.

The comprehensiveness of the Division's programs has made its administrative structure and institutional status obsolete. Administratively, we have become a bifurcated entity. Academic programs in the Division require the approval of the provost even though all administrative responsibility is to the vice president for university relations. Indeed, in operation the arrangement is even more complex since the separation of research, service, and academic matters is artificial. In practice, the existing administrative structure for the Division is cumbersome and inefficient.

At the same time the administrative structure is modified, the institutional status of the Division should be changed. The status of the Division does not reflect the full range of academic, research, and service programs carried out by our faculty and professional staff. Moreover, divisional status creates some confusion within the University since on some occasions we are regarded as an academic unit and on other occasions we are not. Such confusion in understanding the programs and activities we carry on is even greater for individuals outside the University who do not understand our unique usage of divisional status. It seems appropriate to change our status from a division to a college of urban affairs and public policy. This would facilitate an understanding of our functions in the University and would clarify our relationships with other units on campus. Moreover, such a change would represent no increase in costs to the University since the Division is already functioning in terms of the broad range of activities designated by the status of a college; the purpose of the change would be to bring our designated status in line with our operational status.

In becoming a college of urban affairs and public policy, we would be administratively responsible directly to the provost. Such administrative lines of responsibility would encourage the easy coordination of Division efforts with other academic units along the full range of our activities. Virtually all academic programs report to the provost and such coordination would be facilitated if we followed similar lines of administrative responsibility. As a college we would continue to carry on academic programs in research, teaching, and service expected of such units and to work in close cooperation with other colleges at the University.

Faculty and staff in the Division have participated in the development of these recommendations and strongly support their implementation. I hope that this memorandum may serve as a basis for a formal decision to alter the Division's status.

Graduate Study In Urban Affairs

The Division of Urban Affairs offers graduate study leading to the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in urban affairs. Nineteen M.A. degrees have been awarded in the last three years; approximately 60 students are currently enrolled. A master's degree in public administration has been approved by the University Senate and is awaiting final approval from the board of trustees.

The graduate program is interdisciplinary and designed to prepare students for a variety of positions in government, research organizations, universities and urban-related private and quasi-public agencies. The curricula stress the application of social sciences and social philosophy to public policy problems of metropolitan regions. The program seeks to provide students with analytic perspectives and methodological skills which will enable them to deal with a wide variety of complex urban problems.

Students develop areas of specialization in urban administration, social planning, housing and land use, educational policy, health policy, resource analysis, or other dimensions of urban policy problems. M.A. candidates are expected to complete an internship in lieu of the traditional thesis.

Graduate students have a unique opportunity for involvement in numerous research and public service projects conducted by faculty and staff of the Division.

Census and Data System

The Division of Urban Affairs' Census and Data System is celebrating its tenth anniversary this year. The System has evolved from a short-term project team into a comprehensive survey research facility.

The first function of the System is to conduct the New Castle County school census that currently involves over 90,000 households. In earlier years the information provided by the census served primarily as a planning tool to determine when and where new school buildings should be constructed. This use has now changed, in light of a declining school-age population, but the census remains an important factor in capital and operating budget management.

The school census data have also been used to aid planning officials throughout the State with various kinds of projects such as housing studies, locating concentrations of the elderly and the poor, occupation and manpower studies, growth impact analysis, and many others. The System is the only alternative to the 1970 Census, outdated for many purposes.

The second function of the System is to provide technical support for the many survey research projects handled through the Division. System personnel have expertise in an array of areas, including sampling procedures, questionnaire development, all forms of interviewing, survey management, data preparation, and data processing.

One rapidly expanding area utilizing the expertise available within the Census and Data System is the development of management information systems to help government perform more efficiently. These projects generally involve the analysis of administrative records collected by the agency, with data collection, data preparation, and data processing carried within the System.

Urban Agent Program

In September 1972, an experimental Urban Agent Program was launched in Wilmington. Three professionals, with graduate degrees in social work and urban education, coordinate this program from offices at 103 West 7th Street.

The idea of an urban agent program for inner-city areas evolved from experience with county agent and agricultural extension services. The aim of both of these programs has been to generate a process of channeling resources of the University into a new mode of helping to solve contemporary social problems. It was with this goal in mind that the Division expanded its established public service program to provide more direct involvement with Wilmington neighborhood and community groups in need of technical assistance in planning, organizing, and implementing change-oriented program activities.

During its three years existence, the Urban Agent Program has addressed Wilmington's social problems in three major program areas: urban public education, neighborhood credit unions, and community-based educational programs.

The Urban Agent Program has also provided consultative assistance to the Model Cities Program, the Delaware Technical and Community College, the Delaware Household Technicians (Domestics), the Wilmington Coalition of Minority Groups, and other community groups. Most important, members of the staff have begun to develop a network of community relationships and a scope of professional public service expertise that should lead to broader and more effective university public service programs of this kind in the future.

CUIUA

Dr. C. Harold Brown has been elected chairperson of the Governing Board of the Council of University Institutes for Urban Affairs (CUIUA). He previously served as the organization's secretary-treasurer.

CUIUA was founded in 1969 in response to the creation of hundreds of urban affairs institutes in the United States and Canada. Through regional and national meetings, an information clearinghouse and a limited publications program, the council seeks to support the development and enrichment of university education, research, and service programs, to furnish a forum for the exchange of information about urban programs, and to provide leadership in fostering the development of urban affairs as a professional and academic field.

With Dr. Brown's election, the CUIUA secretariat has returned to Delaware. The secretariat was located there earlier when Dr. James L. Cox, now director of the Institute for Urban Studies and Community Services at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, served as CUIUA executive director. Mary Helen Callahan has been appointed CUIUA administrator and will edit the monthly newsletter. She will soon have compiled a list of member-centers' publications and a digest of their courses with syllabi. The council also furnishes information on job opportunities in the field, provides technical advice to universities and urban institutes on organizational and program development, and maintains liaison with other professional and educational organizations.