

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

June 1, 1970

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m. by President Olson. Senators not in attendance were:

Peggy Bedingfield	Allan M. Granda	William Pulliam
Gordon R. Bonner	Raanan Liebermann	Peter W. Rees
Harold Brown	Lynn M. Doherty	Robert E. Sheridan
Mary K. Carl	Thomas D. Myers	John W. Shirley
T. Allan Comp	David M. Nelson	Peter M. Weil
Alice P. Eyman	William D. Osborne	

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

James Soles has been designated as a replacement for Mr. Ingersoll.

President Olson asked the senators to please reserve their time from 4:10 to 5:30 every Monday (tentatively) to do the work of the Senate. Hopefully, we can soon get back to a regular schedule.

II. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Tingey moved, seconded by Mr. Wriston, the adoption of the agenda. Agenda was adopted by voice vote.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Recommended Policy on Disruptive Behavior (continued)

President Olson called on Mr. Anapol for a parliamentary ruling on bringing a substitute amendment before the body. Mr. Anapol replied parliamentary procedure tells us the way a substitute amendment should be brought before the body. We should vote to accept the substitute and vote to pass the subsequent amendment.

Mr. Wriston indicated that in his opinion this amendment would have no force whatever. It might be counterproductive. We consulted with Mr. Halio and wrote a substitute amendment.

Mr. Halio stated at the time of the original debate the question came up whether we might revise this because of legal technicalities. The original wording might be considered counterproductive. After consulting with a lawyer in Wilmington, a further item occurred to me to prevent further interruptions or disruptions. To cooperate, etc., may put the faculty in the position colloquially known as "finks." This is a risk we should be prepared to take. The main thrust of the amendment is that we should be on the scene

and cooperate to see that there is a minimum of violence and avoidance of untoward incidents.

At the suggestion of the chair, this substitute amendment was accepted unanimously.

Vote was called for on the revised Hailo amendment. Passed unanimously.

The amendment reads: ". . . it shall be the responsibility of the faculty, further, to engage in surveillance of any action by security forces (internal or external) which may, under no circumstances, prevent, impede or inhibit the faculty from exercising this responsibility."

Mr. Kerner's amendment was presented by Mr. Wriston. (Text of Kerner amendment is on page 5 of May 21, 1970, minutes. Capitalized parts represent material in the Kerner amendment that differs from the original document.) Mr. Wriston indicated that this version was acceptable to Mr. Kerner, the officers of the Senate, and the President.

Mr. Kerner made two points: It was his opinion that the Kerner amendment as adopted leaves it ambiguous as to who should call security forces. The President is concerned that a call should emanate only from himself or the person acting for him in his absence. Some additional phraseology is contained therein. Mr. Kerner added that the substitute amendment is superior to the original.

The chair requested that the Senate accept the substitute Kerner amendment. The acceptance was made unanimously. The amendment was approved by unanimous vote of the Senate.

Mr. Kramer was recognized by the chair and stated that it is rather dangerous in a document like this to try to interject what appears to be a philosophy of why a university actually exists. We should be very clear as to what role a university must play in society. The way the document is originally stated it basically leaves too much to the discretion of the individual attempting to interpret this particular paragraph.

Mr. Kerner presented his amendment, seconded by Mr. Bray.

Mr. Moszynski was recognized by the chair and stated that he wished to speak against the Kramer amendment. It is a very narrow view of the University. He would subscribe to it as a scientist, but it leaves out a large part of what is true and what is known.

Mr. McLaughlin indicated that he would like to speak against the amendment. It leaves out any sense of our being involved with values. Finally, the last few statements are very vague. What do they mean? He could not

envision a case which would be described by these pages. Mr. Kramer replied that the point of concern refers particularly to the last statement. He voiced concern about how the role of the University becomes one of motivating social change. Our major job should be searching for the truth and education. We were engaged in a force for education rather than for a change with respect to the moratorium. In the moratorium we were engaged in education of our community but not using basically the University as a social motivating force. It was a force for education rather than a force for change.

Mr. Harlan indicated that to call attention to what seems a very narrow definition of truth and knowledge as implied by Mr. Moszynski and Mr. McLaughlin-- truth is of many varieties and to apply the test of science would be a very narrow definition. It is the business of the University to deal with creation, or discovery, and dissemination of knowledge, but to limit that to science is certainly a very parochial definition.

Mr. Glenn said basically speaking, I agree with the idea in the amendment; however, at the same time, share the doubts of Mr. Moszynski.

Mr. Kramer indicated that he would rather be narrow in statement and broad in interpretation.

Mr. Wriston said Mr. Kramer suggested that what we need to do is to interpret it more generally and less specifically, since this is watered down until it says very little. Could Mr. Kramer give us a sample of what he intends this to stop or allay?

Mr. Kramer replied it is very difficult to come up with a concrete example of what we are driving at. We must be very careful that the way this is worded, the intent in mind is that we are concerned with the students going off half-cocked in any particular direction with respect to dissent on any particular action they wanted to get involved in. It could be a light on 896 in the vicinity of Hullahen Hall. It might have nothing to do with University functions.

Mr. Tingey called for the question. Debate was limited by voice vote. The Kramer amendment was defeated by voice vote. No further amendments were made to the statement on disruptive behavior.

VOTE ON THE DOCUMENT AS A WHOLE, INCLUDING HALIO AND KERNER AMENDMENTS TO THE STATEMENT: ACCEPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

#### B. PROPOSAL REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF A WINTERIM PROGRAM

Mr. Wriston introduced discussion on the Winterim. Mr. Finner then gave

a presentation regarding the Winterim. Mr. Dilley was recognized by the chair and indicated as chairman of the Courses and Curricula Committee, he would like to report that the committee did unanimously pass a strong endorsement of a Winterim for 1970-71. We should make some creative use of the Winterim.

Mr. Finner in response to a question asked about the evaluation of Winterim programs at other universities stated we received a Winterim evaluation from the University of Hawaii. It was somewhat ambiguous as you would expect some reports to be. It was considered a success considering it was the first year. There were too many activities and not enough coordination.

Mr. Moszynski inquired have you consulted any universities similar in size regarding results of a Winterim? Are you planning to let us see some of the results before we commit the institution to the program?

Mr. Wriston replied no, the decision must be made during the next two or three weeks.

Mr. Moszynski continued it is quite clear that it can be a beneficial experience. It is equally clear that 33 percent will plan a vacation starting now. It will cut educational experience by one week each semester and two weeks in succeeding years. The students will be here in body but not in spirit. Is it planned that this would be a program of a different nature in each department? Could students be required to participate in all four years rather than one?

Mr. Finner responded this only states University policy. What each department decides is their own business.

Mr. Schweizer indicated that the first thing on the floor is whether we want the Winterim or not. We will then go through the details.

Mr. Moszynski asked if we want a Winterim, does it have to be two weeks this year or four weeks another year, or is the calendar precluding that? Mr. Lippert indicated that we have several issues, separate yet interconnected. We want to supplement the action of the Courses and Curricula Committee. They voted for a Winterim for 1970-71 but not for future years. Consider the Winterim for this year only. If we do have one this year, there will be all sorts of problems, some that will have to be worked out. We certainly question whether we should vote affirmatively for the Winterim period. We personally prefer that we confine the Winterim for 1970-71. It seems to me it clarifies and brings it into focus. There is considerable irritation on the calendar. We are not saying it is good or bad. We must distinguish between

the irritation on the calendar and the Winterim program. We should experiment with the Winterim. We propose an amendment to limit the vote on the program for 1970-71.

Mr. Halio stated that on the matter of the Winterim he is in a peculiar position. While he endorses the policy behind it entirely, he opposes its implementation in the way presented to us. It is not thoroughgoing enough. If the policy is valid, it ought to influence the entire teaching process of the entire University. It should not be boxed into a short period between semesters. If we are not going to expand it throughout the entire term, the best place would not be in January, but in May. If students got seriously involved, they would not have to drop everything come February 1 but could continue throughout the summer. For these reasons, he is going to oppose the specific implementations here.

Mr. Kilpatrick said it seems that if we focus on the fact that the calendar has been changed and if it is going to be that way for just one year, we will have this two-week period to experiment. It seems to me academically irresponsible not to make use of time, to do some experimenting. We should have a Winterim in 1970-71.

Mr. Denn stated that he would like to repeat some remarks that were made in the University Council. There will be some severe adjustments on the faculty changing from 15 weeks to 14 weeks, particularly in Engineering. We are going to desperately need those weeks just to have a normal academic program.

Mr. Krum said he can envision a program here that would involve getting students off the campus which would be in keeping with our philosophy. He inquired if anyone has come up with any funding to have this kind of program?

Mr. Finner answered by saying at one of our earlier drafts, a figure of \$100,000 was mentioned. In special cases, the students would be expected to pay a \$15.00 fee as a portion of the funding.

Mr. Schweizer stated he speaks against the Winterim as a fundamental policy. A student should be given some time to do a problem in depth for which they could get credit. The two-week period will not accomplish this. The students feel the curriculum is too limiting. The Winterim has not added anything else.

Mr. Kerner inquired which students were polled? This question refers to page 6 of the document. Mr. Finner replied this was a random sample.

Mr. Kerner asked how many students were questioned? Mr. Hunt responded it was a proportional stratified random sample. The same sample of graduate students as of everyone else. Mr. Kerner indicated graduate students and extension students were overwhelmingly against the Winterim. The graduate program has very little fat in it that can be trimmed away. He does not support the general philosophy of the Winterim as a free-lance program. There is plenty of room for innovation.

Mr. Rosenberry was recognized by the chair and stated that he spoke for the delegation from the English Department. Much of his ammunition has already been fired off by others. It seems a matter of importance in my mind that one general basis for student complaint about the rigidity of our program is the sheer quantitative pressure placed upon them by the five-course standard load each semester. He would like to see it reduced to a four-course load to split them less radically apart. There are programs embodying the Winterim which do reduce the regular fall and spring semesters into four courses and permit the student to take a three-credit course in a solid month or more in the winter or the spring. This program falls between two stalls.

Mr. Glenn indicated that he believed we should make the best of those two weeks. This first year must be experimental. There is doubt that we can change the format at the present time. Some students might aim at special experiences while at the same time, other students might wish to continue their regular course work. We should be quite flexible on that point of view. Most of us should be prepared to be in our offices for our students to complete their own course work.

Mr. Salsbury stated what bothers me is that we are rushed rather hurriedly into something that will not give us a valid experiment. We should recommend to the President that we should scrap the calendar and go back to the 15 weeks. During the first two months of the Senate next year we could come up with a recommendation for a Mayim or whatever. The whole program is ill-designed and ill thought through.

Mr. Comings indicated the calendar is a fait accompli. We should do something with the month of January 1971. We can be rather flexible and adjust to many kinds of programs including one with a Winterim. The College of Engineering has a definite commitment to a professional educational program. Control of the Winterim should be delegated to the College. He is in favor of giving the student as much flexibility as possible, but he should indicate to us what use he has made of it.



Mr. Wriston suggested that there is no doubt that a calendar change has educational implications. The President has the responsibility of making the calendar.

Mr. Finner stated as a faculty member, I share somewhat your feelings about the calendar. As chairman of the ad hoc committee, I was surprised when the calendar was announced. The two issues must be kept separate. After working on the Winterim proposal, I feel it is a worthwhile experiment if we view it in the light of an experiment. Scrap it if it is a failure.

Mr. Hunt said when he was in Grad school, the formal course work and the time in class whether they were being held, did not make that much difference. This would not affect the graduate student that much. He is not sure about Salsbury's remark that it is a hastily proposed program. He was in on the developmental part of the committee. It was not the intent to specify very careful, but very strongly decentralized plans that could be developed on the department basis.

Mr. Moore commented it is extremely unfortunate that it is tied to dormitory residence. A commuter or nonresident would not be welcomed in this program.

Mr. Denn commented it seems that we must recognize that we are talking about two very different experiments. Can we evolve courses in 15 weeks? He contends that he at least cannot cope rationally with two experiments at the same time. Many of my colleagues cannot devise shorter courses and put together a good program between semesters. The calendar does need some modifying. It is hard enough to teach 14 weeks. Why don't we have a one semester of 14 weeks followed by 15?

Mr. Moszynski said that he is concerned that this would be a one-shot experiment. It seems reasonable to think of educational experiences involving a student for a month but not for two weeks. There is no question about the fact that any one of us can shorten a course; we can also accelerate the rate of instruction. But the point is that all of this becomes a rather useless exercise if it must be done again. It would be far better to adopt the suggestion of the Dean to use these two weeks this winter to plan for a meaningful four-week Winterim and complete change-over in our program; otherwise this is merely a stop-gap to fill two weeks that nobody knows what to do with.

Mr. Finner responded one of the reasons why in the course of interaction it became a two-week Winterim was because of concerns expressed over the prospect of shifting to a 13-week semester and a 4-week Winterim was too radical or abrupt a change.

Mr. Williams stated that he is impressed in this discussion about the new calendar and fitting in a two-week Winterim is the idea that everything is going to go as scheduled during the academic year.

Mr. Glenn suggested that the question of opening the dormitory should be made clear. Those who wish to continue with class work should be able to continue in dormitories. If they want to work in a special program or someone wants to spend time in completing a course from previous semester should not be kicked out of his room.

Mr. Sasser stated he just attended a University that had three one-month Winterim periods. Classes were 60 minutes in length instead of 50 minutes in length. After four years the University discarded the Winterim and went to the quarter system.

Mr. Halio inquired what can you do in two weeks with students? The faculty could do a lot in two weeks. Expand the two weeks for the faculty to review intensively and extensively what happened in the 14 weeks. One vehicle would be the Community Design report, if ready. We need more faculty discussion of this type of thing. The question of quantitative versus qualitative values of courses should be studied.

Mr. Finner suggested the bureaucratic device to get around a dormitory problem would be for each department to certify the activity and that would take care of the problem. Many projects that have been carried on at other schools are available. Winterim activities could involve faculty and student discussions.

Mr. Anapol asked what are my majors going to do during the Winterim?

We do not think necessarily that one must work in the major department. There are certain areas, largely in the arts, where two-week programs might be workable.

As long as we are stuck with the calendar, we should have a committee study the whole thing and report back March 15.

Mr. Williams suggested there is an error that is made clear in this report and that is the Winterim must be at the departmental levels. Mr. Finner replied the students could work both in and out of departments.

Mr. Dilley indicated that there was an implication for the faculty to study. The students would be out of the dormitory.

Mr. McDaniel pointed out that we were to have discussion for 45 minutes. We should move toward taking a vote.



Miss DeArmond objected to the implication of Mr. Dilley and Mr. Anapol. We do not understand why a student who is interested cannot go to the Metropolitan Museum or the Philadelphia Academy on his own time just as we on the faculty must do. Why must we carve a chunk out of our academic time to have students do things they could do in the summer months?

Mr. Williams expressed concern in general with apparent subservience to educational policy and principle matters of expediency. We are faced with two matters of expediency. We are confronted with a new calendar and asked to fit a new educational program to it. We are faced with constraints on students in dormitories. The primary goal of the University is education and scholarly work; calendars and availability of dormitories and services are things an effective administration should make available. The decision should be based on educational principle and not on expediency.

Mrs. Bohning commented that she represents a department that welcomes this idea. We need a committee to coordinate department projects.

Mr. Wriston indicated that there is a coordinating committee proposed.

Mr. Mosznyski inquired there was a point raised by Mr. Dilley regarding student attendance during the school year. What is implied by the statement if there is no school session or activities? Does this mean we must approve a Winterim so that the student may stay in the dormitories?

Mr. Wriston retorted when school stops, students leave.

Miss DeArmond asked if we can vote to return to a 15-week semester.

The chair responded we tried to find that out. The calendar is irreversible and fixed for next year. We can vote on it, but I am not certain that we can effect a change.

We are asking that we vote to adopt or reject 1A - 1C of page 2 of the Winterim report.

Motion by Mr. Lippert, seconded by Mr. Anapol: RESOLVED, That we limit the Winterim Program for only the year 1970-71.

Call for the question on the Lippert amendment passed voice vote.

The vote to accept the substitute Lippert amendment passed with one dissension.

Mr. Tingey called for the question, seconded by Mr. Anapol; passed 27 ayes, 13 nays.

Vote on the resolution to establish Winterim for 1970-71: 30 ayes, 10 nays, 2 abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry B. Tingey, Secretary