

DIGEST OF THE SPECIAL MEETING

March 22, 1971

CONVENED: 4:10 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS: Announcements and adoption of the agenda.

REPORTS: Report from the Coordinating Committee on Education regarding the Intercultural Communications program phaseout. (Resolution below under "Bills Reported.")

BILLS REPORTED:

S. Res. 44 (Schweizer), resolution to express the Senate's distress at the proposed cutback in the Intercultural Communications program. Passed 33 ayes, 3 nays, 10 abstentions.

Amendment to above: Passed 32 ayes, 6 nays, 6 abstentions.

ADJOURNED: 5:00 p.m.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

March 22, 1971

MINUTES

The special meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:10 p.m. by President Olson. Senators not in attendance were:

Albert A. Branca	Kevin J. Kerrane	William Pulliam
Mary K. Carl	Paul Knudson	John W. Shirley
Elizabeth D. Cloud	John J. Kramer	Robert W. Stegner
Morton M. Denn	William E. McDaniel	Edward A. Trabant
William S. Gaither	Robert M. Nielsen	John C. Wriston, Jr.

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Olson announced that the special meeting of the Senate to discuss Winterim, tentative notification of which went out with the agenda for the present meeting, will definitely be held on March 29.

Mr. Harward requested that the matter of developments at the State level regarding the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Alcohol be placed on the agenda for March 29. Resolutions on the subject will be placed before the Senate on that date.

II. AGENDA

On motion made by Mr. Crawford, seconded by Mr. Anapol, the agenda was adopted as published.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Report and Recommendations from the Coordinating Committee on Education With Respect to the Intercultural Communications Program Phaseout

Mr. Moszynski, chairman, read to the Senate the attached memorandum addressed to Mr. Olson, and referred to the excerpts from memoranda to Dr. Shirley and President Trabant, also attached. He stated that at the meeting with Provost Shirley, it became apparent that there is a difference of opinion on the interpretation that is to be given to the review of the program which took place last spring. Mr. Moszynski has gained the impression that the Provost considers the report as being less than favorable and therefore feels that curtailment is justifiable. There seems to be some disagreement among the framers of the report as to its interpretation. There is also an honest difference of opinion as to any evidence which has accumulated during the year. Although the committee feels that the program is not only important now but is likely to become more so in the future, both Provost Shirley and Dr. Dillely feel that the evidence has been available and no new evidence has arisen. As the matter now stands, the Provost has reasserted his views of the priorities within the University and has promised to submit the proposal of the committee to the President.

Discussion: Mr. Schweizer asked if the Provost is not in favor of creating a new department. Mr. Moszynski answered that the Provost is in favor of the new department; in fact, the establishment of the department

was speeded up to include the Intercultural Communications program, which was to be one of four parts of the department. Mr. Anapol pointed out that the original review was made in the spring of 1970. In December 1970 (several months later) the program was recognized nationally in that both members of the staff were invited to participate in the National Association of Speech and Communications meeting. Their talks were one of the most successful aspects of the meeting. This was a detached, professional judgment and it is hard to see how this can be regarded as inconsiderable evidence. Mr. Mosznyski replied that reference to this is contained in the report of the Coordinating Committee on Education.

Mr. Lippert confirmed what Professor Moszynski said about the position of the College of Arts and Science. He believes, however, that the program is being associated too closely with the creation of the new department as there is justification for the new department even if Intercultural Communications did not exist. Miss Strattner asked how many courses were now taught, to which Mr. Moszynski replied six in all, two at the 800 level, two at the 600 level, and two at the 400 level. Following a question about the chairman, Mr. Glenn stated that the chairman would not come from Intercultural Communications "since it is our honest opinion that there are people more qualified for the position." Mr. Crawford said it is disappointing that the program would face a cutback but what can we do now? Mr. Mosznyski replied that all the committee could do was look at the situation, present their recommendations to the Senate and to the Provost and the President. He said he had also tried to persuade student organizations to undertake more constructive action than protests; one suggestion was that they try to approach local foundations for funding for one year; he doesn't know the outcome of this suggestion.

Mr. Krum inquired if the key variable is the interpretation of the Provost's Office of the recommendations of the investigating committee's report, to which he replied that this seems to be the case. Mr. Krum said he had served on the committee of review and asked if this committee could meet again. Mr. Kilpatrick indicated that he didn't see how one could get a better statement with a new committee. The report is in final shape and presents a fair summary of the sense of the committee; it seems a clear document to him.

Mr. Schweizer made the following motion, seconded by Mr. Crawford: RESOLVED, That the Senate express its distress at the proposed cutback in the staff of Intercultural Communications because this will curtail a program which seems to be on the upswing in its demand, response, etc., and we support fully the report of the Coordinating Committee on Education.

In further discussion, Mr. Mosznyski said the six courses are not a complete presentation of the program. Others are taught in Extension involving state and Newark police; also, strong interest has been expressed by the Upward Bound program, which hopes to use it next year. To a suggestion that a report be made enumerating these various contributions to the community, Mr. Mosznyski indicated that these contributions had been pointed out but it is a question of priorities between this and other programs.

Mr. Crawford proposed an amendment, seconded by Mr. Williams, requesting Provost Shirley to present his reasons to the Senate for the cutback. Mr. Glenn said he was not in favor of placing an administrative officer in an embarrassing position and requested that the amendment be withdrawn. Mr. Crawford withdrew the amendment. Mr. Brown said he would like to see the amendment retained; he would like to have the opportunity to understand more fully the nature of the position that was taken and the rationale.

Mr. Moszynski said the decision was made about a year ago when there was no Senate; as for the reasons, they have to do with priorities with budgetary implications. On the basis of the report received last year, the Provost felt that the priority of a second position in Intercultural Communications was lower than two other positions, one in Political Science connected to the Ph.D. program, and the other the chairman of the Speech and Communications Department. There are also other priorities not detailed. Mr. Crawford said he understood this but it seems to him that if you have a University functioning on a State level, to reduce its services to the community is not savory. Mr. Moszynski explained that the program has not been funded by the University but by the Unidel Foundation; this year, however, it was supported by the University and it appears in next year's budget as one position; the program has petered out in this light.

Mrs. Eyman inquired as to what the Senate was acting on and asked why were recommendations sent to the President first? The chair replied that the purpose of the meeting is to hear a report from the Coordinating Committee on Education and then to act on it; Mr. Schweizer's motion is the present item of business. Mr. Moszynski indicated that he had called the President of the Senate for instructions; due to the press of time, a decision needed to be sent to the Provost before the Senate met. Mr. Anapol agreed that the committee had to act and he approved its action; however, the Senate must now either affirm or disapprove the committee action.

Mr. Weil proposed the following amendment to the Schweizer resolution: In addition, the Senate recommends that the committee carry its report to the President with full support of the Senate. Mr. Hubbard seconded this motion.

Mr. Harlan expressed concern about the role of the Senate and indicated that he was disinclined to support either the amendment or the resolution. He is not convinced that the Senate is playing a proper role, and asked is the Senate saying there should be two positions here or 13 places in Sociology; he would be happy for the Senate to support the latter but feels it would be improper for him to advance it. He further feels the phrase "being phased out" is not accurate; it is being continued but at a reduced level. Mr. Moszynski replied that the committee felt it was an important program, one which should be supported by the University, but the committee was not attempting to order the Provost's priorities.

Mr. Kilpatrick made a point of clarification: In the memorandum from Professor Moszynski to Dr. Olson, near the middle of the first page, to the sentence "They also recommended to concentrate the program at the undergraduate level and recommended against asking Unidel for long-range support" add the words "as originally planned." Mr. Kilpatrick indicated that original plans called for rapid expansion of the program to seven faculty members.

Mr. Crawford moved the question on the amendment, seconded by Mr. Anapol, and passed voice vote. The Weil amendment as voted on reads: We further request that the committee chairman, J. R. Moszynski, carry this report and resolution to the President of the University. This amendment passed by a count of 32 ayes, 6 nays, and 6 abstentions. Mr. Glenn requested that his abstention be recorded by name.

Mr. Crawford moved the question on the main motion, seconded by Mr. Soles, and passed voice vote.

The Schweizer resolution as voted on reads: RESOLVED, That the University Faculty Senate is most distressed by the proposed cutback in staff of the Intercultural Communications program; we are distressed because the program is on an upswing and is effective both for the University students and the community at large. We therefore support fully the recommendations of the Coordinating Committee on Education. (Amendment) We further request that the committee chairman, J. R. Mosznyski, carry this report and resolution to the President of the University. This resolution as amended passed by a count of 33 ayes, 3 nays, 10 abstentions. Mr. Anapol and Mr. Glenn requested that their abstentions be recorded by name.

Mr. Glenn thanked the Senate and the Coordinating Committee on Education for their consideration of the case, and said he would like to offer just one thought: On the question of priorities, it is a matter of comparing one person presently working in a program and a position to be recruited, something which can always be done sooner or later. Mr. Brown indicated that he would like to learn what are the criteria used in determining priorities. Mr. Halio pointed out that the Senate is dealing with an ex post facto situation and expressed the hope that the Senate would not have to deal with this kind of situation in the future. Mr. Crawford said he would like to second this as a motion or resolution. Mr. Anapol felt this was the sense of the resolution just passed. The chair requested that Mr. Halio draft a written version of his thoughts on the matter.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m. on motion duly made, seconded, and carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry B. Tingey, Secretary

HBT:psb

Attachments

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE  
NEWARK, DELAWARE  
19711

DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

March 22, 1971

M E M O R A N D U M

TO : Dr. Jon H. Olson, President Faculty Senate

FROM : J. R. Moszynski, Chairman Coordinating Committee on Education *Y. Hall*

SUBJECT: Program in Intercultural Communications

In response to the Senate resolution adopted on March 1st, the Committee met twice to consider the problems involved. We have quickly focussed on the educational impact of the Program, rather than priorities and procedures, for reasons which will appear below.

The program was initially funded by the Unidel Foundation for two years. At the end of the 2nd year a review was to be held and a request to Unidel was to be made either for long term funding on a large scale, or for one phase-out year. The review was made last Spring by a 16 - person Committee. They recommended not to expand the program beyond the then current level but recommended the retention of both Professors Glenn and Stewart. They also recommended to concentrate the program at the undergraduate level and recommended against asking Unidel for long-range support. When the report of the Committee became available, the Unidel funds were already committed and even the phase-out funds could not be secured. The University supported the program for 1970-71. Simultaneously a decision was made to accelerate the formation of the Department of Speech and Communication and to incorporate the program in Intercultural Communications within it. The College of Arts and Science requested new positions to accommodate Professors Glenn and Stewart and a Chairman for the new Department. The University was able to provide only two of these positions, particularly in view of an earlier commitment to a proposed Ph.D. program in Political Science which is the No.1 priority in the College of Arts and Science. Professors Glenn and Stewart were informed of this decision last Spring.

Since the review of the program, new evidence of its value has been forthcoming from many quarters, but the importance of this evidence is questioned by the Provost and the Associate Provost.

Dr. Jon H. Olson  
Page 2  
March 22, 1971

At the same time the Dean of the College of Arts and Science indicates that in his assessment the second position in the program in Intercultural Communications ranks in priority behind the new position associated with the Political Science Ph.D. and the new chairmanship for the Department of Speech and Communications. We have been told that at the University level there are many more positions which rate a higher priority than a second position in the Intercultural Communications Program. We have not been told what these higher priorities might be except that they relate to programs to which earlier commitments have been made.

We have summarized our discussions and recommendations in a letter to Provost Shirley and in a separate one to President Trabant. These are appended. A subcommittee has met with Dr. Shirley, Dr. Dilley and Dr. Lippert, to present our recommendations. Dr. Shirley reiterated the question of budgetary priorities. This writer, at least, has gained the impression that the report of last Spring's evaluation of the Program was interpreted as not very favorable, justifying curtailment of the Program and even possibly complete elimination. It does appear that this was not the intent of at least some of the framers of this report. Dr. Shirley has promised to present the Committee's recommendations to President Trabant but did state that he would have to reassert his views, when asked.

JRM/mi

UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE  
NEWARK, DELAWARE  
19711

DEPARTMENT OF MECHANICAL AND AEROSPACE ENGINEERING

Excerpt from memorandum to Dr. J. W. Shirley from  
J. R. Moszynski, dated March 12, 1971.

We were concerned particularly with the value to the University and with the educational impact of the Intercultural Communications Program and with the effect thereon of the decision not to retain Professor Stewart.

We agree with the need to exercise budgetary restraint and to weigh carefully the various priorities. Insofar as they have been placed before us, we are in sympathy with the priorities within the College of Arts and Science, particularly with regard to the Ph.D. Program in Political Science.

We are, however, in substantial agreement within the Committee that the Program in Intercultural Communications is of very great value to the University and merits very high priority on the University level. We recommend that every possible effort be made to continue the Program, at least at the present level.

The Committee has been greatly impressed by the universal praise of the Program from diverse quarters. These included students who approached several of us on an individual basis to register both their appreciation of the courses offered and the two Professors involved, and their concern that the Program should not be curtailed. The students were moved to present a petition,

which contained over 200 signatures, and the text of which is appended. Strong praise came also from national professional societies in Speech and Communications and from Faculty of several Colleges and Departments, whose students participate in the courses offered in the Program, notably the College of Education and the College of Nursing. The students and personnel in College Try feel that the courses in Intercultural Communications provide an important analysis of many of the problems they face. The Program has proved very valuable to the immediate Delaware Community as witnessed by the 100 students registered in Extension courses last Spring. The Division of University Extension estimates that its income from Intercultural Communications Programs is approximately \$4,000 per year. The Division suggests that this income could be used to help maintain the present level of the Program through the retention of Professor Stewart.

The Program, as at present constituted, contributes substantially to the goal of providing a high quality liberal education, which goal the Community Design Commission considers to be of very high priority. It exposes students to a unique and truly interdisciplinary approach to complex sociological problems. The students appear to have a sincere interest in it. Some evidence of this may be found in the fact that in two years the enrollment has grown to 107 students; 50 of those in courses offered by Professor Stewart. In particular, Professor Stewart's course U 466 has grown from 5 students when first offered last Fall to 33 students this semester.

The problem of Intercultural Communications is recognized as one of great immediate and continuing importance to our society. The number of scholars of national stature in the field is very small and the University is fortunate to have two of this small number on its campus. There exists the potential for developing a program of considerable national impact in line with the expressed aim of placing the University in a position of national leadership in higher education. This opportunity would probably be lost if the program were cut in half.

In the light of the above, the Committee is in agreement that the Program should be retained at least at the present level and that the necessary additional financial support for this be urgently sought from sources outside the University. If this search were impractical or fruitless, we would urge that the budgetary priorities be seriously reconsidered at the University level, rather than at the level of the College of Arts and Science, with a view to retain the services of both Professor Glenn and Professor Stewart.

Excerpt from memorandum to President E. A. Trabant from J. R. Mosznyski dated March 12, 1971

We would like to suggest the following possible alternative courses of action:

1. That the University make every possible effort to secure outside financial support for the Program, allowing its continuation next year at the present level.
2. That the University provide the necessary additional funds to insure such continuation next year but at the same time the Faculty in the Program and the University Administration seek longer range support from outside sources.
3. That the budgetary priorities at the University level be reconsidered with the aim to continue the Program at the present strength.