UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

DIGEST OF REGULAR MEETING

APRIL 10, 1972

CONVENCED: 4:10 PM.

ANNOUNCEMENTS: President Trabant spoke on budgetary matters.

Request for changes in pension plan was forwarded to and
approved by Board of Trustees but responsible committee
of State legislature indicated they could not take action
at this time.

General Faculty Meeting on April 17.

Special meeting of the Senate on April 24 to consider two
interrelated reports concerning faculty review.

BILLS REFERRED: S.B. 77 - Coordinating Committee on Education - Supplemental report concerning credit by examination in introductory courses. Referred to colleges, then to be reported back to Senate.

BILLS REPORTED: S.B. 82 - Committee on Undergraduate Studies - Establishment of a B.S. Degree Program in Physical Therapy.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED: S.Res. 57 - Professor Munroe - Any Reorganization Plan for the University.

BILLS PASSED: S.B. 79 - Committee on Student and Faculty Honors - Revision of Degree with Distinction Requirements.

S.B. 80 - Ad Hoc Committee on Publications and Press - Delaware Studies.

S.B. 81 - Committee on Committees - Proposed Change in Structure of the Library Committee.

ADJOURNED: 5:45 PM.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. A. Van Gelder

FROM: Dr. J. R. Moszynski /s/ J. R. Moszynski

The Coordinating Committee on Education at the meeting on March 15 passed the following resolution:

That the Committee on Undergraduate Admission and Standing be commended on their proposed policy of accepting area CLEP examinations in lieu of area credits. The implementation of the proposed policy should be deferred until such time as all departments concerned have had an opportunity to inspect and approve the proposed area examinations. Once the approval is obtained, the policy should be implemented at the earliest possible time.

It appears that acceptance of the above resolution would resolve all conflicts between the policy proposed by your Committee and the new policy on credit by examination proposed by the Coordinating Committee and adopted by the Senate.

JRM/rs

CC: Dr. G. R. Bonner, President, University Senate
    Dr. D. E. Ingersoll, Vice President, University Senate
    Dr. D. W. Harward, Secretary, University Senate

Coordinating Committee on Education:
W. G. DeColigny
F. B. Dilley
E. S. Ferguson
B. F. Levin
A. L. Lippert
A. B. Metzner
J. R. Moszynski, Chairman
J. A. Murray
S. Salsbury
A. Van Gelder
RESOLUTION CONCERNING ANY REORGANIZATION

PLAN FOR THE UNIVERSITY - PROF. MUNROE

Resolved: that it is the sense of this body that any reorganization plan submitted to the Board of Trustees should only be submitted after it has been approved by an affirmative vote of either the faculty of the University at a duly constituted faculty meeting or by the representatives of the faculty in the University Senate.

3/6/72
MEMORANDUM

TO:    David Ingersoll, Vice-President
       University Faculty Senate

FROM:  R. McDonough, Chairman
       Senate Committee on Student and Faculty Honors

SUBJECT: Revision of Degree-with-Distinction Requirements

A number of modifications seem desirable in the present requirements for the Degree with Distinction. Accordingly, the Senate Committee on Student and Faculty Honors requests that the Senate consider approval of the attached revised regulations. Changes from the previous regulations are as follows:

1. Various changes in application deadline, thesis due dates, etc., to reflect the present academic calendar.

2. Change in the number of credit hours allowed for the thesis, from 6, 9, or 12 hours, to a uniform 6 hours.

3. Explicit recognition that the research work may be into the subject matter of the major field, as is usual at present, or into the process of teaching the subject matter of the major field.

4. In the event the student does not complete the DD program, e.g., by not finishing his thesis research, by failing to meet the index requirements, or by failing the oral examination, the student will receive six credits for U401-402, and the appropriate grade based on the work actually completed, on the recommendation of the thesis adviser and one other member of the major department. Previously, it was required that in any event a thesis be submitted, and possibly defended, in order that course credit be received.

5. The composition of the oral examining committee has been simplified. Previously, there were required the Chairman of the major department (or his appointee), the thesis adviser, the academic adviser, one other examiner in the major subject, a representative of the Honors Committee, and (possibly) an external examiner. The proposed (minimum) composition is the thesis adviser, one other member of the major department, and a representative of the Honors Committee.
6. Various technical changes in handling the application forms.
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Committee members:

Kermit Cudd, Business and Economics
A. J. DeArmond, Graduate College (English)
Ralph Exline, Arts and Sciences (Psychology)
Stuart Kupferman, Marine Studies
Robert McDonough, Engineering (Electrical), Chairman
Dorothy Moser, Nursing
Wilfred Pemberton, President's Designee (Counseling)
Elaine Richert, AS2
R. L. Salsbury, Agriculture (Animal Science)
Judy Van Name, Home Economics
The Degree with Distinction in a Major Field

What follows is an expansion of the description of this degree found in the University of Delaware Undergraduate Catalog in the chapter on Academic Regulations. Section I below summarizes the essential requirements and procedures; Section II adds important details.

Section I: Summary of requirements and procedures

A. Academic index of 3.0 overall, and 3.5 in the major field (calculated for the work of the junior and senior years), at the time of graduation.

B. Application for the Degree with Distinction program (hereafter called DD) at least one week before Commencement in the spring of the junior year.

C. Registration for and successful completion of U 401 and U 402 (3 credits of each) during the senior year.

D. Successful completion of a thesis based upon independent research by April 15 of the senior year. The research may be directly in the major field, or research into the teaching of the major field, leading to new knowledge about the teaching process.

E. Successful completion of an oral comprehensive examination by May 1 of the senior year.

Section II: Description of requirements and procedures

A. Eligibility

A candidate for the DD must ordinarily have attained a general academic index of 3.0, and an index of 3.5 in his major field, before being permitted to register for the program. However, with the recommendation of the dean of his college, and the chairman of his major department (if applicable), a student who has not met the index requirement may be allowed to enter the DD program. In order to receive the DD, however, he must have attained the overall 3.0 and the major 3.5 (junior and senior years) by the time of graduation.

B. Application

A candidate for the DD must ordinarily apply at least one week before Commencement in the spring of his junior year. There are, however, two possible exceptions to this provision: (1) For a student who expects to complete the requirements for his degree at some time other than the spring Commencement, the date of application and all other deadlines shall be adjusted. (2) Under special circumstances, and with the approval of his dean and his department chairman, a student may be permitted to apply in the fall of his senior year.
Application forms, in triplicate, are available at the Records Office. The candidate should obtain and complete the forms, should have them approved by the prospective thesis adviser and the appropriate department chairman (or Dean, if the College is not departmentalized), and should return them to the Records Office. After the index qualifications have been checked, that office forwards all copies to the chairman of the University Committee on Student and Faculty Honors (hereafter called UCSFH) for approval. He will return one copy to the Records Office, one copy to the DD adviser, and file one copy to accompany class lists of U 401 and U 402.

C. Course

A candidate for the DD must successfully complete U 401 and U 402. This is done by completing a thesis, which is then assigned an appropriate letter grade by the thesis adviser. The assigned grade is reported to the Records Office by the Chairman of the UCSFH. If a student satisfies this requirement, but fails to meet the index requirements for the DD, he is not penalized by loss of credit: the six credit hours in U 401 and U 402 may be counted as electives in his major field. The student's DD adviser and at least one other member of his major department, however, must certify that the work completed for the DD is acceptable for six credit hours.

D. Thesis

The thesis is the final result of the work of U 401 and U 402. The format shall agree with the regulations of the College of Graduate Studies for the master's degree. Copies of the thesis shall be available to all members of the oral examination committee at least one week before the examination. One copy of the thesis, in its final form, shall be submitted to the chairman of the UCSFH, bound, and deposited in the University Library, at a cost to the student which in 1971 was approximately $4.00.

E. Oral examination

The oral examination is required of all candidates and is intended primarily to demonstrate the student's knowledge of his major field. It should, however, offer an opportunity for him to comment upon and defend his thesis, if the several readers have any questions about it.

The examination committee shall consist of at least three persons: at least two members of the student's major department, one of whom must be his DD adviser, and a representative of the UCSFH chosen by the chairman of that Committee, in so far as possible for his competence in the student's field.
The DD adviser shall ordinarily act as moderator of the examination. His responsibilities are these: (1) to arrange a place and date for the examination; (2) to assure that a copy of the thesis is given to each member of the examination committee at least one week before the examination; (3) to send each member of the examination committee, in advance of the examination, a list of the courses in his major department and in related areas which the candidate has taken; (4) to provide opportunity for everyone present to participate in the examination; (5) to allow time, if necessary, for the student to defend his thesis; (6) to take a vote at the end of the examination to determine its outcome. The representative of the UCSFH shall report the outcome to the chairman of the UCSFH by May 5.

Note: All members of the University faculty, particularly those who have taken part in the DD program, are urged to make suggestions for its improvement. All questions or criticisms should be addressed to the chairman of the UCSFH.
Ad Hoc Committee on Publications and Press

Recommendations on Delaware Studies

The Ad Hoc Committee on Publications and Press was charged with the responsibility of reviewing the status of Delaware Studies. The Committee having discussed and deliberated the status of Delaware Studies, moves the following:

Whereas the manuscripts for the proposed Volume 1 of Delaware Studies were submitted over five years ago, and, to this date, the volume has not been published, and, whereas, the feasibility of the University's undertaking the publication of any periodical is questionable in the light of recent experience and comment by knowledgeable publishers, and, whereas, the funds available for publication of a periodical such as Delaware Studies should be used to support a more feasible publication, therefore, be it resolved that the Ad Hoc Committee on Publications and Press be instructed by the University Senate to return all manuscripts to their authors with an expression of regret that, despite the manuscripts' earlier acceptance by the faculty Publications Committee for Volume 1 of Delaware Studies, that Delaware Studies will not be published.

Moreover, whereas the publication of these manuscripts may have an effect on such matters as the author's retention and promotion, and whereas the manuscripts were accepted for publication, therefore be it resolved that the Senate recommends that the Director of the University Press forward a letter to each author stating the matters set forth in this resolution and expressing the University's regrets.

Ad Hoc Committee on Publications & Press:

Eleanor D. Craig
Wallace A. Dynes, Chairman
George H. Gibson
Ronald E. Martin
James M. Merrill
Russell B. Powers
N. Schwartz
MEMORANDUM

TO: David E. Ingersoll
    Vice President, Faculty Senate

FROM: W. E. Baxter
      Chairman, Committee on Committees

RE: PROPOSED CHANGE IN COMMITTEE STRUCTURE

January 28, 1972

The Committee on Committees would like to propose a change in the structure of the Library Committee from the committee representation which is now prescribed in the document Standing Committee System of the Faculty and Its Senate Approved by Faculty Senate, December 14, 1970 as this committee "shall consist of the Director of Libraries; three faculty members, of whom one shall be chairman; and one undergraduate and one graduate student".

The recommendation is to change this statement to read

"This committee shall consist of the Director of Libraries; one faculty from each of the several colleges, of whom one shall be chairman; and one undergraduate student; and one graduate student".

The motivation for this change comes from an appeal from the present committee which feels that a wider range of opinion is necessary to the formulation of policy than is now provided by the Committee as constituted. The Committee on Committees agrees that we should meet the request of this committee and recommends the proposed change. However, we also wish to remind the Faculty that membership on committees should imply their responsibility to give considerations and judgements which are broader than the possible parochial viewpoint of the college to which they may belong.
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Committee on Committees: W. E. Baxter, Chairman  T. D. Myers
                         C. E. Birchenall      M. Sasser
                         B. J. Kelly          J. S. Shellenberger
                         E. H. Kerner        G. F. Somers
                         W. C. Krauss        J. W. Weaver
                         A. J. Magoon        B. Wilcox
REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

April 10, 1972

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:10 PM. Senators not in attendance were:

Irma Ayers
William J. Benton
Edward W. Comings
John S. Crawford
William G. DeColigny
William S. Gaither
Kathryn R. Hallman
Dorothy A. Kennedy
John J. Kramer

Arnold L. Lippert
William E. McDaniel
Francis J. Merceret
Thomas F. Merrill
Dorothy H. Moser
Thomas D. Myers
Robert M. Nielsen
Arlette I. Rasmussen

John W. Shirley
Grant S. Snyder
Robert W. Stegner
Peter M. Weil
John E. Worthen
John C. Wriston, Jr.
Laszlo Zsoldos
George Nocito

I. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(1) President Trabant spoke to the Senate on budgetary matters. The manner of requesting funds from the State of Delaware was changed this year. The tradition was for the University to make its request to the State through a meeting with the Governor, then going to the Joint Finance Committee with their recommendations. This year, before meeting with the Governor, they went to all three counties and met with different legislators and other citizens, in order to explain to the people the value of the University of Delaware to the State of Delaware, and the needs of the University in the next fiscal year.

The total budget for this year is $46.7MM, with an anticipated $52MM budget for next year. The State appropriation for 1971-72 for operations is $13,177,450. The funds recommended for 1972-73 total $14,720,565, an increase of $1,543,115 or 11.7%.

The University is subject to wage guidelines; however, President Trabant believes we are able to justify to the Wage Control Board an average 6.3% wage increase.

(2) Mr. Bonner reported on the status of changes in the pension plan. This request was forwarded to and approved by the Board of Trustees. When sent to the responsible committee of the State legislature, they indicated they could not take action at this time.

(3) There will be a General Faculty Meeting on April 17, 4 PM, in Mitchell Hall Auditorium.

(4) There will be a special meeting of the Senate on April 24 to consider two interrelated reports concerning faculty review.
(5) The minutes of the last regular meeting were approved as distributed.

II. OLD BUSINESS

(1) Supplemental report from the Coordinating Committee on Education concerning credit by examination in introductory courses - S.B. 77 -

The principle difference between the report from the Coordinating Committee on Education and the report from the Undergraduate Admission and Standing Committee, concerns the acceptance of area tests which would be used at the discretion of the departments involved. The Coordinating Committee on Education report would allow departments to have a chance to examine and accept or reject area tests; long-term acceptance will be subject to final approval by departments and will be on a trial basis for next year.

Mr. Williams moved to delete the last sentence of the paragraph and add: "Only after departmental approval in general can examinations be effective." This amendment carried by voice vote.

Mr. Geiger made a motion to refer this report to the colleges and their appropriate governmental machinery, and then report back to the Senate. The amendment carried by voice vote.

(2) Resolution from Mr. Munroe concerning any reorganization plan for the University - S. Res. 57 -

Mr. Munroe stated that his resolution says that the Senate or general faculty should approve any reorganization plan. His resolution was seconded, and passed by voice vote.

(3) Revision of Degree with Distinction requirements from the Committee on Student and Faculty Honors - S.B. 79 -

After Mr. McDonough discussed the report with the Senate, the motion to accept the revisions carried by voice vote.

(4) Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Publications and Press concerning Delaware Studies - S.B. 80 -

There was no debate and the motion passed by voice vote.

III. NEW BUSINESS

(1) Report from the Committee on Committees proposing a change in the structure of the Library Committee - S.B. 81 -

Mr. Sasser stressed the importance of change in membership on this committee. The motion passed by voice vote.
(2) Report from the Committee on Undergraduate Studies:

(a) Recommendation concerning the establishment of a B.S. Degree Program in Physical Therapy - S.B. 82 -

Mr. Halio moved to defer action on this part of the Committee report until the May meeting. The motion carried.

Mr. Salsbury announced there will be an open hearing in three weeks.

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Donald W. Harward, Secretary
S.B. 77 - CREDIT BY EXAMINATION IN INTRODUCTORY COURSES - SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT

That the Committee on Undergraduate Admission and Standing be commended on their proposed policy of accepting area CLEP examinations in lieu of area credits. The implementation of the proposed policy should be deferred until such time as all departments concerned have had an opportunity to inspect and approve the proposed area examinations. Only after departmental approval in general can examinations be effective.

4/10/72
MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty Members

FROM: John S. Crawford, Secretary
University Faculty Senate

SUBJECT: Correction in Minutes of April 10, 1972, Senate Meeting

A correction has been made to the minutes of the April 10, 1972, regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate to read as follows:

The total budget for this year is $46.7MM, with an anticipated $52MM budget for next year. The State appropriation for 1971-72 for operations is $13,177,450. The funds recommended for 1972-73 total $14,720,565, an increase of $1,543,115 or 11.7%.

Please indicate this correction on your copy of the minutes.

dpe
MEMORANDUM

TO: Professor Donald W. Harward, Chairman,
Department of Philosophy

FROM: E. A. Trabant, President

May 3, 1972

I write to ask you to make a correction in the minutes of the April 10, 1972 meeting of the Faculty Senate.

My reference to the total budget of the University being $46.7 million and going to $52 million for 1972-73 was not related to the State appropriation. The State appropriation for 1971-72 for operations is $13,177,450. The funds recommended for 1972-73 total $14,720,565 an increase of $1,543,115 or 11.7%.

The phraseology of your minutes suggests that the State is providing the difference between $46.7 million and $52 million, or an increase of more than $5.5 million from the State. This is not at all the case.
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