

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 11, 1974

MINUTES

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

Michael Barney

Robert L. Nicholls

Karen Toht

Richard Norman

Edward A. Trabant

Daniel C. Neale

Jonathan E. Taylor

The President of the Senate noted that the special meeting was restricted to discussion of the proposed Winter session. The Senate had a clear obligation to advise President Trabant on the academic dimension of proposed changes. In fact, Professor Smith noted, it is impossible to separate the purely academic from other issues. Therefore, Provost Campbell had prepared answers to several questions posed by the Senate Executive Committee concerning the nature of the Winter session. (The questions and a summary of the Provost's replies follow.)

WILL WINTERIM ITSELF CONTINUE, OR ARE THERE PRESENT PLANS TO PHASE OUT WINTERIM?

Provost Campbell: No, there are no current plans to phase out Winterim-type activities unless the Senate committee finds that the current Winterim program is not sound. We have to wait for their committee to see if Winterim-type activities have been successful on academic grounds.

IF THERE IS A WINTER SESSION, WILL STUDENT PARTICIPATION BE VOLUNTARY? OR, TO PUT IT ANOTHER WAY, HOW DO YOU ESTIMATE THE PROPORTION OF STUDENTS THAT WILL ATTEND?

Provost Campbell: It is difficult to estimate how many students will attend. If we use Winterim as a guide we have about 5,000 students who attend for the three-week session. Student participation would be voluntary. Tuition covers student participation; participation in the Winter session would be handled in the same way. Students wanting to take part in Winter session would do so without paying any fees beyond the regular tuition for the nine-month academic year.

FACULTY APPARENTLY WILL BE REQUIRED TO PARTICIPATE ON AN ALTERNATING YEAR BASIS; IF A FACULTY MEMBER DIRECTS A WINTERIM PROJECT, WILL THAT COUNT AS AN "ON" YEAR?

Provost Campbell: If a Winterim-type project is part of the unit's winter session program, the faculty member's participation would be counted as participation in the Winter session.

CAN WE ASSUME THAT THE DEPARTMENTS WILL DECIDE WHICH COURSES ARE SUITABLE TO BE OFFERED IN THE WINTER SESSION, AS IS THE CASE NOW FOR SUMMER SESSION PROGRAMS?

Provost Campbell: Yes, academic units will decide what courses they will offer as is done in Summer Session.

SUPPOSE A FACULTY MEMBER HAD RESEARCH FUNDS FROM OUTSIDE THAT ALLOWED HIM TO BUY A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF "RELEASED TIME"--IS THERE ANY REASON WHY THIS SAME NOTION CANNOT BE EXTENDED TO THE PROPOSED WINTER SESSION?

Provost Campbell: As is presently the case, released time on grants could count as activity.

HOW LONG WILL THE WINTER SESSION CONTINUE? HOW WILL WE DECIDE IF IT IS A SUCCESS OR A FAILURE?

Provost Campbell: The proposed Winter session would last five weeks but it would be on an experimental basis and would be evaluated as is the current Winterim. We would have to evaluate the Winter session; there are a number of mechanisms that could be used for that purpose. (Provost Campbell spoke of University committees, Senate committees or COPE as possible evaluators.)

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE SOURCES OF NONACADEMIC PRESSURE TO WHICH THE ADMINISTRATION IS RESPONDING IN PROPOSING A WINTER SESSION?

Provost Campbell: Having a Winter session would increase the utilization of our plant. There are financial pressures both from the State and from the students. A Winter session would remove some of that pressure. Students could receive degree sooner. The cost to the student would be less (over a time period) and would allow students to participate in more activities.

(The Provost continued answering questions posed by Senators as follows.)

HOW MANY CREDITS COULD A STUDENT SIGN UP FOR IN THE FIVE-WEEK TERM?

Provost Campbell: This would probably be handled as Summer Session. Six hours would be a normal load though it would be largely dependent on the student.

WOULD THEY BE ABLE TO GRADUATE EARLY? SIX CREDITS FOR THREE YEARS IS ONLY 18 CREDITS. THEY WON'T BE GRADUATING A FULL YEAR EARLY.

Provost Campbell: It will depend on the student.

WOULD THERE BE A POSSIBILITY THAT THE PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENT COULD BE FULFILLED IN SUMMER TIME VERSUS THE WINTER TIME? COULD A FACULTY MEMBER TRADE OFF?

Provost Campbell: We would have to look at it in the context of the department.

IF A COURSE THAT WAS OFFERED DID NOT MAKE IT, WHAT HAPPENS TO FACULTY MEMBER?

(Dr. Gibson noted that present Summer Session policy calls for developing a second section of the instructor's course which showed an adequate enrollment.)

WOULD THE ACCENT BE ON WINTERIM-TYPE OR REGULAR ACADEMIC OFFERINGS?

Provost Campbell: We would have to work out a balance. Both are possible.

(Dean Rosenberry remained concerned with the possibility of trade-offs and the distribution of Winter session teaching assignments. This suggested to him that we would have to have clearly understood basis for these assignments. Every faculty member would have to be required to teach one course every other year. No one should be given a free ride. If a faculty member could not fulfill his obligation within the Winter session framework, there would have to be some other mechanism by which that obligation would be fulfilled. The answers to questions concerning such a mechanism not being answerable at the departmental level suggests that the administration will have to address itself to it.)

AS YOU SEE IT, WOULD IT BE FAIR TO ASSUME FACULTY MEMBERS FULL LOAD WOULD APPROXIMATE THE EQUIVALENCY OF ONE REGULAR THREE-HOUR COURSE?

Provost Campbell: Yes, a regular three-hour course.

WHAT EVIDENCE DO WE HAVE THAT SUGGESTS THE FIVE-WEEK WINTER SESSION WOULD BE OF ACADEMIC VALUE TO THE STUDENTS?

Provost Campbell: There are many educational opportunities possible in a Winter session which are not possible in a Summer session. (Several examples were given.) It is clear that a literal interpretation of the comments here and in the Fletcher report would suggest that you have very good justification for abolishing the Summer session.

HOW WOULD A WINTER SESSION INCREASE THE USE OF OUR FACILITIES?

Provost Campbell: We can demonstrate that the facilities are being used: two summer sessions, a winter session, plus regular semesters. Winterim-type activities do not utilize fully the facilities of the campus. A lot of work is done off campus where students do not use our facilities.

HOW WILL THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR BE CHANGED?

Provost Campbell: We would move graduation back to where it used to be in early June.

(Prof. Smith wrote schedule on board: Winter Session: Start January 6, End February 7; Spring Term: Start February 17, End June 7.)

IN CERTAIN AREAS THERE IS QUITE A NEED FOR FLEXIBILITY. THE PROPER SEQUENCE OF COURSES IS NECESSARY. MANY COURSES TAKE A LONGER PERIOD.

Provost Campbell: Departments must sequence courses in the best way for the students.

ANALOGIES KEEP BEING MADE BETWEEN FIVE-WEEK WINTER SESSIONS AND SUMMER SESSIONS. DOESN'T IT MAKE MORE SENSE TO RETAIN THE PRESENT WINTERIM CALENDAR AND ADD TWO WEEKS TO THE SUMMER PROGRAM?

Provost Campbell: Retaining the present Winterim calendar would not provide the expanded educational opportunities for our students.

WHAT PORTION OF THE FACULTY NOW PARTICIPATES IN WINTERIM?

(Interim figures provided by the Committee on Winterim are attached as a supplement to these minutes.)

HOW WOULD THE ADMINISTRATION VIEW OFFERING ONLY 600 LEVEL COURSES WITH RESTRICTED ENROLLMENT?

Provost Campbell: Every department should raise questions as to what is academically sound based on the educational needs of their students. Quite a few questions would be raised as to the value of that possibility. Students would probably question that practice.

ONE TO THREE WINTERIM CREDITS ARE NOW GIVEN ON A PASS/FAIL BASIS. DURING A WINTER SESSION WOULD ACADEMIC CREDIT BE GIVEN AT THE SAME TIME AS WE CONTINUE PASS/FAIL FOR PROJECTS?

Provost Campbell: Credit for regular credit courses would be given.

AREN'T YOU PROPOSING PUTTING US BACK TO THE SUMMER GRADUATION DATE BUT KEEPING US AT OUR REGULAR STARTING DATE? THAT'S TWO WEEKS MORE.

Provost Campbell: Yes, it does add two more weeks.

WOULD IT BE POSSIBLE TO OFFER A REQUIRED COURSE DURING THIS TERM?

Provost Campbell: Yes.

WHY IS THIS FIVE-WEEK PROPOSAL FOR WINTER SESSION INTEGRATED INTO THE REGULAR PACKAGE OF THE OTHER TWO REGULAR SEMESTERS?

Provost Campbell: Lots of students participate that might not if they had to pay more for it.

President Smith noted that at last Monday's regular meeting several requests were made for more information on the success of the Winterim session. Prof. Frick was present to present available answers. Prof. Frick reported that fifty

percent of faculty had returned Winterim questionnaires. Of those fifty percent, the following results were obtained: 63% favored three-week Winterim; 4% favored five-week Winter session; and 12% favored abolishing the whole thing. The majority of faculty seemed to go for concept of Winterim, a kind of independent experience that Winterim has provided.

Prof. Smith read last week's postponed resolution and noted that it was before the Senate.

Therefore be it resolved on the basis of information reported to it by the Committee on Educational Innovation and Planning that the Senate recommends that the University not move to a five-week Winter session for the calendar year 1974-75.

Prof. Crawford reported that his department was unanimously opposed to the Winter session, based on the following points: Five weeks is too short for both research and writing. Inferior work is often demanded for the same amount of credits. Research projects are not going to be very successful. There are alternates, one being to make the summer term stronger. Courses can't be shortened without loss of content. New courses would appear more to our majors. We would end up with students taking courses when offered with weaker requirements. If we have to compress material into five-week format we are going to have less time to do research. There would be a dilution in the quality of teaching.

Prof. Bonner noted that the five-week term presents problems for his college where the undergraduate program is accredited by Collegiate School of Business. Faculty are limited in the number of hours they can offer by accreditation requirements. They are currently trying to get accreditation for MBA program. If Winterim program was expanded and the faculty member required to teach an extra three-hour course, an accreditation problem would exist.

Prof. McLuckie requested a summary of the report prepared by the Committee on Educational Innovation and Planning. Prof. Fletcher, the Chairman, replied that his Committee had received a fair indication of feelings. The College of Nursing did not apply. Fifty percent of Arts and Science replied, as did about fifty percent of the remainder. A large percentage of faculty wished to retain Winterim as is. People knew very little about what they were answering. Salaries and other nonacademic issues covered in the Provost's remarks were not discussed.

DO YOU SEE THE ADMINISTRATIONS PROPOSAL AS EDUCATIONALLY SOUND?

Prof. Fletcher: The Committee was asked to forward its report which it did. The members of the Committee favor Winterim over the Winter session.

WAS THERE ANY FOLLOW-UP TO THE UNITS WHO DID NOT REPLY?

Prof. Fletcher reported that information was collected during the pressured weeks of December and January and that no follow-up was conducted.

Dean McHugh noted that the College of Home Economics did not receive a questionnaire. Prof. Fletcher replied that a response to a questionnaire was received and had been signed by Prof. Bieber.

Prof. Morstain mentioned that the Committee's findings were neither conclusive nor comprehensive. In trying to write a general report, a lot of details were left unstated. A number of departments did indicate that many of their regular courses were oversubscribed and that new offerings could be developed for the Winter session. (Several examples were given.)

Doug Brown, President of the Resident Student Association and a member of Undergraduate Cabinet to the Vice President for Student Affairs, spoke of the cost and educational growth from a student standpoint. He favored a five-week session.

Sam Tomaino, President of the Undergraduate Council of the College of Education, reported the strong sentiment among education undergraduates in favor of the current Winterim.

Prof. Pikulski commented that many students in Education were under the impression that there would be an additional fee.

Dean Carl stated that regardless of which way the decision went, academic autonomy had been endorsed. She felt that autonomy in unit decision making was extremely important.

Prof. Schweizer reported that he had polled the Chemistry Department which voted 17-4 against the mini winter term. He suggested that the subject be tabled again until we could go back and poll them on the basis of information provided by the Administration (at this meeting).

The motion to postpone was made by Prof. Acunha and seconded by Prof. Finnie.

Prof. Bonner agreed that there was more information to be obtained, but argued that the bargaining procedure was well underway and that decisions had to be made. We should support the original motion and emphasize that it is a temporary decision for one year. He saw the five-week term as having some real benefits.

Comments followed to the effect that there was no support for a five-week term and no opposition to returning to the old system, and that the Senate should accept their responsibility and speak to the original motion. Others favored postponing the issue for departments had been polled under false assumptions. The Winter session was to be an either/or proposition rather than having two types of programs running simultaneously.

Dr. Worthen called for question which was seconded by Prof. Crawford. The chair noted that a postponed motion would appear on the agenda for the next regular meeting of the Senate. The motion to postpone failed, 15-30.

The chair clarified the original resolution before the Senate. After additional debate, Prof. Crawford called for question. Debate was closed and the motion to oppose the Winter session on academic grounds carried: 28-17.

Prof. Bonner called for the Committee on Educational Innovation and Planning to continue their survey in order to provide answers to many unanswered questions. This motion was seconded and carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 PM.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "CD Marler". The letters are cursive and somewhat stylized.

Charles D. Marler, Secretary

Attachment

Winterim *Total Enrolled - 1/25/74 (includes drops - undoubtedly more adds since)

Total - Undergraduate & graduate	Resident & Del. Conditional	Non-Resident
4,737	3,164	1,468

Divided almost equally male/female and by year (freshman-senior)

	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	<u>(1974-Grad)</u>
Undergrad	3,647	4,275	4,632	
Ag Sci.	195	242	278	10
Arts & Science	1,771	2,025	2,172	50
Business & Economics	331	408	516	10
Education	638	570	514	10
Engineering	276	241	252	15
Health Sciences	----	45	64	0
Home Economics	239	297	321	5
Nursing	137	272	301	1
Phys Ed	---	104	103	2
CP/Georgetown	60	42	15	
CP/Wilmington		29	14	
Urban Affairs				2
Graduate	194	150	105	
Continuing Ed	79	153	82	

No. in group projects:	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>	No. in independent projects:	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Students	3,877	3,200	Students	701	1500
Faculty	238	244	Faculty	435	494

*Final data on number completing will be available by March 15, 1974