

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

December 1, 1980

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, December 1, 1980 at 4:00 p.m., with President Toensmeyer presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Margaret Benner  
Donald Crossan  
Jeffrey Davidson

James Fisher  
Stuart McGee  
David Regehr

Douglas Ridge  
David Schulz  
David Stixrude .

Senators excused were: Edith Anderson, Eugene Chesson, Maurice Cope, Alexander Doberenz, Charles Epifanio, Andrea Kapolka, Nancy King, Anne McCourt-Lewis, Erwin Saniga, James Soles, E.A. Trabant.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA. The Agenda was adopted as distributed.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. The Minutes of the November 3, 1980 meeting having not yet been distributed, their consideration was postponed to the January meeting.

III. REMARKS BY PROVOST CAMPBELL. Provost Campbell announced that the two Associate Provost positions have been filled. Effective January 1, Dr. Larry Travis will become Associate Provost for Computing, and Dr. Eudora Pettigrew will become Associate Provost for Instruction. Dr. Travis is presently chair of the Department of Computing at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; Dr. Pettigrew is presently chair of the Department of Urban Affairs and Metropolitan Studies in the College of Urban Development at Michigan State.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS. President Toensmeyer reminded the senators that, as required by the Bylaws, there would be a meeting of the Senate on January 5, during Winter Session.

He also announced that Prof. Gertrude Stokes has been appointed by the Committee on Committees to replace Prof. Pikulski, who has resigned from the Promotions and Tenure Committee.

Regarding the showing of X-rated films on campus, President Toensmeyer reported that he is still getting calls on this matter, and it is still an issue outside the University.

V. OLD BUSINESS. None.

VI. NEW BUSINESS.

Item A, a resolution from the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Privileges to revise step 4A of the Student Grievance Procedure, was introduced by Prof. Martin, chair of the committee. Prof. Martin explained that the proposed changes would restore a phrase, which had been in the original version of the Procedure, that allowed the

committee to decide not to hear an appeal, and would establish the grounds upon which the committee would rehear a grievance. Senator Haskell asked if the proposed changes would still permit an appeal on substantive as well as procedural grounds. Prof. Martin responded that the change would permit the committee to decide not to hear an appeal when they felt the parties had had a fair chance to present their cases and to defend themselves at the previous levels, and there was no new evidence in the case.

Senator Waid asked whether the committee's recommendation came as a result of their having reviewed the entire statement, including the preamble which gives the basis on which a student may use the procedure, or if it was in response to procedural problems they had run into. Prof. Martin responded that they had reviewed all the steps in the procedure but, because of the backlog of cases, they were primarily interested in getting a procedure that worked and they had not yet considered revising the whole statement.

There was no further discussion and President Toensmeyer called for the vote; the following was approved by a hand vote:

*RESOLVED, that step 4A of the Student Grievance  
Procedure: Complaints Related to Grades, shall read:*

- 4A. *An undergraduate student or faculty member who is not satisfied with the fairness or thoroughness of the procedures used in step 3A may appeal to the Faculty Welfare and Privileges Committee of the University Faculty Senate. This Committee, on reviewing the case, may uphold the decision of the departmental committee without a hearing, or it may decide the appeal should be heard. For purposes of a hearing, the Chairperson of the Committee shall appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of three faculty members and two undergraduate students. The decision of the Faculty Welfare and Privileges Committee or its ad hoc hearing committee shall be final.*

Item B, a resolution for approval of a Doctor of Education (Ed.D.) program and degree, was introduced by Prof. O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. Prof. O'Neill explained that the program and the degree were developed in response to an expressed need of school administrators in the state, and his committee felt that such a program should be administered by the University College of Education. Regarding the financial implications, he said no additional resources from the University would be required and that support for the program would come under the responsibility of the dean to shift priorities within the College of Education.

Prof. Pikulski called attention to a typographical error in the program summary, Attachment 2 of the Agenda: on page 2, paragraph 2, line 2, the number "12" should be "42."

Senator Waid asked how the proposed program fit in with the mission of the College of Education. Prof. O'Neill responded that part of the College's mission was to work with the needs of the state, and in this case with the more than 400 school administrators who expressed a need for advancing their knowledge. Dean Murray agreed that the program fit with the service mission of a land grant college, and noted that at present school administrators had to go out of the state or to programs like Nova and Walden to pursue

their professional training; he added that the Ph.D. program in the College was geared to research training and did not respond to this professional need.

In response to a request for an explanation of the three year cycle of admissions, Prof. Pikulski said the purpose was primarily to keep the number of students at a manageable level.

Senator Kelly asked why a program intended for school administrators was titled "educational" rather than "administrative" leadership. Prof. Pikulski explained that the program was broader than "administrative" would imply, and was intended for curriculum and program leaders, and "educational leadership" was the terminology used in the field. Senator Kelly also asked why the program required only 54 credits when many doctoral programs require a minimum of 60 credits; Prof. Pikulski responded that he didn't know why the number was 54, but that that was in line with other similar programs.

Referring to conversations she has had with teachers in the state about the importance of good school principals, Vice President Hoffecker asked how this program would help the principals do a better job of choosing good teachers, courses, and curricula; Prof. Pikulski responded that some of the course work in the program would deal directly with these problems.

In response to a question about the three Executive Position Papers required for the degree, Prof. Pikulski said that because it was a very practical degree for people already employed in leadership positions in educational settings it was felt that the final synthesis should also be practically oriented, and they had not wanted it to be confused with the traditional research-oriented paper.

Senator Waid asked about the 18 credits which the program requires in the student's area of specialization. Prof. Pikulski responded that most students entering the program would already have some background work and, working with an advisory committee, they would select from among the many appropriate graduate courses already offered at the University, those which complemented the student's background. Referring to the description of the Executive Position Papers in the program summary, Senator Waid asked whether they would be summaries of the candidates' own positions, philosophical ideas and performances, which were pointed toward analyses of their own opinions and perceptions, rather than scholarly studies. Dean Murray replied that the papers would not be exercises in self-indulgence, but were intended to bring the student's thinking up against the accumulated knowledge and the best literature in the field. Senator Waid asked how such papers, in the absence of required original scholarship, would be judged; Prof. Pikulski replied they would have to demonstrate a new way of looking at the existing information, but that the judgments would ultimately depend, as was the case for any dissertation, on the quality of the faculty who supervised the work. Dean Murray added that, unlike the dissertations in the College's Ph.D. program, where students are trained for research, the position papers would not be required to make an original contribution to the field but would be contributions to the candidate's own knowledge and professional development. Senator Waid asked how someone could fail the requirement, and Dean Murray said the candidate must be able to defend his work convincingly.

A discussion on the program's courses and staffing followed. Senate Secretary Reynolds noted that it seemed to be a "nuts and bolts" degree, and asked why philosophy of education was not stressed more; Dean Murray responded that that would be addressed in at least two of the core courses. Secretary Reynolds also commented that in two

years the program would have 36 students and 5 faculty members, and that seemed a lot of work for that kind of manpower; Prof. Pikulski responded that external evaluators, chosen by the Office of Graduate Studies, had concluded the program was workable and had written a very positive report.

Senator Flynn said the courses sounded more like good training workshops and conferences than a program leading to a graduate degree. Dean Murray replied that workshops and conferences were offered at the 500 level and did not count toward a graduate degree, whereas these were 800 level courses which were on a par with other 800 level courses in the University for rigor of requirements.

Dr. Richard Murray, University Coordinator for Graduate Studies, noted that although this was the first time the Senate had received a proposal for a professional doctoral degree, there are many such degrees--for example, the J.D. and M.D.--which are terminal professional degrees. Dr. William Keene, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, spoke in support of the proposed degree, noting that while knowledge was growing in the field of education, fewer young people were entering teaching, so people were moving into leadership positions with very little training and needed this chance to learn to do their jobs better and to advance themselves.

Senator Waid expressed a concern that the program would perpetuate the status quo, because it was designed primarily for people already in administrative and leadership positions; she noted that there are few women or minorities presently in such positions, and asked if the College of Education should not be playing a leadership role in getting more minority individuals trained. Prof. Pikulski responded that a mechanism for this is in the program, with the provision for a year's internship, but he agreed that they should attempt to recruit women and minorities.

Senator Braun asked about the relationship between the Ed.D. program and the Master of Instruction degree; Senator Neale, who teaches in the M.I. program, said that the two programs are for completely different students, with the M.I. program intended for teachers who want to stay in the classroom.

Provost Campbell called for the question. In the absence of objection President Toensmeyer moved to the vote, and the resolution, as follows, was approved by a hand vote, 31 in favor, 7 opposed, with 7 abstentions.

*RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves the establishment of a Doctor of Education Program in Educational Leadership, leading to the degree of Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), on a four year provisional basis, effective September, 1981, with a final review to be conducted in the academic year 1984-1985.*

No further business was introduced. President Toensmeyer reminded the senators of the January 5 meeting, and adjourned the meeting at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



H.T. Reynolds  
Secretary  
University Faculty Senate