

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 4, 1980

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on February 4, 1980 at 4:00 with President Smith presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Edith Anderson	Robert Gilbert	Jerold Schultz
Maurice Cope	James Leathrum	Mark Sharnoff
Donald Crossan	Gerard Mangone	John Sullivan
Chris Facciolo	Charles Marler	Stephen Woodward

Senators excused were: William Boyer, Alexander Doberenz, Helen Gouldner, Irwin Greenfield, John Pikulski, Erwin Saniga, Walter Vincent, Peter Warter.

I. Adoption of the Agenda. President Smith noted that the Agenda as distributed contained two sections numbered "V"; the second of these, "New Business," should be numbered "VI." He announced that items D and E of New Business had been withdrawn at the request of the sponsoring committee. The Agenda was adopted with these changes.

II. Approval of the Minutes. The Minutes of the meetings of November 5 and December 3, 10, and 17, 1979 were approved as distributed.

III. Remarks by President Trabant. President Trabant called the Senate's attention to his report on the Winter Session, published in "From the Corner Office" in the last Newsletter. He expressed his concern that perhaps Winter Session had veered from its original Winterim concept, and recommended that the Senate look for ways to keep the innovative and creative components alive.

On a second topic President Trabant reported that there is a difference of about 1.1 million dollars between the amount of state support the University has requested and the lesser amount in the governor's budget proposal. He noted that the major difference is a \$900,000 reduction in the "Operations" line, which is support of academic and scholarly endeavors. The remainder of the difference is \$200,000 for the Work/Study program and \$55,000 for a Gerontology program which were not recommended for funding in the governor's request. He said the University statement that, if their budget request were granted, in-state tuition would not increase and out-of-state tuition would go up \$150 per year, would have to be re-examined if the request were not fully funded.

On a third and related topic, President Trabant reported that, despite a 21% cut in consumption in the past, the University's utility costs are multiplying rapidly. He asked that any suggestions for ways to reduce this expense be addressed to Dr. Mayer, Associate Vice President for Facilities Management.

IV. Announcements. President Smith read the following resolution, which was approved by the Board of Trustees at their December meeting, regarding University mortgages:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT. . .
The maximum term of the mortgage will not exceed 30 years, or until the eligible member attains 70 years of age, whichever is the shorter term.

President Smith announced a minor in Psychology; in the absence of challenge the minor, as follows, was approved:

Total credit hours: 18

Required of all minors: PSY 201 3 credits

Required choice of alternatives 6 credits

*A. Choose one 3 credit course from among the following three:
PSY 301, PSY 303, or PSY 325*

and

*B. Choose one 3 credit course from among the following three:
PSY 310, PSY 312, or PSY 314*

Elective credits: 9 credits (three of which may be from special problems or research courses, e.g. PSY 366, PSY 466, or PSY 468) to be chosen from any regularly scheduled 300--400--or 600 level departmental courses.

Students wishing to discuss such a minor should contact the Department Chair or Assistant Chair for advisement.

V. Old Business

Item A, a resolution concerning quizzes and tests during the last week of classes, was introduced by Prof. O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. He explained that, as requested by the Senate when the item was returned to committee at the September 10 meeting, they had sought student input, and the resolution as it appeared on the Agenda had been presented to the DUSC where it was approved by a slim majority. He said the basic intent of the policy was to provide a protective device for students.

A motion to amend by changing "33 percent" to "one-third" was made and seconded. After a brief discussion the motion was defeated by a voice vote. Senator Summerton made a motion, which was seconded, to amend the resolution by replacing "counting for more than 33 percent" with "counting 33 and one-third percent or more"; there was no further discussion and the amendment was approved by voice vote.

Dean Brucker noted that if this resolution were adopted evening courses would either have to go to 15 weeks or not give a final exam counting more than 33 and one-third percent. Provost Campbell, a member of the Coordinating Committee, said that point was considered and the committee had rejected the idea of exceptions to the rule; Associate Provost Halio, a member of the Undergraduate Studies Committee, said they had come to the same conclusion.

Senator Flynn objected that the resolution would still allow exams that counted for a great deal in the last week and would leave it up to the faculty to give a final or not, and he didn't think this would really help the students. Professor Halio and Senator Summerton said they saw the resolution as the best

compromise, giving a large measure of protection to the students while still allowing the faculty the option of a final exam.

In response to a question from Senator Braun as to how the rule would be enforced, President Smith said students have access to the grievance system, and an exam contrary to the policy would be grievable.

In response to questions about the implementation and effects of the policy the following points were made: 1) even if a class voted to have the final in the last week of classes, the resolution would prohibit this; 2) it would still be possible for a student to have one or more exams in the final week, as long as none of them represented more than 33 and one-third percent of the semester's grade for a class; 3) final exams for evening courses would also have to be scheduled for final exam week; 4) the policy would apply to all courses, graduate and undergraduate; 5) take-home final exams would be turned in during finals week.

In response to questions about the intent of the resolution, Senator Summerton said he thought it would both promote compliance with the existing Senate policy by providing a definition, and protect the student's time for questioning and for pulling together the course material. Senator Braun noted that it also protected the student's right to a full 14 weeks of instruction.

It was noted that many evening students are employed full time during the day and priority should be given to scheduling finals in the evening for evening courses; Provost Campbell said that could be done.

President Smith called the question and the following resolution was approved by a hand vote:

RESOLVED, that no examination, hourly examination or test or quiz, counting for 33 and one-third percent or more of the semester's grade for any class (except laboratory exams) shall be given during the last five class days of any regular semester.

Item B, a resolution for endorsement of a recommendation from the Senate acting as a quasi-committee of the whole during the December meeting, was approved, as follows, by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate hereby endorses the Delaware Undergraduate Student Congress resolutions on the current Iranian/American conflict.

(Note: the resolutions are printed as Attachment 1 of the February Agenda.)

VI. New Business

Item A, a resolution to change the membership of the Committee on Undergraduate Studies, was introduced by Professor Kingsbury, chair of the Committee on Committees. He explained that the purpose was to replace the Associate Vice President for Facilities, Management and Services, or his designee, with the Director of Records, to reflect changes in the assignment of administrative responsibilities. There was no discussion and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Bylaws, Section III, Committee on Undergraduate Studies (Handbook, p. I-16, 17) last paragraph, be changed to read as follows:

This committee shall consist of an appointee of the Vice President for Academic Affairs; three faculty members from the College of Arts and Science and one faculty member from each other undergraduate college, of whom one shall be chairperson; one representative of the Committee on Graduate Studies; three undergraduate students; the Director of Records; the Director of Student Counseling; and the University Scheduling Officer.

Item B, a resolution to change the membership of the Committee on Undergraduate Records and Certification, was also introduced by Prof. Kingsbury. He explained the recommendation reflected the same administrative change as that in Item A; in addition, the resolution would make a faculty member chair of the committee. Provost Campbell read a memo from Douglas McConkey, Director of Admissions, who was unable to be present; Mr. McConkey pointed out that it is the Director of Records who has the necessary material for the committee's discussions, and that each dean's designee on the committee usually meets with the Director of Records only to deal with students from his or her college. He felt this had worked well in the past and there was no reason to change. Professor Kingsbury said the committee had considered that, but felt the chair could delegate the authority and business could be run on the present basis. Professor Halio said since it was really a record-keeping rather than a policy-making committee, he doubted there was a need for a faculty member to chair it.

A motion was made and seconded to amend the resolution by deleting the last sentence: "One of the deans' designees will be appointed chairperson by the Committee on Committees." The motion to amend was approved by voice vote.

President Smith called for the vote on the resolution as amended and it was approved, as follows, by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Bylaws, Section III, Committee on Undergraduate Records and Certification (Handbook, p. I-19) last paragraph, be changed to read as follows:

This committee shall consist of an appointee of the Vice President for Academic Affairs; the Director of Records; and one designee of the Dean of each college enrolling undergraduate majors.

Item C, a resolution to change the charge and membership of the Committee to Regulate the Use of Beverage Alcohol on the University of Delaware campus, was introduced by Professor Kingsbury. He explained that in the phrase "initiate, where appropriate, new educational programs" it was felt that since the Beverage Alcohol Committee had no resources, "initiate" should be changed to "recommend." The other

changes were intended to make the membership listing more accurate and appropriate, and to make it clear who is to chair the committee and who is responsible for appointing which members. There was no discussion and the following was approved by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Bylaws, Section III, Committee to Regulate the Use of Beverage Alcohol on the University of Delaware Campus (Handbook, p. I-25) be changed to read as follows:

This committee shall conduct a review of the Faculty Senate policy relating to beverage alcohol at least once a year, and shall: recommend additions or changes to existing policies where appropriate; evaluate existing programs directed toward education of students about the dangers of alcohol abuse; recommend, where appropriate, new educational programs; and eliminate ineffective programs and practices. It shall also review the overall University Policy relating to beverage alcohol, and advise the President in this regard.

This committee shall consist of ten members drawn from the following campus groups, agencies or organizations:

- 1. A representative of the Dean of Students Office)*
- 2. A representative of the Student Health Service)*
- 3. A representative of Security) Appointed by the*
- 4. A representative of Food Services) heads of their*
- 5. A representative of the Office of Housing) respective*
and Residence Life) administrative
- 6. A representative of the Center for Counseling) units*
and Placement)
- 7. Two representatives of the Delaware Under-graduate Student Congress (DUSC)) Appointed by DUSC*
- 8. Two representatives of the University) Appointed by the*
faculty, one to be chair) Committee on Committees

Item F, a resolution for approval of a Ph.D. program in Linguistics, was introduced by Professor O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. He said the Committee felt the new degree would be advantageous for the University because: 1) existing faculty have the potential to offer the degree; 2) students who want to continue for the Ph.D. could do so without having to go to another university; 3) there is an employment demand for the graduates; and 4) there is a growing possibility for outside funding. Senator Hall questioned the lack of courses in the concepts of computer and non-natural languages and in the psychology of language in the proposed program. Professor DiPietro, chair of the Department of Languages and Literature, responded that, while many things can be brought under the label of linguistics, a theoretical program like those of the 60s would not be appropriate because there is enough theory and now the research is in exciting new areas.

In response to an objection that the proposed structure seemed more like "English as a Second Language" than Linguistics, Professor DiPietro said many applied linguistics courses had come through English as a second language, but he didn't think this was a problem because there is a broad range of courses in the proposed program.

Senator Summerton said he felt some thought should be given to computer languages, and Professor DiPietro responded that he would be delighted to have somebody offering such a course, and that the schedule was loose enough to include it. Professor Arena said the University's computer hardware is conducive to this, and it is a possibility.

Senator Hall asked how the program differed from the proposal made four or five years ago which had never been instituted, and whether the considerations that surfaced then had been taken into account. Professor Kirsch responded that the earlier program had not been funded, that it had been a terminal M.A. degree, that fewer faculty were involved, and that the thrust of the present proposal was quite different. Professor Hall said he thought the proposal was modeled on the program at Georgetown, and asked if the number of faculty with Ph.D.'s in Linguistics was adequate to staff such a program, with a theoretical component, at the University of Delaware; he added that some of the courses on the core list, one of which was his course, are almost never taught because there haven't been enough students. Professor DiPietro responded that the Georgetown program, which he had directed, had started with only four faculty and was presently overstaffed, with twenty-one faculty. He said a few new people had been hired at Delaware, but he didn't think the number had much to do with the quality of the program. He also said the Philosophy Department course referred to was included because he felt any Linguistics doctoral program should have reference to the philosophy of linguistics. Professor Arena added that three of the four members of the program's Executive Committee had Ph.D.s in Linguistics.

Provost Campbell noted that the earlier proposal for a Master's Degree in Linguistics had been approved by the Senate's Graduate Committee, but when the Coordinating Committee held an Open Hearing the comments were so unfavorable that they had not brought the program to the Senate.

Senator Chesson asked about the demand for graduates of the program and Professor DiPietro said there was a growing need for applied linguistics graduates, and particularly a need for specialists in second languages. Senator R. Murray, Coordinator of Graduate Studies, read from a letter from one of the external consultants which supported this.

In response to a question as to whether the proposed course list was similar to the core program at Georgetown, Professor DiPietro said it was in some ways, and in some ways it was an improvement, but the "package" was quite comparable.

President Smith called the question and the following was approved by voice vote:

RESOLVED, that a Ph.D. degree program in Linguistics be provisionally established for a four year period beginning September, 1980, with a final review in Spring, 1984.

Item G, a resolution regarding the Pass/Fail policy, was introduced by Professor O'Neill, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. He explained that the intent of the resolution was to create an incentive for students to learn and to work harder in Pass/Fail courses. Senator Agnello made a motion, which was seconded, to amend part 1 of the resolution by substituting the following:

1. Any undergraduate student may register for one elective course per semester on a pass/fail basis. Under the pass/fail option, the grade P (Pass) will be entered in the student's record when the instructor assigns a letter grade of C or D. All other grades will be entered as assigned (A, B or F).

Professor O'Neill explained that the intent of the amendment was to reduce paper work by making a change to "A" or "B" automatic.

Senator Summerton spoke in opposition to both the resolution and the amendment, arguing that few students would see it as an incentive, but that it was open to abuse and would undermine the integrity of the grading system. He said students should be expected to make responsible decisions when registering for a course.

Senator Christensen asked if students could change to a letter grade by petition under the present policy, and Associate Provost Halio said they could during the six weeks drop/add period; Senator Chesson said he thought after that period appeals were entertained, especially for graduating seniors.

Senator Ulrich said the present policy contributed to grade inflation because students, by their own admission, do less work and cut classes more often in the courses they take for pass/fail, or where they change to pass/fail if they are not sure they will do well, thereby raising the over-all mean of the others in the class. It was suggested that grade inflation should not be considered in the debate because the real cause of grade inflation is in the grading deadlines for the computers, which make it more likely that a faculty member choosing between an "A" and a "B" will assign the higher grade when under time pressure.

Senator Summerton said if the Senate were to remain consistent with its refusal to extend the drop-add period, it should not pass the resolution because that would create an extension just for the pass/fail option.

Senator Chesson noted that the Engineering curriculum did not permit pass/fail registration except in overload courses; President Smith said the resolution would not affect that. Professor Halio noted the original resolution left the option of changing to a letter grade to the student, while the amendment would make it automatic, and he urged the Senate to give the flexibility to the student. President Smith called for the vote on the motion to amend; the motion failed on a voice vote. He then moved to the vote on the original resolution. In response to a request for a point of information, he said the vote was on the entire resolution as presented in Item G of the Agenda. He read the resolution and called for the vote; the resolution failed on a hand vote.

No further business was introduced and President Smith declared the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Ulrich C. Toensmeyer

Ulrich C. Toensmeyer
Secretary
University Faculty Senate