

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

February 1, 1982

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, February 1, 1982 at 4:00 p.m., with President Hoffecker presiding. Senators not in attendance were:

Susan Bennett	Fred Masterson	Janet Pholeric
Maurice Cope	Donald Mogavero	Douglas Ridge
Catherine Fraleigh	Joel Morse	James Thornton .
Gerard Mangone		

Senators excused were: Edith Anderson, Norman Collins, Alexander Doberenz, Barbara Gates, Billy Glass, Helen Gouldner, Jonathan Jeffery, Nancy King, Frank Murray, David Nelson, Norfleet Rives, Thomas Wood.

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

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES. The Minutes of the December 7, 1981 meeting were approved as written.

III. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRABANT. President Trabant reported that the 1982 Winter Session had a record total enrollment of over 8,900, and that the course offerings had as good a representation of enriching activities as ever before.

Commenting on federal involvement in higher education, President Trabant said it seems to be the intent of the present administration to remove, as much as possible, the federal government from higher education--not yet in terms of too much change in regulation, but a move away from financial support. He noted especially that the prospects for student aid for next year are very serious, and he requested that everyone discuss this and seek out information such as that presented on the back page of the February 3, 1982 Chronicle of Higher Education.

Commenting on state financing, President Trabant reported that in the budget submitted by the governor the recommended increase for the University ranges, depending on how you count the monies, from 4.6% to 5% or slightly higher, all in the line "Operations." He noted that there was no increase recommended for other activities, the largest of which is student aid, with the exception of \$65,000 included for Title VI compliance. He reported that the governor's budget recommends increases ranging from 8% to 12 or 15% for other state agencies, and that he would be forming a group to meet with state representatives to explain what it means to the University to have state support.

He concluded by urging all members of the University community to look at the effects on education of the lack of financial aid, and to assume a role in speaking out on this issue.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS. President Hoffecker reminded the senators of the Open Hearing on course numbering policies regarding double listed courses, to be held Monday, February 15, at 2:00 in room 114 Purnell.

A minor in Educational Studies was announced for challenge; there was no discussion and the minor, as printed in Attachment 1 of the Agenda, was declared approved.

Referring to a recent newspaper article about a University ad hoc Committee on Classified Research, President Hoffecker reported that the Senate Executive Committee had received that committee's report and had forwarded it to the Senate Research Committee; she urged anyone who wished to express views on this issue to contact the Research Committee.

Noting that there were a number of visitors present, President Hoffecker explained that the Senate's rules of debate provided an opportunity, after senators have been recognized, for her to recognize non-senators, and she urged those with a point of view outside those already raised to offer their independent opinions at that time.

V. OLD BUSINESS. None.

VI. NEW BUSINESS.

Item A, a recommendation from the Coordinating Committee on Education for the disestablishment of the B.S. degree in Physical Education, was presented by the chair of the committee, Prof. Callahan. He explained that this degree had become redundant with the earlier Senate approval of a B.S. in Physical Education and Health Education and a B.S. in Physical Education Studies which replaced it. There was no further discussion, and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the degree of Bachelor of Science in Physical Education is disestablished, effective with the completion of the program by those students currently enrolled. No new students shall be admitted to the program.

Item B, a recommendation to change the charge to the Senate Fine Arts and Exhibitions subcommittee, was introduced for the Committee on Committees by Prof. Morrison, chair. He explained that, by focussing the Senate committee on displays in the Student Center, the change would resolve problems of overlapping responsibilities between it and the Provost's Coordinating Committee for Exhibitions. There was no further discussion, and the following was approved by unanimous voice vote:

RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate Bylaws, III: Standing Committee System of the Faculty and its Senate, Fine Arts and Exhibitions Subcommittee (p. I-20 of the present Faculty Handbook) is changed by replacing the first paragraph with the following:

FINE ARTS AND EXHIBITIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

It shall be the general objective of the Fine Arts and Exhibitions Subcommittee to exchange ideas and information with various departmental, college, or special galleries for the visual arts on the Newark campus, thereby contributing to the oversight, collaboration and balance of exhibitions of the visual arts.

It shall be the specific objective of the Fine Arts and Exhibitions Subcommittee to sponsor, direct, suggest, or coordinate presentations at the Student Center of the visual arts, either those that originate on the campus or those which are brought to the campus.

Items C and D, recommendations for establishing an Air Force ROTC program and department in the College of Engineering, were introduced by Prof. Callahan, chair of the Coordinating Committee on Education. He reported that the proposal had been approved by the Engineering faculty, by the Senate Undergraduate Studies Committee, subject to the proviso that courses in the program would undergo the normal course approval procedures, and by the Coordinating Committee on Education.

Senator Mosberg asked if it were not normal to have an open hearing for a new program. Prof. Callahan responded that it was not necessary; Pres. Hoffecker added that it was up to the committee to decide.

Senator Geiger noted that no rationale had been supplied with the proposal to explain whether the program was needed and desirable for the University. Dean Greenfield responded that the program would: 1) permit students interested in an Air Force military career to study at the University of Delaware, a civilian institution, rather than a military academy; 2) allow such students to gain commissions in the Air Force; 3) establish a new scholarship program, which would attract better students, for the University; 4) offer, through the College of Engineering but available to all students at the University, courses in leadership and military history, focussed toward the Air Force. Senator Geiger asked if there were an estimate of the impact on the present Army ROTC program, and particularly whether eligible students would shift from one to the other or whether there would be a net gain in students. Dean Greenfield replied that, while it was not clear what the impact would be at Delaware, the information from the 36 existing programs in the Northeast showed a steady state of about 60 students supported under such scholarships.

Noting that the AFROTC program had been rejected by the Arts and Science faculty, Senator Mosberg asked what the reasons were. Senator Smith responded that he had chaired the Arts and Science committee which had extensively reviewed the Air Force proposal and which had voted to take it to that Senate. He said the basic positions on the positive side were that it was a legitimate program that served a need, and that there was anecdotal evidence that students leave the University who would come here if it were available; opposed to this were those who were basically anti-military, and who felt the Army ROTC program was sufficient and the University would not be enhanced by the addition of another ROTC program. Prof. Beer said he had been among those opposing the program and he felt there were several problems with it: 1) because no copy of the contract with the Air Force was available the contractual arrangements of the program they were asked to approve were unclear; 2) the program was felt not to enhance the academic excellence of the University because the number of students entering on the scholarships seemed to be small and the courses they would be required to take were not felt to be as educationally valuable as other University courses; 3) the present Army ROTC program allows students to transfer into the Air Force, so there is no need to train Air Force officers here; 4) there is a question as to whether the Air Force needs more officers, since there seemed to be a 5 or 6 month waiting period before present graduates are activated; 5) the claim that the program would bring revenue to the University had not been substantiated; and 6) there was

concern that the University would enter upon a program of a large military ROTC without thinking it through or limiting the degree of growth. He concluded by asking if it wouldn't be truer to the University's academic mission to marshal faculty resources in conflict resolution and establish a peace-oriented program.

Responding to some of Prof. Beer's remarks, Senator Christopherson, from the Arts and Science Dept. of Military Science, stated that the Army ROTC does not train officers for commission in the Air Force, and that he thought there was room for both programs on campus.

Dean Crossan agreed with Dean Greenfield's point that one important aspect of the program was that it trained career officers on a University campus rather than in a military college; he said he thought we would be amiss if we did not maintain civilian control of the military and that, as a Land Grant institution, the University has a charge to provide leadership training for the military.

Dean Greenfield, responding to Prof. Beer, said he thought the Air Force's interest in adding more officers from public institutions indicated they were not just building an excess number of military officers. He also said he thought a University program for finding peaceful solutions could co-exist with an AFROTC program which would be educating officers with a broader focus than those from the various academies.

Responding to questions about the cost of the Air Force program, Provost Campbell said that the long-term costs could not be determined, but that the Army ROTC this year had a total budget of \$12,884 and if a charge for space--\$31,506 at the 81-82 rates-- were added, the Army program costs would total roughly \$50,000. He noted that the Air Force program would probably not be as large and would therefore not exceed that amount, and that the University pays no salaries in either program. He anticipated that the two programs would provide about sixty \$12,000 scholarships.

Senator Mosberg asked why a new department was being proposed and whether there would have to be at least one tenured faculty member, as required by the Trustees. Dean Greenfield said that for convenience of administration the program was most properly defined as a department, in parallel to the existing Military Science department for the Army program. Noting that there was no tenured faculty member in the Military Science department, he said that the Air Force proposal would be submitted to the Board and they could reject it if they chose; President Trabant added that the Board had a number of such guidelines, but they were not always followed.

Senator Kingsbury said a typical ROTC agreement required the institution to confer the rank of professor on the senior officer and associate or assistant professor for all others assigned to the detachment, and he asked if this would be the case here. Dean Greenfield said that the agreement also said no Air Force officer would be assigned to the department without the prior approval of the authorities of the institution, and none would continue after the authorities have requested his release, and the University would retain its prerogative of ranking the individuals based on a review of their academic credentials. Provost Campbell added that current University policy of awarding faculty rank to military personnel based on their credentials would not be changed.

Replying to a question from Senator Beasley, Dean Greenfield said students applying to the AFROTC would be subject to the same academic requirements as all other students; he added that on the average the student who gets an Air Force scholarship has a 1250 or 1260 SAT score, and students already at the University must have a 2.5 cumulative or better to apply.

Senator Wilson, representing undergraduate students, said he thought any scholarship program that helps students should be backed. Mr. Larry Brehm, a graduate student, related his experiences in seeking release from the AFROTC undergraduate program at Manhattan College. He noted that if students in the program develop moral reservations the procedures for obtaining a discharge are lengthy, in his case involving meeting the requirements in federal court for conscientious objector status, and that such students are subject to military law and to very real penalties. He also noted that the AFROTC program was not education, but was clearly intended as military training, and he suggested that if the University were to have AFROTC they should try something new and conduct the program independent of the U.S. government, run completely by the school under its own faculty. He said if such a program met the highest standards of excellence its graduates should be capable of serving in the Air Force and their military training should be conducted by the Air Force at its own time and expense and in its own institutions. Dean Greenfield agreed that it should be made very clear to students that it is a serious matter when they sign an agreement with the military, with obligations on both parties, and that it would not be easy for them to change their minds. Regarding the academic value of the program, he said it is the faculty's responsibility to make sure it is academically challenging to the students, since the faculty will review the program and if the Air Force disagrees they will have to go someplace else. He added that the AFROTC programs in place in other colleges in the northeast are all different, and have been adapted to fit the colleges.

Prof. Kerner, noting that the University presently uses a 50% figure to determine overhead charges for contracts, said that, while that might not be the appropriate figure to use in this case, the University would be responsible for all overhead charges and the coming of the AFROTC would cost the University something. He suggested that the Senate ought to try, perhaps by returning the item to committee for further discussion, to ascertain what the program would cost. Provost Campbell responded that the \$32,000 figure he had given earlier represented the direct cost for the office--utilities, maintenance, and so forth, some of which is spent within the institution--and that the 50% figure would be inappropriate in determining overhead unless it was also applied to all other academic programs on campus.

It was pointed out by a senator that the only revenue to the University from the program would be the tuition paid by the Air Force scholarships and that, given the University's enrollment ceiling and its fixed number of students, this would not mean any increase in net income, but that the University would definitely have some expenses in setting up the program. He questioned whether, in a time of budget reductions, it made sense for the University to subsidize the training of military officers for the Pentagon.

A recommendation by Provost Campbell that Item D could be clarified by changing "President" to "President Trabant" was accepted.

Prof. Ahrens questioned the earlier statements that having the Air Force program on campus would produce well-educated officers. She suggested that the military program was interested in task-oriented training and that this wasn't the same thing we usually mean by academic excellence or creative thinking, and she said that if the faculty succeeded in doing a good job in getting students to think creatively the students would be almost assuredly entrapped and would want to get out of the program.

President Hoffecker called for further discussion; there was none, and she called for the vote. In response to a request from Senator Mosberg for separate votes on Items C and D, President Hoffecker then called for a hand vote on Item C; the resolution, as follows, was approve, 21 for and 18 opposed.

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate approves, effective September, 1982 for a 4 year provisional period, the 2 year and 4 year Air Force ROTC programs, as presented in Attachment 2 of the Agenda, subject to approval of new courses through the established University course approval procedures.

The call for a hand vote on Item D resulted in a tie, which was broken by President Hoffecker; the resolution, as follows, was approved, 22 for and 21 against.

RESOLVED, that the University Faculty Senate recommends to President Trabant the establishment within the College of Engineering of a Department of Air Force ROTC.

President Hoffecker recognized Prof. Woo, a member of the Board of Trustees, who said he wished to state that he held a research contract with the Army Research Office, and not with the Air Force as had been incorrectly reported in a recent newspaper article, and that he would therefore not be going to the Trustee meeting with a conflict of interest on the Air Force program proposal.

No further business was introduced, and the meeting was declared adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Henry N. Lee
Secretary
University Faculty Senate