

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

March 4, 1985

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, March 4, 1985, at 4:00 p.m., with President Kuhlman presiding.

Senators not in attendance were:

Lee Anderson	Alexander Doberenz	David Lamb
Donald Crossan	John Kraft	James Wiggins

Senators excused were: Dore Butler, Robert Dalrymple, Selcuk Guceri, Rosemary Hooper, Arnold Kerr, Allen Morehart, David Nelson, James Soles, Marvin Sussman, Carolyn Thoroughgood, Ferris Webster, Robert Wilson.

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

At the request of Prof. Marler, chair of the Committee on Student Life, two changes were made in the Agenda. Under New Business, each of the resolutions on Academic Honesty (Item VI.A) was numbered to facilitate discussions. In resolution V., 4 and 5, "court cost fee" was changed to "administrative fee." The Agenda for the March meeting was then adopted by unanimous consent.

II. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRABANT

President Trabant reported on applications to and enrollments in the University this Spring. Undergraduate applications are up 8% over applications last year at this time; the applicants' achievement test scores and Projected Grade Point Indices are also above those recorded for last year's applicants. The Spring semester 1985 enrollment is approximately 17,000 students, with 12,500 undergraduates on the Newark campus. The goal for new black student enrollments this Spring was also reached. [An excerpt from President Trabant's remarks can be found in Appendix 1 of these Minutes.]

### III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Dean Harold D. Jopp (University Parallel Program) addressed the Senate on the nature of and misconceptions about the University Parallel Program (UPP). A summary of his presentation follows. [The data from Dean Jopp's remarks can be found in Appendix 2 of these Minutes.]

- . The UPP is located across the state on the campuses of Delaware Technical and Community College, in Georgetown (since 1967), Wilmington (since 1971), and Dover (since 1985). The program includes sixteen full-time faculty, two permanent part-time faculty, and four professional staff.
- . Although the UPP offers exclusively freshman- and sophomore-level courses, it is not primarily a remedial program.
- . Although the UPP is housed on the Del Tech campuses, the program is not a part of the Del Tech system.
- . In general, those UPP students who transfer to the Newark campus in good academic standing succeed in the University.
- . Not all UPP students come or intend to come to the Newark campus of the University, so the UPP serves a varied group of students, 99% of whom are Delaware residents.

To strengthen the UPP and to enhance its connections with other parts of the University, Dean Jopp recommended that (1) the administration encourage faculty exchanges between the UPP and the UD Newark faculty; (2) the Associate in Arts/Associate in Science degree options be supported; (3) and that the UPP develop a better remediation program while maintaining a strong second-year option for its students.

2. President Kuhlman announced that (1) the Committee on Committees needed a University Faculty senator to fill a vacant seat, and (2) in the absence of objections from the senators, the date of the next Senate meeting would be changed from April 1 (Spring break) to April 8, 1985.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR CHALLENGE

The proposed revision of the B.A. in Anthropology and the concentration in Anthropology Education (Appendix 3) came to the Senate for its approval. Senator Bellamy (Mathematical Sciences) asked why the proposed changes were necessary. After Prof. Villamarin, chair of Anthropology, explained that the revisions added an important tutorial component to the program, allowing students to gain more in-depth experience in anthropological work, and broadened the major's general education in biological and social anthropology, the proposed revisions were approved without challenge.

#### IV. OLD BUSINESS

Item A, a recommendation from the Committee on Undergraduate Studies (R. Brown, chair) to amend the existing regulations governing the awarding of Associate in Arts (A.A.) and Associate in Science (A.S.) degrees came to the floor moved and seconded. [This issue was recommitted at the February 4, 1985 Senate meeting.]

Chairperson Brown explained that the current resolution was more detailed and more adequate to the complexity of the issue of the Associate degrees than the earlier resolution had been. The current resolution allows clear discretionary powers to each college as to whether and how it will award the degree. The resolution also provides a timetable for students applying for the degree.

Chairperson Brown also noted that colleges which award the Associate degrees need to specify required courses which are available to both full-time and part-time (CEND) students. Because the University Parallel Program does not currently offer enough courses to satisfy the requirements for some Associate degrees, Chairperson Brown asked that the resolution be altered to allow substitute courses for UPP students. Senator Bellamy, at Chairperson Brown's suggestion, moved that the resolution be amended by the substitution of the following for part 4 of the resolution:

4. In order to receive an associate degree students in the Parallel Program shall satisfy the particular requirements of one of the colleges, unless some course(s) needed to do so should be unavailable on their campuses over an extended period of time, in which case (an)other appropriate course(s) may be substituted with the approval of the dean of the Parallel Program and the dean of the college to award the degree.

The amendment was seconded and carried by a show of hands.

Senator Olson (Engineering) asked that the Faculty Senate Minutes clearly indicate that the policy on awarding Associate degrees, if approved, will become effective September 1, 1986. Responding to Senator Levin's question about the rationale for the Associate degrees, Dean John Hurt (Arts and Science) explained that for the College of Arts and Science the Associate degree was appropriate for those many part-time students as a mark of their often slow, partial progress toward a degree, and for those part-time students for whom a general education program was better suited to the vocational purposes.

The question was called for, seconded, and carried by a hand vote. The amended resolution, as follows, was carried by a hand vote.

WHEREAS: *the Council of Deans has approved "administrative changes" governing Associate Degrees, and*

WHEREAS: *the regulations of the sort proposed should have Faculty Senate approval and should be applied uniformly in all colleges in which Associate Degrees are awarded; be it therefore*

RESOLVED: *that existing regulations governing the awarding of Associate Degrees be amended or supplemented by the following, namely that:*

1. *The degree awarded will be identified simply as Associate in Arts or Associate in Science, without specification of a major field of study.*
2. *Each college awarding the baccalaureate degree(s) shall decide whether it will grant the associate degree(s) and, if it does, shall determine (subject to established University procedures for approval of curricula) the specific courses and number of credits (60 or more) required for the degree(s).*
3. *A candidate must apply for the associate degree during the academic term in which all requirements for the degree are to be completed and (except for students in the Parallel Program) must, at the time of application, be enrolled in the college that is to award the degree. Later application requires the approval of the student's dean.*
4. *In order to receive an associate degree students in the Parallel Program shall satisfy the particular requirements of one of the colleges, unless some course(s) needed to do so should be unavailable on their campuses over an extended period of time, in which case (an)other appropriate course(s) may be substituted with the approval of the dean of the Parallel Program and the dean of the college to award the degree.*
5. *More than half of the credits for the degree must be earned at the University of Delaware.*
6. *The recipient must be in good academic standing (have a minimum grade point average of 2.0).*

## VI. NEW BUSINESS

Item A, a resolution from the Coordinating Committee on Education (U.C. Toensmeyer, chair), with the concurrence of the committees on Undergraduate and Graduate Studies, for the approval of a Department of Linguistics, came to the Senate moved and seconded. Chairperson Toensmeyer, referring to the reports on the academic and financial considerations of a new Department of Linguistics, said that the Coordinating Committee on Education believed the current financial resources for the department were adequate and that the prospects for

additional outside funding were good. He also described how the existing Linguistics Program would be improved by the establishment of a Department of Linguistics with regard to formal academic visibility, external funding, and faculty hiring and development.

The resolution, as follows, was carried by a hand vote.

*RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves and recommends to the Board of Trustees the establishment, as described in Attachment 2 of the March 4, 1985 Senate Agenda, of a Department of Linguistics in the College of Arts and Science, effective September 1, 1985.*

Item B, a resolution from the Committee on Student Life (C. Marler, chair) for changes in the University policies on Academic Honesty, came to the Senate moved and seconded. Chairperson Marler reiterated the history of the University's review of the policies governing academic (dis)honesty, explaining that in 1983 the Office of Institutional Research, with the President's ad hoc Committee on Academic Dishonesty, had conducted a campus survey, one result of which was the resolutions currently before the Senate.

Senator Bellamy (Mathematical Sciences), saying that the resolution was well thought out, called the question on the resolution. The motion was seconded, but was defeated by a hand vote.

Senator Olson (Engineering), at the urging of President Kuhlman, moved to debate each item in the resolution individually before considering the resolution in its entirety. The motion to so order the debate was seconded and carried by a hand vote.

Parts I-III: no debate in the Senate.

Part IV: Responding to Senator Levin's question about the use of the criterion "clear and convincing evidence," Chairperson Marler and Dean Brooks (Student Affairs) explained that no university policy they knew of used the criterion "beyond a reasonable doubt," which is appropriate in criminal cases but not in school regulations. Chairperson Marler noted that the proposed resolution would change the judicial criteria in the policy but not the judicial procedures as found in the Student Guide to Policies.

Part V: Senator Horowitz (Sociology) noted that the proposed resolution seemed to lower the standard of evidence but to increase the level of punishment for a student found guilty of academic dishonesty. Notations might not always be removed from all prior versions of a student's transcript, and so might unfairly color a faculty person's perception of that student. Senator Schweizer (Chemistry) and Chairperson Marler responded that the proposed policy actually increased the educative value of a sanction against a student and that the transcript notation can effectively be removed after the student participates in the appropriate academic conduct seminar. Senator Olson added that there is a difference between an academic transcript and a disciplinary transcript, which should provide the student some protection. Finally, Senator Fletcher (History) strongly objected to the generalization about how all faculty would react to disciplinary information on a student's transcript.



A motion by Senator Safer (At Large) to amend the resolution by deleting section V.5 (removal of the transcript notation) was seconded. Senator Smith (Undergraduate senator) spoke against the motion to amend by noting that the proposed policy provided an educative role for the disciplinary sanction and a second chance for a student who was convicted of academic dishonesty. Senators Sharnoff (Physics) and Schweizer (Chemistry) also spoke against the amendment, the latter asking why the University should be tougher than the courts.

The question on the Safer amendment was called, seconded, and carried by a hand vote. The motion to amend the resolution was defeated by a hand vote.

Responding to Senator Sharnoff's question about the academic conduct seminar and administrative costs, Chairperson Marler said the seminar would be run by the Dean of Students office and the administrative costs would run approximately \$60/student found guilty of academic dishonesty. He added that while the costs are minimal considering the expense of the procedures, the University is not interested in making money on academic dishonesty.

Senator Ahrens (Human Resources) spoke in favor of the proposed policy, which would institute what she believed to be a much-needed educational program to help convicted students "unlearn" academic dishonesty.

Senators Beasley and Ahrens noted that the transcript notation was analogous to the Communications Condition notation. Both can be removed following appropriate action.

Senator Beasley asked what would happen if a student refused to participate in the academic conduct seminar; chairperson Marler and Dean Brooks noted that the "additional sanctions clause" (V.6) would then take effect [see Student Guide to Policies, pp. 9-10]. Refusing to participate in the seminar would constitute another violation of the University Code of Conduct.

Senator Bellamy then posed the question: How would a student dropped from the University for a quality point deficit as a result of receiving an "F" in a course in which he cheated (V.1) be able to participate in an academic conduct seminar run by the Dean of Students office in order to remove the transcript notation? Dean Brooks argued that cases must be decided individually and that a student could petition to remove the notation for various reasons, not just after successfully completing the seminar.

In the interest of time, Senator Schweizer called the question on the entire resolution, but was overruled because that motion violated the Senate's earlier agreement to discuss each item of the resolution in turn.

Part VI. Senator Bonner (Business Administration) raised several questions about the criteria which would be used to determine what is an "independent action" by a faculty member, and whether a University policy or a student's rights to due process have been violated. Chairperson Marler, speaking for his committee, compromised by suggesting a motion to delete Part VI from the resolution. Senator Bonner's motion to amend the resolution by deleting Part VI, with the request that Part VI be returned to the Committee on Student Life for further review, was seconded. The call for the question was moved, seconded, and carried by a hand vote. The motion to delete Part VI was carried by a hand vote.

The call for the question on the amended resolution was moved, seconded, and carried by a hand vote. The amended resolution, as follows, was carried by a hand vote.

WHEREAS academic honesty is essential to achieving the goals of a University; and

WHEREAS violations of academic honesty do especial harm to all members of the University community and dishonor the University and its academic degrees; and

WHEREAS recent and reputable surveys at the University of Delaware suggest a level of dishonesty utterly intolerable to administrators, faculty, staff, and students alike:

- I. BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate express its support for current administrative efforts to develop, initiate, and evaluate a comprehensive, University-wide educational program designed to enhance academic honesty and reduce academic dishonesty. Recommended by President Trabant's Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Honesty, it is expected that this program will: closely adhere to approved University policy; provide orientation sessions, materials, and helpful recommendations to groups such as faculty and students; and seek Senate support and/or approval, as appropriate, in generating new initiatives such as continuing and widening survey efforts, urging the establishment of a University proctoring service, etc.
- II. FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the last three lines on p. 1, col. 1, of the 1984-85 Student Guide to Policies be revised to read as follows: "Students found guilty of academic dishonesty will incur sanctions provided for within the University Undergraduate or Graduate Student Judicial System."
- III. FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the sentences on p. 3, col. 2, lines 8-12, of the 1984-85 Student Guide to Policies be revised to read as follows: "Students found guilty of academic dishonesty will incur sanctions provided for within the University Undergraduate or Graduate Judicial System."
- IV. FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED that the first sentence under point 6, p. 7, col. 2, of the 1984-85 Student Guide to Policies be revised to read as follows: "Guilt must be established on the basis of clear and convincing evidence."
- V. FURTHER, BE IT RESOLVED, that Sanction "J" on p. 9, col 1, of the 1984-85 Student Guide to Policies be revised to read as follows:
  - J. Academic Dishonesty Sanctions:
    1. A guilty finding for academic dishonesty will result in the student's receiving an "F" in the course in which the offense occurred.
    2. Students found guilty of an academic honesty violation will have the following notation placed on their University transcripts: "This student has a judicial record with the Dean of Student's office."

3. *Students found guilty of an academic honesty violation will be required to complete a non-credit seminar dealing with the University's expectations for academic conduct and the moral and social ramifications of violations. A copy of the student's final seminar paper will be sent to the professor who brought the charge. Appropriate costs for the seminar will be borne by the student.*
4. *An administrative fee will be charged to students found guilty of an academic honesty violation.*
5. *Given the completion of the seminar and the payment of the administrative fee--and in the absence of any repetition of similar misconduct--the transcript notation will be removed upon the student's written petition to the Dean of Students.*
6. *These actions will not preclude additional sanctions.*

No further business was introduced. After entertaining a motion from the floor to adjourn, President Kuhlman declared the Senate meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Dutifully submitted,

*Mark Amsler*

Mark Amsler  
Secretary  
University Faculty Senate

MA/b

- Apendices:
1. Remarks by President Trabant
  2. University Parallel Program - data
  3. Revisions in the B.A. in Anthropology and the B.A. in Anthropology Education



REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRABANT  
to the University Faculty Senate

First of all, I wanted to look forward to next Fall, and where we are with respect to students. I think you would be interested to know that to date we have received 10,280 applications for the entering class for September, 1985, about 8% more than last year. With respect to the total number of applicants, the quality of the students is essentially the same as last year. With respect to those being offered letters of admission, if you believe test scores are indicative of a quality, it is a slightly higher quality entering class for next year than the past year. SAT scores are higher on the average, and predicted grade point indices are higher. What is the reason for that? Well, because we are going to admit fewer students for next year there is a tendency to admit those students with the higher scores. What about transfer students? The numbers are running about the same as last year. Although it is still too early to tell much about them, we do expect to have about 450 new students at the transfer level.

Are there any changes in the patterns of the applications? Yes. At the moment there is a measurable increase in the number of students applying to the College of Arts and Science, particularly in the Social Sciences and as "undeclared," and there is an increase in the number of students applying for the College of Business and Economics. The number applying to the other colleges is about the same as in the past, with the exception of the College of Nursing where, in keeping with a national trend, there is a decrease. That does not mean that we will have any empty spaces in the College of Nursing, only that the number of applicants is down.

With respect to our enrollments for this Spring semester, I am happy to be able to tell you that we met our enrollment goal for new black students at the University of Delaware, and the applicant pool for next year is coming along better than last year at this time. We feel that our goal of 202 new black students for September, 1985 is within our reach. In round numbers, we have a total of about 17,000 students this semester. The official numbers, the numbers for the tenth day of classes, are: 12,550 undergraduate students on the Newark campus; 335 Parallel students; 1,940 graduate students; and 2,075 part-time students.

On an entirely different topic, I want to go into a very important thing that is happening now at the federal level, and that is the re-authorization of the Higher Education Act. If you look at the Authorization Act for Higher Education you find that it is primarily composed of a group of "titles." And if you look at the origin of those "titles," that is, why did those get in the Authorization Act in the first place, you find that almost always they were introduced in the interests of self-defense--which means fear of losing a war. When you try to think about it rationally you may ask: why should education be in the Defense Department? Well, most of these started in the Defense Department, and we had to support higher education because it was necessary for the United States to defend itself against the so-called "enemies of the

world,"--that is, of us in the world. Then you ask, should we continue that? Should we sell this to ourselves and to our senators and representatives as the reason that higher education should be supported? When I was a student federal support for students was an unheard of concept. But it has been started in various ways through my lifetime. So I would suggest that each of us think about this, that maybe what we should do is to go back and decide why higher education should be supported in terms of the basic missions of the federal government. If we do that we might have a more defensible, rational approach to convincing ourselves and our fellow citizens of why higher education ought to be supported at the federal level. There are five basic reasons why we have a federal government: to establish justice, to ensure domestic tranquility, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty--as well as to provide for the common defense. That last is the Defense Department, and that's how we have justified things almost entirely in the past. I would suggest that we don't want federal aid merely to keep colleges and universities open unless that is important in the mission of the federal government within all of those five categories, or the majority of them. We don't have financial aid for students so the colleges and universities can stay open, but because of the role of the federal government in these five areas. We should start thinking in terms of how we would define this, and how we would talk to our representatives in terms of the reasons for a federal government and the reasons for federal funding. I have a hunch in my own mind that things may go better if we continue to ask what the reasons are for there being a federal government, and then cast our requests and our needs from the federal government in that context. I hope I am not misunderstood. I hope no one thinks that I am not in favor of federal funding or that it is not important. What I am saying is, let us make sure that we want education in the Defense Department, that we know that we have been doing that, and that it usually appears to be the easiest way to sell federal funding for education. But that may not be the only place that we should base our arguments. Perhaps we should try a different position, and look at it in terms of the total mission of the federal government.

On a third topic, tomorrow we go to Dover. A lot of us, I think, will be there, and we will be presenting recommendations to the Joint Finance committee of our General Assembly of the State of Delaware for support from tax funds for the University of Delaware. We will be suggesting, recommending, presenting arguments from many of us from the campus community, about why we think the funding from the state for the University should be at a higher level than that in the current recommendations before the General Assembly. At the present time it's about a 2.6% recommended increase, just a little bit over a million dollars. Now that's a lot of money, but it must be looked at it in the context of our needs of more than two hundred million dollars. So we will be making recommendations before the Joint Finance committee which will enable us to meet our obligations and optimize some of our opportunities in a relatively satisfactory way, with a minimum of tuition increases.

85A Summary Report  
Georgetown Campus  
Parallel Program

New Admissions	100
Withdrawals During Semester (GC88)	6
Returning Students	64
Withdrawals During Semester (GC87)	2
Dropped for Academic Reasons	4
Transfers to Newark	8
Preregistered for Spring and Eligible to Return	180
Known Transfers to Other Institutions	2
Dean's List	12 ( 2 Students had 4.0 )

## End of Term Academic Actions Report

	<u>85A</u>	<u>84A</u>
No Action	119 (73%)	122 (68%)
Probation	38 (23%)	36 (20%)
Action Pending	0 ( 0%)	8 ( 4%)
Dropped	4 ( 2%)	5 ( 3%)
Special Probation	4 ( 2%)	10 ( 5%)

85A Summary Report  
Wilmington campus  
Parallel Program

New Admissions	192
Withdrawals During Semester (WC88)	10
Returning Students	17
Withdrawals During Semester (WC87)	4
Dropped for Academic Reasons	9
Transfers to Newark	6
Preregistered for spring + Eligible to Return	169
Unaccounted	5

End of Term Academic Actions Report

	<u>85A</u> <u>N = 203</u>	<u>84A</u> <u>N = 189</u>
No Action	121 - 60%	89 - 47%
Probation	66 - 32%	23 - 39%
Action Pending	2 - 1%	2 - 1%
Dropped	9 - 4%	25 - 13%
Special Probation	4 - 2%	1 = .05%

PRELIMINARY ENROLLMENT SUMMARY REPORT - 85B

February 28, 1985

	WILMINGTON			DOVER			GEORGETOWN		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
Matriculated Students	100	83	183	6	2	8	48	84	132
CEND	10	3	13	9	5	14	60	64	124
TOTAL	110	86	196	15	7	22	108	148	256
			(163)			(--)			(158)
			(84B)			(--)			(76)
			(84B)			(--)			(234)

474 TOTAL PARALLEL ENROLLMENT



Table 5

Colleges From Which Parallel Program Entrants of  
Fall 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979  
Obtained Bachelor's Degrees

	<u>Georgetown</u>		<u>Wilmington</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Agricultural Sciences	24	27.2	9	14.8
Arts and Science	31	35.2	31	50.8
Business and Economics	17	19.3	9	14.8
Education	6	6.8	6	9.8
Engineering	2	2.3	-	-
Human Resources	4	4.5	5	8.2
Nursing	4	4.5	-	-
Physical Education	-	-	1	1.6
Total	88	100.0	61	100.0

B.A. in Anthropology and B.A. in Anthropology Education

Revision in major requirements for ANT courses

<u>Old Requirements</u>		<u>New Requirements</u>	
Social and Cultural ANT courses	9 cr	(same)	12 cr
Biological ANT course(s)	3	(same)	6
Archaeological ANT course(s)	3	(same)	6
Other ANT course(s)	15	(same)	3
(none)		Tutorial in Social and Cultural ANT (466-70)	3
(none)		Tutorial in Archaeological ANT (466-71) or Biological ANT (466-72)	3
Total ANT credits	<hr/> 30	Total ANT credits	<hr/> 33

Required distribution of ANT courses:

200 level	9 cr	200 level	6 cr
300 level or		300 level	12
400 level )	15	400 level (the above tutorials)	6
Any level	6	Any level	9

"A maximum of six credits in courses especially designed for Winter and Summer sessions may be taken."

(none)

(Statement deleted)

One or more of the following recommended for students planning graduate study: Readings in:

Cultural ANT (466-73)	2 cr
Social ANT (466-74)	2
Archaeological ANT (466-75)	2
Biological ANT (466-76)	2