

REGULAR MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

November 3, 1986

MINUTES

The regular meeting of the University Faculty Senate was called to order on Monday, November 3, 1986, at 4:00 p.m., with President Callahan presiding.

Senators not in attendance were: Christopher Boorse, Norman Brown, Donald Crossan, Thomas Leitch, Conrad Trumbore

Senators excused were: Joan Brown, Alexander Doberenz, John Dohms, Robert Hampel, Louise Little, John Morgan, Frank Murray, R. Byron Pipes, James Richards, Nancy Schweda-Nicholson, Stuart Sharkey, James R. Soles, Gregory Stephens, E. A. Trabant, Doris Williams

I. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Hearing no dissension, the agenda was adopted as distributed.

II. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Following a minor correction, the removal of a redundant bracketed sentence on the bottom of page 3 of the distributed minutes, the October 6, 1986 minutes were approved.

III. REMARKS BY PRESIDENT TRABANT OR PROVOST CAMPBELL

Provost Campbell announced that the University will make its budget presentation to the State Budget director and his staff on Friday, November 7, 1986.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS

President Callahan reported on the progress of the Presidential Search Committee. (A copy of his report can be found in Attachment 1.)

V. OLD BUSINESS

Two resolutions were approved altering the membership of the Undergraduate Behavior Review Committee and the Graduate Behavior Review Committee. Both resolutions were presented by Senator Anne Marie Tierney. Faculty Senate President R. Callahan suggested that the Student Life Committee strongly supported the resolutions. Dean Tim Brooks added his support of the passage of the resolutions.

Following no discussion, the resolution altering the membership of the Graduate Behavior Review Committee was unanimously approved by voice vote.



*WHEREAS: the present membership of the Graduate Behavior Review Committee includes only one graduate student representative, and*

*WHEREAS: increased student input would be beneficial to the Committee; be it therefore*

*RESOLVED: that an additional graduate student representative, to be chosen by the Graduate Student Association, be appointed to the Graduate Behavior Review Committee.*

Following no discussion, the resolution altering the membership of the Undergraduate Behavior Review Committee was unanimously approved by voice vote.

*WHEREAS: the present membership of the Undergraduate Behavior Review Committee includes only one undergraduate student representative, and*

*WHEREAS: increased student input would be beneficial to the Committee, be it therefore*

*RESOLVED: that an additional undergraduate student representative from the Committee on Student Life be appointed to the Undergraduate Behavior Review Committee.*

#### VI. New Business

Item A was a request from the Committee on Committees (A. DeHaven, Chair) for approval of a faculty appointment to the University Athletic Governing Board.

Following no discussion, the following resolution was unanimously approved by voice vote.

*RESOLVED, that the following reappointment to the University Athletic Governing Board is hereby approved:*

*John Burmeister September 1986 - September 1989*

Item B was also a request from the Committee on Committees. The request was for approval of faculty appointments to two-year terms on Senate committees.

The following resolution was presented and approved unanimously by voice vote.

*RESOLVED, that the following appointments to two-year terms, beginning September 1, 1986, are hereby approved:*

*Library Committee - Member: David Kirchman*

*Committee on Student and Faculty Honors - Member: Kent Price*

Item C was a recommendation from the Committee on Graduate Studies (L. Lemay, Chair), with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education (S. Crawford, Chair), for the permanent status of the Ph.D. in Applied Sciences -



Climatology and for a change in name of the graduate major from "Applied Sciences - Climatology" to "Climatology." (See Attachment 2 for a description of the program.) [Provisional approval was given for four years in December 1979, and was extended for two years in March 1984.]

Following no discussion, the following resolution was approved unanimously by voice vote.

*RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves and recommends to the Board of Trustees that the Ph.D. Degree in Climatology be granted permanent status and recommends that the name of the graduate major be changed from "Applied Sciences - Climatology" to "Climatology."*

Item D was a recommendation from the Committee on Graduate Studies, with the concurrence of the Coordinating Committee on Education, for provisional approval of the Master of Arts in the Liberal Studies Program. (See Attachment 3 for a description of the program.)

Faculty Senate President Callahan asked Professor Leo Lemay, Chair of the Committee on Graduate Studies, whether or not he wished to introduce the Master of Arts in the Liberal Studies Program. He deferred to Professor David Norton, the person primarily responsible for seeking information concerning comparable programs.

After a lengthy introductory statement, Professor Norton responded to questions. (See Attachment 4 for a summary of this presentation.)

Professor David Bellamy wondered if the Master's Essay/Synthesis Project was an attempt to "water down" the master's thesis. Professor Norton responded that the "mid-life" learners who will become candidates in this program would not want a "watered down program." The term "Master's Essay/Synthesis Project" was used to suggest greater flexibility in the "applications of scholarship that might better serve the interests and needs of people, most of whom are not endeavoring to become professional scholars."

Professor Leo Lemay added that there are other "excellent academic programs in the University which do not require a master's thesis."

Vice President Thomas Merrill asked about the 3.0 undergraduate grade point average required for admission. He wondered about its relevancy. Professor Norton responded that the 3.0 undergraduate grade point index was considered by his committee and may need to be reconsidered after a period of time. The goal now is to establish a reputation of a high quality program.

Professor Robert Dalrymple suggested that it was not clear to him that a master's degree should be awarded to "people that are interested in lifelong learning in an area that is not a professional degree." He elaborated that he was worried "by having a degree that potentially may not mean as much as a master's degree in a traditional field." Further he was worried "that we are going to reduce the quality in other areas." Professor Norton responded that his committee was sensitive to Professor Dalrymple's observations and to the "fact that it is widely supposed that any non-standard pattern of education can be viewed as a

watering down." He assured the Senate that the program faculty would do a good job. He added that he detected that Professor Dalrymple suggested that "a standard graduate program is vocational training." Professor Norton disagreed with this assessment. He elaborated on the kinds of students that the MALS program hoped to attract.

Dean Helen Gouldner agreed that the goal was to recruit some of the best learners. She also noted that the National Endowment for the Humanities has asked the University to submit a proposal to help support the program.

Professor Edward Schweizer questioned why there was no plan to expand the program to include the departments of theatre, music, and art. Professor Norton agreed that "there is no good reason for not including them as a possibility, along with the social sciences." The reason restrictions are suggested in the proposal is the intent to begin with a small quality program.

Professor H. Perry Chapman questioned who the faculty of the program will be and who could take the courses. Professor Norton responded that "initially, qualified applicants will come from the eight representative departments." Further, "initially," the program will draw upon faculty "known to be exemplary at interdisciplinary teaching." Professor Chapman questioned whether or not the program had "the support of the departments to release these people from their already committed courses." Professor Norton responded, "Yes."

Professor David Bellamy reiterated his earlier point that "essay" was the wrong term to use to describe the synthesis project. Professor Norton responded that the term was used because it was a "preferable" term for this "special group of people" who fear their return to higher education.

Associate Provost Richard Murray commented that the University has a number of master's programs that do not require a master's thesis. For example, the Master of Fine Arts degree requires a summary project and the English department has a non-thesis option.

Professor Ronald Martin asked if the statement on page 4 of the document meant that the students could take any graduate course in the participating departments, as long as they meet the department requirements? Professor Martin wondered how it would be possible for students working full-time to take regular graduate offerings. Professor Norton suggested that if a student wanted to take an afternoon course he/she would need to get release time from his/her employer. He elaborated that a job of the program's director will be to cultivate community support.

Professor Martin indicated that he thought the program looked like a good program and that "graduate students on the campus should be encouraged to take courses with people who have been out in the real world."

Professor Dalrymple questioned why, since "mature students" are to be the candidates in the program, age is not a requirement for admission into the program. Professor Norton responded that age is not a requirement for admission. A few people might come directly from undergraduate education to the program.

Professor Stephen Wolff noted that he did not notice any sort of research methods course in the list of proposed courses. Professor Norton suggested that research methods would be incorporated into the first core course.

Professor Peter Warter called the question.

The following resolution was voted upon and approved.

*RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate approves provisionally, for four years, commencing September 1987, the establishment of the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies Program with review for permanent status to occur in 1991-1992.*

Item E was a report of existing University Policy on Conflict of Interest, as a matter of information, by the Committee on Research (P. Weil, Chair). (See Attachment 5 for a copy of the report.)

Professor Peter Weil introduced the report. He indicated that the Research Committee examined the University's policies concerning conflict of interest as a result of a request from Provost Campbell. The report is a summary of existing policy. There is "nothing new" in the report. He suggested that the "most important theme that runs through [the report] is the importance of discussing questions" concerning conflict of interest matters with immediate supervisors or chairs. Following his introductory statement, he responded to questions.

Professor Peter Warter complimented the committee on the preparation of a "very good document" that "put in one place [the] things that ought to be put in one place." He indicated that he had difficulty understanding one item (Item 2), "Altering the focus of a research program for the benefit of one's outside interests or for financial gain."

Professor Hugh Frick questioned what was meant by "...financial gain to any party other than the party supporting the work." As an example Professor Frick used the National Science Foundation. "Does that mean the National Science Foundation is interested in aggrandizing to itself the profit of those public projects that it supports?" Professor Weil responded that the "intention is to get people engaged in thinking about these issues;" every possible situation cannot be addressed by a document.

Professor Thomas Church indicated that if the supporting agency is a "federal agency, then certainly the knowledge which is developed under such support should be in the public domain and for the public welfare."

Provost Campbell indicated, "We are beginning to see a change in the attitude of federal support for areas that bring income as a result of work done on federal contracts. NSF just recently...announced they own two very hot patents...." "The purpose of them owning them rather than the institution is they hope that some of the license income will return to support future research activity."

Professor Frick questioned whether or not it could be expected from DuPont that the projects they support directly would ultimately be in the public domain. Provost Campbell responded that he could not speak for DuPont.

Professor Warter indicated that the question is "What is in the public domain?" "The results of the research is one thing; the proprietary rights are another thing." Since the report required no Senate action, President Callahan moved to the final item on the agenda, the introduction of new business.

Item F was such items as may come before the Senate.

Professor Bellamy made the motion that we begin classes on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday at least at 7:30 a.m. rather than 8:00 a.m.

Provost Campbell indicated that anyone is free to schedule classes at any hour he/she wants as long as he/she sets it up with the Registrar's Office. He added that the President's Council will make the decision on the calendar at its meeting this month so it is too late for the option suggested by Professor Bellamy to be included in next year's calendar.

Hearing no additional new business items, President Callahan called for a motion to adjourn. Following receipt of the requested motion, President Callahan declared the meeting adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Dutifully submitted,

*Carol Vukelich*

Carol Vukelich  
Secretary  
University Faculty Senate

rg

Attachments:

1. Report on the Progress of the Presidential Search Committee
2. Ph.D. Program in Climatology
3. Master of Arts in the Liberal Studies Program
4. Summary of Presentation by Prof. D. Norton
5. University Policy on Conflict of Interest