

12-8-1980

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 8, 1980

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Copyright © 1980 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa
Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, December 8, 1980" (1980). *Faculty Senate Documents*. 361.
http://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/361

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Documents by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

SENATE MINUTES

December 8, 1980

1277

1. Remarks from Vice President and Provost Martin.
2. Announcement of items that will appear on the January 26, 1981 calendar. The proposed mission statement of the Educational Policies Commission and a request from the Commencement Committee concerning faculty attendance at commencement appear at the end of these minutes.

OLD/NEW BUSINESS

3. 277 222 A ROTC Program at UNI (letter from LTC Michael J. Bartelme, Professor of Military Science, University of Iowa, October 14, 1980). Approved motion to continue consideration with a possible completion date of May 1, 1981. Approved motion to docket in regular order.

DOCKET

4. 278 223 Report of ad hoc Committee on Admission to the University. Approved motion to: 1) accept this as an interim report, 2) expand the committee by including the Vice President and Provost, the Department Heads of English and Math, and the Director of the Learning Skills Center, 3) and to not disband the ad hoc Committee.

The University Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:18 p.m. December 8, 1980, in the Board Room by Chairperson Davis.

Present: Abel, Alberts, Cawelti, D. Davis, J. Duea, Evenson, Geadelmann, Gillette, Heller, Hollman, G. A. Hovet, Little, Millar, Noack, Remington, Richter, Sandstrom, Schurrer, TePaske, J. F. Harrington (ex officio).

Alternates: Hallberg for Gish, L. Rackstraw for Hallberg, Bisbey for Thomson

Absent: None

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Mr. Jeff Moravec of the Cedar Falls Record and Ms. Mary Cahill and Ms. Michelle Ruba of the Northern Iowan were in attendance.

1. Vice President and Provost Martin rose and addressed the Senate. Dr. Martin pointed out that the current issue of the North Central Association Quarterly carries pictures of the University of Northern Iowa on the cover and inside cover of the publication. Dr. Martin stated that this quarterly is sent to all primary, secondary, and post-secondary member institutions of the North Central Association in a 20 state region.

Vice President and Provost Martin stated that on Tuesday, December 9, members of the administration would be attending a budget hearing with the Governor in Des Moines. He indicated that while the state revenue picture appears better, it is not as good as could be hoped for.

2. Chairperson Davis indicated to the Senate that three items would appear on the calendar of the January 26 meeting. Those items include: proposed mission statement from the Educational Policies Commission, the report from EPC on the academic ethics proposal, and a proposal from the Chairman of the Commencement Committee concerning faculty attendance at commencement.

Old/New Business

3. 277 222 A ROTC Program at UNI (letter from LTC Michael J. Bartelme, Professor of Military Science, University of Iowa, 10/14/80). See Senate Minutes 1275 and 1276.

Chairperson Davis had presented to the Senate possible lines of action for the Senate's consideration. He stated he felt the Senate should inform LTC Bartelme of its intentions and time frame concerning his request.

Senator Geadelmann inquired should the Senate approve this proposal, what would be the next approvals that would have to be sought. Chairperson Davis responded by stating the proposal would have to go to the Curriculum Committee, and if accepted there, onto the Board of Regents for approval.

Senator Schurrer stated as a member of the Curriculum Committee that the Committee looks at the content of the courses proposed. She stated that the big question of the philosophy of ROTC would have to be considered by the Senate. Chairperson Davis indicated that an additional possibility would be to refer this proposal to the entire faculty.

Senator Sandstrom indicated that he objects to proposals coming from outside the university. He stated that there has not been a demonstrated need for or a request from UNI faculty or students for this proposal. Senator Duea pointed out that she had been contacted by numerous faculty members who were in favor of this proposal as an available option to students. She pointed out that the faculty members were also strongly in favor of a permanent monitoring committee composed of faculty members.

Hallberg moved, Evenson seconded, to tell LTC Bartelme that the Faculty Senate may consider an association with an ROTC program and; it may be possible to complete the consideration by February 1, 1981.

Chairperson of the Faculty Harrington stated that she had some practical concerns with this proposal. She stated she was concerned about curricular review and about Faculty review before and after the hiring of instructors for this program. She asked if the procedure would follow current UNI policies. She stated she would like more information on how the ROTC program fits into the structure of UNI.

Senator Heller indicated he would like more information on the number of students who are interested in an ROTC program at UNI.

Dr. Paul Kelso rose and addressed the Senate. He stated a survey was conducted at registration for the Fall 1979 semester. The survey was administered at advanced registration and at summer registration for new students. He stated 9,153 students were surveyed and that 6,059 students returned the questionnaire for a return rate of 66%. The return rate broke down as follows by classification: Freshman 66%, Sophomores 92%, Juniors 75%, and Seniors 26%. He stated to the question "If ROTC could be beneficial to UNI?" that 48% responded yes and 52% responded no. He pointed out that of those students who might be able to participate in an ROTC program, mainly new freshmen students, 61% indicated that they thought the program could be beneficial. In raw numbers 79 students indicated they would be definitely interested and 583 students indicated they might be interested. Of this total, 345 students were new to the institution. Of those returning the questionnaire 5,158 indicated they were not interested in ROTC. Dr. Kelso pointed out that on the ACT profile report, 5% indicated they would be interested in an ROTC program.

Senator Sandstrom inquired why the Senate should not simply docket this proposal in regular order. He stated that a February 1 reporting date was simply too soon. Chairperson Davis indicated that the date could be amended but that he thought that it was important that we indicate to the ROTC people whether UNI is still interested in this proposal or not.

Professor David Morgan rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that he thought the Senate was going to move slow on this issue but that he was surprised that the Senate was doing as much as it was today. He indicated that he hoped the Senate would delay acting on this proposal so that additional university input could be sought and received.

Senator Hovet pointed out that the motion on the floor indicates that the Senate may consider the issue and does not give a pro or con stance to the question of ROTC.

Sandstrom moved, Geadelmann, seconded, to amend by substituting May 1 for February 1.

Senator Remington inquired if the result of this amendment would be to prevent implementation of ROTC for the Fall 1981. Chairperson Davis indicated in the affirmative.

Senator Sandstrom indicated that to say May 1 does not say that the Senate could not act before that date.

Several Senators inquired as to necessary consideration completion dates for the ROTC program to go into effect for Fall 1981. It was pointed out that unless this item was taken as a separate issue to the Curriculum Committee and to the Board of Regents that it is unlikely that implementation could occur by the fall semester 1981. It was pointed out that the Senate should feel no pressure to act quickly but on the other hand should progress as expeditiously as possible.

Question on the motion to amend was called. Motion to amend passed.

Senator Cawelti asked for a sharing of the administration's position concerning the ROTC proposal. Vice President and Provost Martin indicated that there is no administrative consensus on this proposal.

Senator Geadelmann stated that since implementation of this program would cause some university expense, she wondered if any latitude existed in the current budget asking to accommodate this possibility. Vice President and Provost Martin indicated the budget had already been submitted and that there was nothing in that budget earmarked for these possible expenses.

Chairperson of the Faculty Harrington indicated that this was the type of question that needed to be resolved and questioned as to what format could be used to solicit these questions and their answers.

Dean Morin rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that he was quite concerned by the use of the word "may" in the first part of the motion and felt that it gave a negative connotation to the respondent.

J.F. Harrington moved and Sandstrom seconded to amend by substituting for the word "may" in the first line the word "will".

Senator Hovet indicated that she felt the change in wording spoke more positively to the proposal than she felt she could support.

Professor Skaine addressed the Senate stating that he would support the original language as used in the motion.

Question on the motion to amend was called. The motion to amend passed.

Assistant Vice President Lott inquired if the word consideration meant Senate consideration or consideration by all the bodies that would have to address this proposal. The response from the Chair was the consideration referred to was consideration by the Senate.

Senator Hallberg indicated that the discussion on this issue was following a peculiar line. He stated he felt the Senate really did not want to talk about this issue.

Chairperson of the Faculty Harrington stated that consideration of this issue must include both the mechanical details and the philosophy of the proposal.

Senator Schurrer asked if the Senate approved this proposal by April 1, could implementation still occur by Fall of 1981. Assistant Vice President Lott indicated that if the Curriculum Committee had this proposal by April 1 and if it was treated as an interdisciplinary curricular proposal, then consideration and possible approval could occur with a potential implementation of Fall 1981.

Senator Remington inquired what new information would be received by the Senate prior to May 1. He also pointed out that the question of finding fault or praise with Iowa State University's ROTC program is irrelevant to the proposal at hand. He stated that he felt the Senate should be making their decision now.

Professor Morgan inquired about the procedural method of handling this issue. Senator Remington responded that the Senate is considering for possible acceptance the concept of ROTC. If accepted, the curricular proposal would go to the Curriculum Committee for review.

Senator Geadelmann inquired if members of the Curriculum Committee were troubled with the source of the ROTC request. Assistant Vice President Lott indicated yes and that last year the Curriculum Committee indicated they did not want to consider this issue until the views of the student and faculty Senates had been sought.

Senator Remington stated that he felt the Senate should be considering the concept of the proposal now.

Remington moved, Alberts seconded, to substitute the motion on the floor with "The UNI Faculty Senate states that there is nothing intrinsically inimical to the educational processes of the University of Northern Iowa in having an ROTC program at the university."

Chairperson of the Faculty Harrington pointed out that the vote that was about to be conducted would be on which motion the Senate wished to consider.

Senator Schurrer stated that she saw nothing incompatible with the two motions and believed that the Senate should defeat this substitute motion and consider the original motion.

Senator Evenson stated that the difference is when do we discuss the real question.

Question on the motion to substitute was called. The motion failed on a division of 8 yes and 12 no.

Question on the original motion as amended was called. The motion passed.

Chairperson Davis called for a motion to implement the spirit of the motion that had just been passed.

Sandstrom moved, Evenson seconded, to docket this item in regular order.

Senator Sandstrom stated that this would have a net result of bringing this issue up at the next Senate meeting.

Senator Hovet asked if the questions that have been raised would be answered at that meeting. Senator Evenson stated that the Senate may come up with a list of questions at that meeting.

Senator Rackstraw stated that perhaps two members could be appointed as a subcommittee to present information on the questions that have been raised so that a decision could be reached at that meeting.

Senator Sandstrom indicated that perhaps the questions could be identified at the January 26 meeting and that various pros and cons of the issue could be presented at the February 9 meeting with a possible vote on the proposal at the February 23 meeting.

Chairperson of the Faculty Harrington indicated that if the Senate so desired they could have a discussion of this issue at the February meeting of the faculty.

Professor Skaine rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that the faculty is the ultimate decider of issues on this campus. He stated he believed the faculty should have the first crack at this issue and that the Senate should be guided by the will of the faculty.

Senator Remington indicated that the Senate should accept their responsibility and act on this issue.

Senator Evenson indicated that the faculty did not have the benefit of LTC Bartelme's presentation and that he felt it would be out of order to take this issue at this point to the faculty.

Question on the motion was called. Motion passed.

Docket

4. 278 223 Report of ad hoc Committee on Admission to the University.
See Senate Minutes 1275.

Professor Macmillan rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that the philosophy of this proposal is to establish a set of courses for high school students to have to be allowed to enter as regular students to UNI. He also pointed out that the proposal outlines actions to be taken if the students have not had these courses during their high school preparation. He pointed out that the committee primarily dealt with courses in areas of Math and English. Professor Macmillan stated that the committee did speak to the use of ACT and CLEP test scores but that these were only recommendations. He stated that a committee including the heads of the Departments of English Language and Literature and Mathematics may wish to modify these recommendations. He stated the committee is striving to see that students are able to do university work and that nothing in the proposal is designed to prohibit or inhibit access to the university. Professor Macmillan stated that the proposal strongly encourages the students to take these courses during their high school preparation. Professor Macmillan reviewed the three recommendations contained in his recent correspondence and stated it would be necessary for the Senate to form the committee indicated in recommendation three. He stated it would also be necessary for the Senate to establish an implementation date which the committee feels should be at least two years in the future.

G.A. Hovet moved, Cawelti seconded, that the University Faculty Senate accept the interim report and approve the implications of the suggested admission standards and that the University Faculty Senate designate a committee which would include the Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Head of the Department of English, and the Head of the Department of Mathematics, the Director of the Learning Skills Center, and the current ad hoc committee, to deal with the implementation and staffing of the necessary remedial coursework as outlined in the report and that the ad hoc committee not be disbanded.

Senator Remington inquired of the maker of the motion if she expected that the report that would come back would be in catalog language. Senator Hovet responded in the affirmative.

Professor Skaine rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that there are some strong concerns on the effect of this proposal on university enrollment. He stated to accept this as an interim report with only implementation left to act upon is moving too fast. He questions if faculty hearings should be held first. Professor Macmillan responded by saying the Committee had met with every faculty senate on campus concerning this proposal. Chairperson Davis indicated that after the ad hoc committee has revised this proposal that the proposal could be referred to a standing committee of the Senate.

Senator Sandstrom raised a point of information. He asked for an interpretation of the ACT scores and how they relate to the current curriculums being taken by students in high school.

Professor Morgan rose and addressed the Senate. He stated he believed the proposal is too broad and that the proposal should be reviewed by individual departments. He stated he was concerned that we not make the proposed guidelines too rigid. He said it was important not to separate the standards from consideration of the atmosphere at UNI and that of student motivation. He pointed out that students who have been out of school in the work world for a while, upon their return to campus often apologize for not having the basic skills. He stated that their motivation and willingness to seek help often overcomes their difficulties. He stated he felt that typical 18-21 year old students lack the initiative to deal with the deficiencies and also lack discipline. He urged that the areas of the standards, student motivation, and UNI atmosphere be linked together.

Professor Wylie Anderson indicated that the committee is looking at the basics which include basic addition and subtraction and composition. He stated that the committee was very concerned that the university not become a remedial institution.

Senator Sandstrom indicated that the university should be providing services for continuing education students and for those students who have been educationally deprived. He questioned if the mechanics of ACT and CLEP allowed for this to happen.

Professor Rider indicated that an important area to investigate is the Learning Skills Center and the role that it plays in this proposal. He stated that is why he supports the motion on the floor.

Dean Morin rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that the objectives were noble but he questioned their meaning. He asked what would be the impact upon students. He stated the report needed consequence statements. He questioned, for example, how many students would be referred to the Learning Skills Center on the basis of the requirements as they now exist.

Registrar Leahy rose and addressed the Senate. He agreed that the test scores are high and that they should be. He stated the Committee wanted the students to do this preparatory work in high school or be able to show on test scores that they have had an equivalent amount of academic work. He pointed out that the desire of the committee is to influence the high school curriculum so that students have this preparation before coming to UNI. If this is done, then the question of the number of sections needed in English and Mathematics is not a problem.

Professor DeNault rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that to not do something such as the proposal before the Senate is to perhaps do a greater disservice to the students. He stated that many students, as they are currently prepared, are not capable of performing basic collegiate course work.

Senator Alberts stated that she was most concerned that we provide services to meet the needs of the students. She questioned, for example, how many students come to UNI currently with $2\frac{1}{2}$ years of mathematics. Chairperson Davis responded by reminding the Senate that the implementation of this proposal would be phased in over a minimum of a two-year period.

Senator Abel stated that the test options were really not a viable alternative and that the real method of meeting these requirements were either by completion of coursework in high school or at UNI.

Professor Wylie Anderson rose and addressed the Senate. He stated that the committee had sent a questionnaire to high school counselors and that their response was overwhelmingly positive. The counselors were asking UNI to give them some guidelines to incorporate in their high school curriculums and to influence their students course selection.

Professor Skaine inquired as to where the possible ramifications part of the original charge to the committee was in the report. He stated he felt this report was incomplete.

Professor Wylie Anderson stated that the committee did not address the ramifications in its report. He stated that the Committee had no way of determining the potential number of new staff members that would be needed. He stated the question of support services would have to be addressed by the Office of Academic Affairs. Professor Macmillan pointed out that this is exactly the reason for the expansion of the committee to include the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the heads of the Departments of English Language and Literature and Mathematics.

Question on the motion was called. The motion passed.

Chairperson of the Faculty Harrington expressed, on behalf of the Senate, a vote of appreciation to the members of the ad hoc committee.

It was moved and seconded to adjourn. Motion passed. The Senate adjourned at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Philip L. Patton, Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, **Friday, January 9, 1981.**

Office of the Registrar
AREA 319 273-2241

TO: Darrell Davis, Chairperson Faculty Senate
FROM: Robert Leahy, Chairperson University Commencement
Committee *Robert Leahy*
RE: Attendance at Commencement
DATE: December 5, 1980

The University Commencement Committee is concerned about the decreasing attendance of both students and faculty at the commencement program. The format of the program is currently under review and some changes may be made to place greater emphasis on the graduates with the hope of increasing student attendance.

The attendance of the faculty was also reviewed. In the Spring 1980 commencement, 148 faculty members participated. The Summer 1980 commencement had only 43 faculty participants. The Commencement Committee requests that the Faculty Senate support a recommendation that a minimum of 50% of the faculty from each department participate in the commencement exercises. If members of the faculty do not have academic apparel, arrangements will be provided for them to rent or purchase the apparel.

ch

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA · Cedar Falls, Iowa 50613

Department of Speech

Area 319 273-2217

To: Darrel Davis
University Faculty Senate

From: Jay Edelnant *JE*
Educational Policies Commission

Re: Mission Statement

The EPC has drafted and approved the following mission statement and refers it to the senate for consideration:

The Educational Policies Commission is an independent body charged with research into and reporting on the issues and implications of broad curricular and educational policies. Issues to be investigated or documents to be studied are usually referred to the commission by the University Faculty Senate although student representatives, student organizations, administrators and individual members of the university community may bring items to its attention. The commission may also generate its own agenda and studies or may recommend that some issues referred to it be redirected to a more appropriate body. The commission engages in research; it may conduct polls and may sponsor hearings or interviews on issues within its province. On the basis of this research, the commission issues reports and recommendations to the appropriate university body, most often the University Faculty Senate.

Should this mission statement be approved, the EPC recommends that the commission be reduced in number by allowing at-large positions to remain unfilled as they become vacant until the commission is composed of representatives from the five colleges (HFA, NS, Ed., SBS, and Bus.) and one at-large member. The student membership would be concurrently reduced so that an equal representation of students and faculty is maintained.