



11-2-1967

November 2, 1967

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "November 2, 1967" (1967). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 50.
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/50>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Elwyn B. Robinson Department of Special Collections at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING

November 2, 1967

(NOT TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO NON-FACULTY MEMBERS)

1.

A meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 2, 1967, in Room 415 of Twamley Hall. Mr. Tomasek presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Starcher, George W.	Hedahl, Beulah	Nordlie, Robert C.
Anderson, Donald G.	Hershbell, Jackson P.	O'Kelly, Bernard
Barnes, Ronald E.	Heyse, Margaret	Pearce, Donald J.
Brumleve, Stanley	Holland, F. D.	Peterson, Russell
Bullard, Charles	Jacoby, Arthur P.	Potter, Gerald
Clifford, Thomas J.	Johnson, A. William	Reid, John
Cornatzer, William E.	Kannowski, Paul B.	Rognlie, Philip
Cunningham, Harold D.	Koenker, William E.	St. Clair, F. Y.
Curry, Mabel	Kolstoe, Ralph	Smith, Glenn
Curry, Myron	Larson, Milton B.	Stenberg, Virgil
Cushman, M. L.	Marti, Leonard	Thomforde, Clifford
Dickens, Nancy	McKenzie, Ruby M.	Thorson, Playford V.
Fisch, William B.	Naismith, D. P.	Tomasek, Henry J.
Hankerson, Kenneth L.	Nelson, Edward	Wynne, John T.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Boehle, William R.	Harwood, Theodore H.	Robertson, Donald J.
Delabarre, Helen C.	Reiten, Palmer J.	Rowe, John L.
Gustafson, Ben G.		Witmer, Robert B.

3.

There being no corrections, the minutes of the October meeting were ordered approved as submitted.

4.

The Chairman called for nominations for the chairmanship of the Senate. Mr. Rognlie and Mr. Brumleve were nominated. It was moved, seconded and carried that nominations cease and that a vote be taken. Mr. Holland moved that the one who received the second highest vote be nominated for Vice-president. The Senate proceeded to the next item on the agenda while the votes were being tabulated.

5.

Mr. Naismith presented the recommendation of the Academic Policies Committee that the present system of reporting deficiencies be continued and moved its acceptance. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and lost. Mr. St. Clair moved that deficiencies be reported once during the semester and that this should start the Second Semester 1967-68. Mr. Thorson seconded the motion. A motion was made to amend the original motion to read that this practice should begin in the fall of 1968. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and lost.

Mr. Thorson moved to amend the motion by delegating to Dean Robertson the power to decide the editorial changes necessary to conform with the new rule. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and carried. The original motion as amended was voted upon and carried.

6.

Mr. Tomasek announced that Mr. Rognlie was elected Chairman of the Senate. Mr. Holland moved that nominations for Vice-chairman cease and that a unanimous ballot be cast for Mr. Brumleve. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Rognlie assumed the Chair.

7.

Mr. Naismith presented the following recommendations from the Committee on Committees concerning procedures for filling permanent vacancies: 1) That the Committee on Committees be authorized to fill the vacancies; 2) That the Committee on Committees make recommendations to the Senate and that the Senate after further nominations elect to fill the vacancies. Mr. Naismith moved that the Senate vote on these two alternatives. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Pearce moved that the Senate authorize the Committee on Committees to fill any vacancies on Senate Committees. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. The following are substitutions or replacements for the 1967-68 Senate elected committees:

Faculty Research - St. Clair for Krahmer
 Board of Publications - Omdahl for Smeall
 Student Academic Standards - Behringer for Fossum
 Summer Session - Iseminger for Walker
 University College - Behsman

Mr. Naismith moved that on those exceptional and rare occasions which call for a special committee meeting and a quorum cannot be assembled, the Executive Committee of the Senate is empowered to make temporary provision for that committee. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried.

8.

Mr. Stenberg moved that the Vice-president for Academic Affairs and the Director of Research and Development (presently the Dean of the Graduate School) become ex-officio members of the Faculty Research Committee. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

9.

Mr. Tomasek presented the recommendation of the Long Range Planning Committee which would have the effect of broadening the scope of the Curriculum Committee's activity. Mr. Tomasek moved to adopt the principle in regard to increasing the jurisdiction of the Curriculum Committee. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Tomasek moved that the Committee on Committees study the structure of the Curriculum Committee to decide upon recommendations to report to the Senate for approval. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (See Attachment)

10.

Mr. Reid moved that pre-registration be eliminated for all except incoming freshmen. The motion was seconded. Mr. Kolstoe moved to amend by including transfer students being allowed to enroll during the summer. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and carried. Miss Heyse moved to amend the motion to read that all pre-registration be conducted only in the summer for the ensuing semester. This was

seconded, voted upon and carried. Mr. Stenberg moved to refer the original motion to the ad hoc Committee on Registration. The motion was seconded, voted upon and lost. Mr. Barnes requested that Glenn Meidinger be allowed to inform the Senate of the student opinion regarding pre-registration. There being no objection, Mr. Meidinger presented the student view to the Senate. The motion that pre-registration be eliminated for all except incoming freshmen and transfer students and that this be conducted only during the summer for the ensuing semester was voted upon and carried.

12.

The Senate went into executive session to consider the awarding of two honorary degrees. Mr. Reid presented the names of the candidates and moved that the Senate of the University of North Dakota recommend to the President and the State Board of Higher Education that the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws and the honorary degree of Doctor of Engineering be awarded to them at the commencement designated by President Starcher.* The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried.

13.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

R. M. McKenzie
Secretary

*The recipients will be announced upon completion of necessary arrangements.

Attachment

The LRPC at its last meeting assigned the implementation of its recommendations to specific faculty members. I have been asked to introduce recommendation #3: (p. 11 Priorities for Progress)

Constitute a Curriculum Committee empowered not only to review and approve course changes (as at present) but to review periodically all University courses and curricula. (Study strengths and weaknesses of each college, faculty, and department.)

The present description of the curriculum committees jurisdiction reads as follows:

The function of the committee is to consider all new courses or course changes. It also considers proposed programs and curricula which may result in further requests for new courses. It considers new courses proposed for graduate credit after they first have been approved by the Graduate Committee. The Curriculum Committee forwards all of its recommendations to the Senate for action.

The following are the pertinent parts of the LRPC Task Force report on Curriculum:

The Task Force on Curriculum has concerned itself with four major areas in which both long- and short-range policy changes might be effected. We considered many proposals for innovations in course offerings and content, though we pass on only three specific recommendations. Full-scale curricular revision, if necessary, is obviously a long-range project in itself. It is not a task to be undertaken within the short time allotted to our committee.

Some members of the Task Force held the view that whatever may be the merit of particular curricular changes, the administrative machinery for accomodating these changes with ease and dispatch does not presently exist. Accordingly, we also considered and are proposing certain procedures by which curricular innovation may better be introduced.

* * *

II. Channels of Curriculum Change. The mechanics for securing curricular change at the University of North Dakota are complex and cumbersome at best. Depending on one's point of view, they might to advantage remain as they are. But if it is desirable both to facilitate and to encourage up-dating, experiment, and innovation in the curriculum, new machinery is needed. We propose that a Curriculum Committee be appointed and that over an extended period of time this committee review critically and systematically the offerings of all disciplines, departments, divisions, branches, and colleges of the University. The Curriculum Committee's primary tasks would be (a) to determine

the relevance of coursework provided, the relation of that work to offerings elsewhere within the University, and the competence of the unit concerned to offer the courses it does, and (b) to make recommendations accordingly to appropriate supervisory bodies, including first, of course, the unit being examined.

One or two subcommittees of the Curriculum Committee could deal with incidental changes in course numbers, titles, hours, and the like as these are proposed by departments. It is not anticipated that such proposals would warrant the attention of the full committee. Another subcommittee would review requests for new courses and for revisions of curriculum. Only in the case of substantial changes in course content or in total departmental offerings would such requests be brought to the attention of the full Curriculum Committee.

This structure would facilitate change by deemphasizing the review function. It would render virtually automatic the approval of most minor and many major curricular changes. Change would be encouraged, on the other hand, by the promise of periodic and general curriculum review.

* * *

At no time during our discussions did we perceive the role of the Task Force to be legislative in character. Our proposals, therefore, are non-specific and intentionally so. As a group we had neither the experience nor the information to devise detailed solutions of the problems we recognized initially or that were brought subsequently to our attention. We expect appropriate University committees to study our proposals and, in the long range to which this enterprise is oriented, to develop equitable solutions.