

# University of North Dakota UND Scholarly Commons

**University Senate Meeting Minutes** 

**UND Publications** 

3-3-1994

### March 3, 1994

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. "March 3, 1994" (1994). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 423. https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/423

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the UND Publications 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.commons@library.und.edu.

#### Minutes of the University Senate Meeting

March 3, 1994

1185 - out lights growthing your suppression 1.0 commission and operation

The March meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, March 3, 1994, in room 7, Gamble Hall. Carla Hess presided.

#### The following members of the Senate were present:

Bender, Myron Bostrom, A. Joy Gabrynowicz, Joanne

Baker, Kendall L. Hill, Richard L. Omdahl, Lloyd Hoffarth, Al Jacobsen, Bruce Boyd, Robert Johnson, A. William Davis, W. Jeremy Koozin, Timothy DeRemer, E. Dale Lawrence, W. Fred Lewis, Robert W. Gard, Betty Lindholm, Lynn M. Strathe, Marlene Gerhardt, Cassie Lockney, Thomas Swisher, Wayne Gershman, Kathleen Ludtke, Richard Grabe, Mark D. Mason, Mark Hampsten, Elizabeth McElroy-Edwards, J. Hein, David W. Merrill, Lois J. Williams, John A. Heitkamp, Thomasine Navara, James L.

Alkezweeny, Abdul J. Henly, George Norberg, Jon Anderegg, Jeanne Henry, Gordon H. O'Kelly, Bernard Antes, James R. Hess, Carla Wulff O'Kelly, Marcia Owens, Thomas C. Phillips, Monte L. Poehls, Alice Rankin, Elizabeth Richards, Thomas Elsinga, Lillian Lee, Randy H. Schmitt, Sue Fivizzani, Albert J. Lemon, Donald Schneider, Mary Jane Sheridan, Daniel Szigeti, Elvira Twohey, Denise Volden, Cecilia

#### The following members of the Senate were absent:

Adams, Shaun Jensen, Clayton D'Andraia, Frank Gust, Ian

Beiswenger, Lyle Johnson, Phil Retzlaff, Cory Knudson, Kari Schubert, George W. Knull, Harvey P. Slotnick, Henry B. Hamerlik, Gerald Kweit, Mary Tobac, David Harris, Mary Kweit, Robert W. Uhlenberg, Beverly Henriksen, Mogens Lepire, Chris Wagner, Heather Irwin, Nathan Loney, Jason Wilsnack, Sharon C. Iserman, Scott Naismith, Donald P.

Odegard, John

The Chair called for announcements: 1) William Sheridan, Professor of Biology, announced plans for a proposed Maize Genetics Research Center; 2) Jackie McElroy-Edwards, Chair of the Committee on Committees, announced that the Committee Preference List has been distributed and urged participation in this fundamental role of faculty governance; 3) Mr. O'Kelly announced that the Council of the College of Arts and Sciences honors the preference of the Act faculty of the School of Communication that the School become collegially Act affiliated, for administrative and budgetary purposes, with the College of Fine Arts; and 4) Mr. Williams offered congratulations to all faculty and departments receiving awards at Founders Day.

4.

The Question Period was held and Mr. Williams asked why the Student Senate did not fund the faculty award for student advisement this year. Ms. Gerhardt responded that she was not aware of this occurrence but that she would take this back to the Student Senate.

Mr. Winrich commented regarding Internet and the computer access super highway. He stated that we are being poorly served by HECN.

5.

The Chair asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the February meeting. Ms. Poehls stated that there was a typographical error in item number eight which has now been corrected to read, 3 against, rather than 32 against. There being no other corrections, the minutes were declared approved as corrected.

M my 1 6.

The Chair asked if there were questions regarding the annual reports of the Administrative Procedures Committee, Admissions Committee, or Student Academic Standards Committee. There being no questions or objections, the Chair stated the reports will be filed.

J Remai 7. over

Mr. Mason presented the following motion which was tabled to this Senate meeting:

that the University Senate create an ad hoc committee on Restructuring, composed of three Senators and two non-Senators. This committee shall be charged with reviewing all proposals for restructuring and bureaucratic streamlining, with a goal of finding alternatives for saving money while preserving the University's ability to carry out its legislatively mandated mission. Findings and recommendations shall be reported to the Senate regularly; the members and chair of the committee shall be elected by the Senate immediately.

Discussion followed. Mr. Jacobsen called for the question. Ms. Bostrom seconded. A vote was taken and the result was 29 for, 26 against, and

1 abstaining. The motion failed to pass by a two-thirds majority. Discussion continued. Mr. Mason moved to amend by adding the following to the end of the second sentence: "as well as examining possible effects on the curriculum." Ms. Lindholm seconded the motion to amend. Discussion continued. Mr. Phillips moved to vote immediately on the amendment. Mr. O'Kelly seconded the motion which was voted upon and carried by a vote of 51 for, 2 against and 3 abstaining. The motion to amend was voted upon and lost by a vote of 20 for, 35 against, and 1 abstaining.

Mr. Phillips moved to vote immediately on the main motion. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried by a vote of 45 for, 9 against, and 2 abstaining. The main motion was voted upon and lost by a vote of 7 for, 47 against, and 2 abstaining.

The Chair asked that the Senate return to the Varvel-Soreneson Restructuring Plan. Mr. Mason moved to suspend the rules to move to informal discussion on the plan. Ms. Gabrynowicz seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Mr. O'Kelly moved a substitute motion to return to informal discussion after the completion of the regular Senate business. The motion was seconded. Mr. Johnson moved to amend the motion to limit discussion until 5:10 p.m. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and failed by a vote of 25 for, 28 against, and 3 abstaining. The motion to return to informal discussion was voted upon and lost by a vote of 16 for, 32 against, and 4 abstaining.

8.

Ms. Rankin, speaking for the General Education Committee, explained the history of the NDUS General Education Transfer Agreement. She described the options which the Committee recommended in response to the proposal and called upon Ms. Strathe for the motion. Ms. Strathe moved to adopt the following:

The University of North Dakota University Senate receives and acknowledges the proposed North Dakota University System transfer agreement as written:

#### GENERAL EDUCATION TRANSFER AGREEMENT

General Education courses in the areas of communications, arts and humanities, social sciences, and mathematics, science and technology taken at any North Dakota University System institution count upon transfer toward the general education requirements at all NDUS institutions in one of the following two ways.

- 1. If the general education coursework includes courses from each of these areas totaling at least 36 semester hours and completes the general education requirements of the institution from which the student transfers then the student is deemed to have completed the lower division general education requirements of the institution to which the courses are transferred.
- In all other areas the general education courses from the indicated areas are applicable to an appropriate general education requirement of the institution to which they are transferred. In these cases the number of credits required

to complete the general education requirement in each area is determined by the policies of the institution to which the courses are transferred.

Within the stipulated areas each institution shall indicate in its catalog and other student advisement materials its courses which are approved for general education. NDUS institutions may establish program/institution specific requirements. A student should consult the institution to which she/he intends to transfer relative to these program/institution requirements.

The University of North Dakota urges the Chancellor's Office, the NDUS cabinet, and the campuses of the NDUS to seriously consider the following:

- Inclusion of a specific minimum hour requirements in each of the four identified categories.
  - Restriction of the transfer agreement to the Bachelor's degree or an Associate of Arts degree.
- Appointment of a NDUS task force to develop implementation guidelines by July 1, 1994.
  - . Review of the agreement three years following implementation.

Ms. Szigeti seconded the motion. Discussion followed. Mr. O'Kelly asked to suspend the rules to allow Thomas Rand to speak. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried by a vote of 52 for, 2 against, and 1 other. Mr. Rand spoke to the motion and there being no objection, the Chair of the GER Committee, Tim Schroeder, was also allowed to speak. Mr. Omdahl moved that the rules be suspended and adjournment be delayed until completion of this item. Mr. O'Kelly seconded the motion which was voted upon and carried by a vote of 51 for, 3 against, and 1 abstaining. Discussion continued. Mr. Phillips moved to vote immediately. Ms. Gabrynowicz seconded the motion which was voted upon and carried by a vote of 50 for, 3 against, and 1 abstaining. The main motion was voted upon and carried by a vote of 50 for, 3 against, and 1 abstaining.

technology taken at env % eth Dokota University System institution

Ms. Lindholm moved to hold a special meeting of the Senate on March 24 to continue discussion on the restructuring proposal and related topics. The motion was seconded, voted upon and failed by a vote of 12 for, 23 against, and 3 abstaining.

and because process in about a feet 10.

light worth followed on Franciscon and to the mediapora obligations

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Alice Poehls
Secretary

#### MEMORANDUM Registros a Office due dilly alcundus di Molif

University Senate TO:

3-18-94

FROM: Alice Poehls, Chair

RE:

Annual Administrative Procedures Committee Report to the University Senate

The Administrative Procedures Committee met on 13 occasions to review student petitions for deviations from university-wide academic requirements and policies, such as registration deadlines, grade changes, and all other administrative procedures not reserved to the jurisdiction of the Deans, except for general education requirements. The summary table below reports the activity of the committee from March 23, 1993 to February 14, 1994.

#### Membership:

### Legister's Office death of the tructor area Spring 1993 Fall 1993 and Spring 1994

Dean Schubert Dean Schmitt Dean Schmitt Bill Bolonchuk Bill Bolonchuk Diane Helgeson Don Lemon Diane Helgeson
Ken Westby Fathy Messiha
No student in attendance Ranetta Starr Monty Nielsen - ex officio, Alice Poehls, ex officio, non-voting chair

Dean Schubert Dale DeRemer non-voting chair

#### III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES COMMITTEE REPORT FOR 1993-94

A.	Petitions by type:	Approved	Denied	Total
	1. Drops after deadline	26	38	64
	2. Grade Changes	11	4	15
	3. Change to/from	0.00	and Screw	
	S-U grading 4. Remove "I" or "W"	6	4	10
	from student record	si bas 1 and	med 1 ol	2
	5. Withdraw from school			
	after deadline	5	2	7
	6. Receive transfer cred	it 0	10001	1
	7. Permanent Incompletes	3	Resultrees.	4
	8. Reinstated repeated			
	grade	0	1	1 The 1
	9. Continue as a transier	nt		
	student	0	1	1

10. 11.	Remove duplication Allow to graduate with	2	0	2
	123 credits	0	1	1
	Accept transfer credit from an AVTI Waive 60 hours from 4-yea	0	x311xevia	1
	college requirement	7	0	7
	Change converted "I" back to "I" Replace transfer credit	2	ino 1 aunu	3
	with Language Placement credit	0 63	<u>1</u> 57	120
B. Pe	rsonal re-considerations ter denials:	2	8	10
C. Re	ferred back for additional	informat	ion: 15	

A. Grade change forms administratively approved by the Registrar's Office due to Instructor Error (authority given by Ad-Pro Committee) for Fall Semester 1993 (941):

В

Arts and Sciences	64
Business and Public Administration	16
Center for Aerospace Sciences	7
Center for Teaching and Learning	20001
Engineering and Mines	3
Fine Arts	5
Graduate School	3
Human Resources Development	12
Medicine	0
Nursing	4
and bring	2
	117

B. Grade change forms administratively approved by the Registrar's Office due to Instructor Error (authority given by Ad-Pro Committee) for Summer Session 1993 (934):

Arts and Sciences	20
Business and Public Administration	3
Center for Aerospace Sciences	9
Center for Teaching and Learning	abuse of our
Engineering and Mines	0
Fine Arts	Seb olla
Graduate School	2 2 2
Human Resources Development	2 2
Law	0
Medicine	905,18
Nursing Inereast s a	Con O nue
	37

C. Grade change forms administratively approved by the Registrar's Office due to Instructor Error (authority given by Ad-Pro Committee) for Spring Semester 1993 (933):

Arts and Sciences	45
Business and Public Administration	6
Center for Aerospace Sciences	5
Center for Teaching and Learning	10
Engineering and Mines	2
Fine Arts	7
Graduate School	4
Human Resources Development	6
Law	0
Medicine	2
Nursing	0
	87

B. Midterm deficiency reports not returned by departments to the Registrar's Office for Fall Semester 1993 (941):

Number of Deficiency sections not returned	Number of course sections	% not recvd
92	846	10.9%
0	218	0%
0	173	0%
24	120	20%
1 0 0 0	129	0.7%
15	224	6.7%
7	291	2.4%
11 11	115	9.5%
<u>2</u> 152	61 2174	3.2%
	Deficiency sections not returned  92  0  24  1  15  7  11	Deficiency sections not returned       Number of course sections         92       846         0       218         0       173         24       120         1       129         15       224         7       291         11       115         2       61



Secretary of the University Senate DATE: 2-11-94

FROM: Arnie Johnson, Chair, Admissions Committee

RE: Annual Report to the University Senate

1992-1993 Membership

Robert Kweit (Chair) Judy DeMers Arnie Johnson Dory Marken Doug Munski Ann Peterson Jiaquin Yang Monty Nielsen (Ex-Officio) Jana Postivit (Student) Nicole Clayton (Student) Donna Bruce (Consultant) Judy Sannes (Consultant) Dean Schieve (Consultant) Gerald Hamerlik (Consultant)

1993-1994 Membership

Arnie Johnson (Chair) Diane Helgeson Doug Munski Ann Peterson Tom Wiggen Alice Poehls (Ex-Officio) Tom Salzwedel (Student) Arthur Jerome (Student) Donna Bruce (Consultant) Judy Sannes (Consultant) Dean Schieve (Consultant) Gerald Hamerlik (Consultant) George Schubert (Consultant)

Review/Appeals subcommittee membership

Robert Kweit, Chair Arnie Johnson

Arnie Johnson, Chair Dory Marken Diane Helgeson Jiaquin Yang Ann Peterson (alternate) Tom Wiggen ( alternate)

Enrollment Management subcommittee

Arnie Johnson Dean Schieve Tom Wiggen Jiaquin Yang

The Admissions committee met four times in the Spring of '93 and three times in the Fall of '93. President Baker met with us on April 2, 1993 to provide guidance and future direction for the committee. In addition, the review/appeals subcommittee met nine times during the year. This subcommittee reviewed the records of 147 applications of students that did not meet the core requirements for term 941 (Fall of 1993). Of these 147 applicants 99 were approved, and of the 99 that were approved, 63 enrolled in the University. Of the 63 that enrolled, 6 cancelled leaving a total of 57 that finished the semester. An interesting statistic is that the Fall GPA for these 57 students was 2.95 while the freshman class as a whole had a 2.51 GPA.

An enrollment management subcommittee was organized in the Fall of 1993. It has looked into the possibility of developing an enrollment model that will assist the Admissions committee in calculating an index that will assist in ascertaining an acceptance level for students applying that do not meet the core requirements. It will also aid in specifying an acceptance level for students who have met the core requirements but have very low ACTs or GPAs.

On Oct. 7, 1993 the University Senate passed the following resolution:

"The Admissions Committee may deny applicants who meet the core curriculum requirements but are evaluated to be high risk candidates for success at UND due to a low ACT composite score or a low SAT combined score, or a low high school grade point average.

To-date we have denied one student under this policy. The student whose admission was denied met the core but had an ACT of 16, a high school GPA of 1.78, and graduated 68th in a class of 76.

The committee is currently in its second year of reviewing applicants that have not met the core requirements in high school as set by the State Board of Higher Education. The committee feels that the review/appeal process has worked quite well. However, a large amount of time has been spent by the Admissions Office and the subcommittee processing these applicants.

The committee has been working in cooperation with the University Admissions Office tracking the students who are admitted without meeting the core requirements. Also, the committee is continuing to evaluate various statistics that correlate a student's college performance with that attained in high school. Qualitative factors such as various sports and leadership activities in high school are considered. In addition, the committee has discussed the use of other data or testing such as the Meyers/Briggs Type Inventory and Learning Methods Evaluation to assist the committee during the acceptance process and also to assist the advisors during the student's stay at UND.



TO: University Senate Team tow ob tails partyloga winsburg for is

FROM: Alice Poehls, Chair, Student Academic Standards Committee

DATE: February 4, 1994

Annual Student Academic Standards Committee Report to Senate

The Student Academic Standards Committee, an appeals board, meets upon demand. The committee functions within the guidelines approved by the Senate on February 3, 1983, and also those as revised in April, 1985. A summary of the year's Probation/Dismissal, Reinstatement, and Academic Grievance activities is attached.

Because of the confidential nature of the information about the students, the committee keeps no written minutes other than a statement about the action taken with respect to each student seeking reinstatement. When a grade grievance is the issue before the committee, minutes are kept of the entire proceedings.

The committee meets as needs arise, with the greatest demand usually occurring at a time immediately preceding the beginning of a term.

Nine meetings were held during 1993. as sat a real court of withour Education of the o

Membership:

#### Spring, 1993

Jean Oberpriller

Susan Henly Fred Schneider Martha Meek John Hammen Susan Henly
Richard Millspaugh Fred Schneider Jodi (Miller) Anderson - student Jodi (Miller) Anderson - student member Collette Landsberger - student member Jennifer Thompson - student member Monty Nielsen - ex officio, non- Alice Poehls - ex officio, nonportion printing bus you voting chair applications and voting chair

E. Academic Grievance Reviews

# Fall, 1993

John Hammen

Randy Lee Richard Millspaugh member

Sue McIntyre

## STUDENT ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT FOR 1993:

A.	Students dismissed:  1. Dismissed after Spring Semester 1993  2. Dismissed after Summer Session 1993  3. Dismissed after Fall Semester 1993  Total dismissed for year		508 59 200 767
В.	Students reinstated by Deans  1. Reinstated after Spring Semester 1993  2. Reinstated after Summer Session 1993  3. Reinstated after Fall Semester 1993  Total reinstatements by Dean for the year		68 26 <u>81</u> 175
c.	Requests for Reinstatement by Committee  1. Approved  2. Denied	,1 15	16
D.	Personal Appeals of Denied Reinstatements		1

February 17, 1994

TO: University Senate

FROM: GER Committee

RE: North Dakota University System General Education Transfer Agreement

The General Education Committee has been asked to bring to the Senate for consideration the attached draft of a North Dakota University System (NDUS) General Education Transfer Agreement. Because there are still unanswered questions about the implications of this agreement, we are not bringing it forward with a specific recommendation regarding endorsement by the Senate. Rather, we will request that the floor be open for discussion for a period of 15 minutes. At the end of the discussion period, we will ask for a motion roughly based on one of the options outlined below.

It should be noted that the text of this particular version has been rather unstable. Revisions were being considered at the System level as late as last week. To help us understand how this version was arrived at, the GER Committee offers the following brief history of the draft agreement, compiled with information provided by VPAA Marlene Strathe and Assistant VPAA Ron Pynn.

#### History and Background

Over many years, the institutions of higher education in North Dakota have developed articulation agreements to assist students transferring from one school to another in the state. Almost coincidental with the creation of the North Dakota University System (NDUS) came calls for the blanket transferability of general education coursework. Sharon Etemad, Executive Dean at UND-Lake Region, completed a study of transfer credits while a graduate student in CTL. She found that almost all transfer work within the NDUS was being accepted and counted toward requirements by the receiving institutions, including general education courses.

In 1993, the Chancellor, calling attention to the Seven Year Plan for transferability of coursework, asked that North Dakota institutions develop a policy on transfer credits to facilitate students transferring from one NDUS school to another. He especially was interested in general education coursework transferability. He called upon the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs in the system (the Academic Affairs Council) to draft a transfer policy covering general education. In the fall of 1993, a subcommittee from the Academic Affairs Council, consisting of Ronald Pynn (UND), Kathleen Corak (Minot), Dean Hermanson (Lake Region), and Richard Hanson (NDSU), was appointed to prepare the draft policy. At this point Professor Pynn consulted with the General Education Committee, which made recommendations regarding the content and language of such a policy.

The subcommittee draft, which was consistent with the GER Committee recommendations, called for blanket transfer of general education within the NDUS if students completed 36 hours of GER and had a minimum of six hours of GER coursework in each of the following areas: 1) English composition and communication, 2) arts and humanities, 3) social sciences, and 4) math, science, and technology.

After considering the subcommittee report, the Academic Affairs Council agreed to the 36 hour requirement but deleted the six hour minimums and substituted the word "communications" for "English composition and communications." The Chancellor's Office received the recommendation, made slight modifications in wording, and added the second paragraph on the partial completion of GER coursework. The section on partial completion was added in recognition that most students presently transfer without having completed the GER requirement.

When the new draft agreement was returned to the GER Committee, we sought to understand the reasons for the changes made by the Academic Affairs Council. The rationale offered by Vice President Strathe is that the specification of at least one composition course and six hour minimums in the other three areas is not flexible enough in its language to apply to the particular model of General Education in place at other NDUS schools. For instance, some schools combine areas (e.g., "Humanities and Social Sciences") or require coursework in areas UND does not (e.g., "Cultural Diversity," "Reasoning," "Wellness," etc.). Rather than try to force the other schools to



conform to UND's model--which is not without its problems--Vice President Strathe had proposed an articulation agreement that would approve <u>only coursework leading to a Bachelor's degree or an Associate of Arts degree</u>. The requirements for these degree programs, it appears, are reasonably consistent with the six hour area requirement we proposed. It is the Associate of Science (A.S.) or Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) degrees that are most problematic, most out of line with UND's general education requirements.

Although Vice President Strathe was still trying, as late as last week, to negotiate a revised agreement that would respond to the GER Committee's concerns, her efforts have met with resistance at the System level. Apparently the current draft agreement is regarded, by the Chancellor's office, as final and ready for presentation to the Board of Higher Education.

#### Proposed Action

At this point, the question before the Senate is: How do we at UND want to respond to this "final" draft of the System Transfer Agreement? As the GER Committee sees it, we have the following options:

**Option 1.** Assume that there may still be <u>some</u> room for further negotiation and ask the Chancellor's Office and/or the Board of Higher Education to consider one or more of the following:

--that the agreement be revised to state: "1. If the general education coursework leading to a Bachelor's degree or an Associate of Arts degree includes courses from each of these areas totalling at least 36 semester hours . . ." [italics indicate revised wording]

--that there be a minimum of six credit hours in each of the four categories (this is the language that was rejected by the Academic Affairs Council at an earlier draft stage)

-- that at least three of the "Communications" credits be in "Composition"

Other recommendations might also be made, though it is clear that the Chancellor's Office is not prepared at this point to entertain major revisions. In fact, we have been told that the likelihood of <u>any</u> revision at this point is small.

### Option 2. Regard this version of the Transfer Agreement as a fait accompli and:

(a) endorse it--thus signalling that we are willing to work with the administration to facilitate transfer between UND and other system institutions and will abide by the decisions negotiated by our VPAA and the academic officers of the other schools.

(b) refuse to endorse it--thus signalling that we don't approve of the agreement and/or that we don't approve of the process by which it was reached. Of course this refusal might send another kind of message too--that we are unwilling to cooperate with other institutions or with the Chancellor's Office on this matter. If we choose this option, we should also be aware that it is likely only a rhetorical gesture. If the NDUS institutions are unable to come to an "agreement" on the general education transfer issue, we are told that the Chancellor may institute a policy regardless.