

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting

October 5, 2000

1.

The October meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, October 5, 2000, in room 7, Gamble Hall. Randy Lee presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Bagheri, Fathollah	Holdman, Linda	Petros, Thomas
Berger, Kristy	Hume, Wendelin	Rankin, Elizabeth
Boyd, Robert	Jeno, Susan	Rice, Daniel
Cleveland, Mike	Krogh, Nancy	Robertson, Charles
DeMers, Judy	Kweit, Robert	Schletty, Chris
Drewes, Mary	Lang, Gretchen	Shaeffer, James
Elbert, Dennis	Lee, Randy	Skramstad, Allan
Elsinga, Lillian	Lindseth, Glenda	Stevens, Wes
Erickson, Daniel	Lowe, D. Scott	Stofferahn, Curtis
Ettling, John	Mabey, Renee	Stolt, Wilbur
Even, Brock	Mann, Michael	Timmerman, Larry
Fivizzani, Albert	Moen, Janet	Todhunter, Paul
Fox, Carl	Munski, Douglas	Towne, Gary
Gabrynowicz, Joanne	Nelson, Berly	Tschacher, Walter
Greves, Cole	Nelson, Enrique	Undlin, Heather
Grijalva, James	Nelson, Theron	Wellcome, Dan
Hafner, Andrew	Nichols, Elizabeth	Yurkovich, Eleanor
Hoffmann, Mark	Pederson, Randy	

3.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Amjad, Sabrina	Khavanin, Mohammad	Poochigian, Donald
Bass, Gerald	Kraidy, Marwan	Smart, Kathy
Davis, W. Jeremy	Kupchella, Charles	Smith, Bruce
Frost, Chris	Ness, Joel	Wilson, H. David
Gallager, Robert	Norton, Theresa	Woehle, Ralph
Goodwin, Janice	Olsen, Glenn	Zierdt, Candace
Jackson, Jon	Owens, Thomas	

4.

Mr. Lee referred the members to the agenda's Attachment #1, the Provost's August 13 memorandum to the President reporting the Provost's recommendations for dollar allocations to

expanding or proposed new programs arising from consideration of such programs during the 1999-2000 cycle. At the September meeting, the Provost had promised, in response to a question, to supply that information.

5.

The Chair announced the Question Period. There were no questions.

6.

Mr. Kweit moved to approve the minutes from the September 7, 2000 meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. DeMers, voted upon and carried unanimously.

7.

Annual Reports on the Consent Calendar from the Faculty Instructional Development Committee, the Compensation Committee, and the Honors Program Committee (two reports), were received and filed after a motion from Mr. Robertson, which was seconded by Mr. Mann.

8.

The proposal arising from discussions last academic year between the Academic Policies and Admissions Committee and the Student Academic Standards Committee concerning the reinstatement of an option to admit new freshmen on probation was considered. This proposal had been considered at the May 4, 2000 meeting and was then postponed to this meeting for further discussion. Discussion this time included the notation to be included on the transcript and the form of this notation, the necessity of this notation for advising purposes, and the stigma of this record for the student. The effect of probationary admission on the amount of time a new student has to make an academically satisfactory start was noted. Other related issues discussed were the categories of probationary, provisional and conditional admission, and the meaning of each as it relates to the University's obligations to a student admitted on probation. Mr. Petros asked that it be noted in the minutes that there was a question about what the following statement (Attachment #5 to the agenda, 2nd bullet under "Proposal") had to do with notations on the transcript to be used for intervention with the student by the University: "such an admission would send a clear message to the student that s/he is expected to perform at an acceptable level or will be dismissed after one semester". A motion was made by Mr. Towne to amend the proposed procedure to provide two semesters for a student admitted on probation to reach the necessary 2.00 cumulative grade point average. This was seconded by Mr. Petros. There was discussion of what language might best accomplish this. A subsidiary motion was made to refer the entire matter back to the involved committees to be considered in light of concerns raised at last May's meeting and today. The subsidiary motion was also seconded by Mr. Petros, voted upon and carried by a vote of 49 for and 1 abstaining.

9.

Scot Stradley opened discussion about the Academic Affairs Council/Council of College Faculties project to create grievance/mediation definitions and procedures for use in matters being considered under North Dakota Board of Higher Education Policy Manual Section 605. The Board has eliminated the Special Review Committee's involvement in proceedings under Section 605 in favor of a grievance and mediation process. The grievance/mediation process is included in the Board's policy manual, available at [www.ndus.edu](http://www.ndus.edu). The CCF is currently researching mediation procedures and welcomes comments. Mr. Stradley said the Faculty Rights Committee will be the final and only committee to hear faculty concerns arising under Section 605, but the President will have the last say. This item will move quickly through the Board. Mr. Lee stated that even absent an agenda item, the Senate needed discussion and comment on this matter. The Council of College Faculties will meet on October 10, over IVN, at 8:00 a.m., in Gamble Hall; all are invited to attend.

10.

Scot Stradley opened discussion concerning the preliminary response of the Council of College Faculties to the Legislative Council Interim Committee on Higher Education ("Roundtable") Report. Mr. Stradley said that a complete copy of the Roundtable Report can be viewed at [www.ndus.edu](http://www.ndus.edu). Discussion centered on the importance of everyone being involved in this process. Mr. Lee said the Senate Executive Committee will consider returning to the practice of holding Senate forums between regular meetings and that a Senate Forum concerning this report might be scheduled. Ms. Gabrynowicz encouraged everyone to join FacTalk, the UND listserv. She stated that any developments regarding the Roundtable Report will be posted there, and that the list is a good forum to get information out quickly.

Mr. Kweit moved to adopt the preliminary response of CCF to the Legislative Council Interim Committee (Attachment #6) with the addition of two words, "and must", after the word "can" in the first sentence of the third paragraph. The motion was seconded by Mr. Petros, and carried by a vote of 38 for, 9 against, and 3 abstaining.

11.

Mr. Lee called the Senate's attention to Attachment # 7, the recommendation for an amendment to the Senate's Bylaws to clarify that the immediate past chair serves on the Senate Executive Committee even if no longer a member of the University Senate. The amendment proposed also provides for a replacement, should the immediate past chair be unavailable to serve. Because the Bylaw on amending the Bylaws requires two meetings of notice before action may be taken, this recommendation will be acted upon at the November 2, 2000 Senate meeting.

12.

Mr. Kweit moved to approve the following resolution regarding the respective roles of the Graduate Committee and the Senate Curriculum Committee regarding changes in graduate courses and programs:

Be it resolved that the University Senate designates the Graduate Committee to review all graduate curricula issues and report directly to the University Senate for action.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoffman. Mr. Kweit voiced support of the measure for five reasons: the process is already time-consuming and involves many committees; the Senate will still have final authority; the Graduate Committee is one of the most thorough committees on campus; if the Senate finds the new division of responsibility is not working, it can rescind it; and the Graduate Committee still represents the faculty. Mr. Lee recognized David Perry to speak as the Chair of the Senate's Curriculum Committee. Mr. Perry acknowledged that he also is a member of the Graduate Committee and noted the potential benefits Mr. Kweit cited. He then voiced the concerns of the Curriculum Committee about the motion, including: changing the scope of the responsibilities stated in the Senate Committee Manual for the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Committee; loss of the opportunity to consider interaction between undergraduate and graduate programs; the relationship to the Registrar's Office for curricular record keeping; the need for some understanding to be developed regarding the relationship between the Senate and the Graduate Committee, the latter not being a Senate Committee; and unclear wording regarding the meaning of "Senate action." Mr. Perry reported that for these reasons the University Curriculum Committee recommended to the Senate that the Senate should not adopt the proposed motion. The motion was voted upon and defeated by a vote of 21 for, 24 against, and 2 abstaining.

13.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Nancy Krogh, Secretary