



5-6-1976

May 6, 1976

University of North Dakota

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

Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "May 6, 1976" (1976). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 119.
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/119>

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

May 6, 1976

1.

The May meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, May 6, 1976, in room 1, Gamble Hall. David Ramsett presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Clifford, Thomas	Kannowski, Paul	Oslund, Valborg
Apanian, Ronald	King, Robert	Penn, John
Behringer, Marjorie	Kinghorn, Norton	Poykko, Bryan
Bolonchuk, William	Koenker, William E.	Pynn, Ronald
Brown, Russell	Kraft, Larry	Ramsett, David
Bzoch, Ronald	Kraus, Olen	Robertson, Donald
Caldwell, Mary	Larson, Omer	Rogers, John
Christy, Neil	Lovell, Faith	Rowe, Clair
Crail, Erick	Lykken, Glenn	Rushing, Robert
Curry, Mabel	Markovich, Stephen	Scott, Rachel
Dobesh, Larry	Mason, Earl S.	Strobel, Jon
Engel, Dean	McElroy, Jacquelyn	Thorson, Playford
Facey, Vera	Nelson, Edward	Tomasek, Henry
Hedahl, Beulah	Norman, Ernest	Ulven, Milford
Heyse, Margaret	O'Kelly, Bernard	Vukelic, Jim
Iseminger, Gordon	Oldknow, Antony	

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Beach, David	Krenz, Mike	Reid, John
Beck, Robert	Kulas, Ludwik	Seabloom, Robert
Bogan, Louis	Lockney, Thomas	Skogley, Gerald
Clark, Alice	Loendorf, Lawrence	Steinberger, Kathy
Dolan, Mike	Lundberg, Stuart	Swanson, Loren
Fletcher, Alan G.	Naismith, D. P.	Tabor, Sandra
Henry, Gordon	Nicoli, Dave	Thomford, Neil
Karner, Frank	Palenberg, John	Tweton, D. Jerome
Kemper, Gene	Perrone, Vito	Warner, Edward
Kilgore, Kevin	Raymond, Art	

3.

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the meeting of April 1, 1976, be approved as distributed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

4.

Mr. Penn moved that the Senate consider agenda items 4, 5 and 9 as first, second and third on the agenda. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried.

5.

Mr. Ulven presented the attached list of Candidates for Degrees in May, 1976, and moved that the list be approved for recommendation to the State Board of Higher Education for the awarding of the degrees indicated, upon satisfactory completion of the degree requirements. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (See attachment #1.)

6.

Mr. Bzoch presented the nominations of the Committee on Committees for the faculty positions on University Committees. The Chair called for nominations from the floor and there being none, the Senate proceeded to vote. The Chair announced that the secretary would collect and tabulate the ballots and publish the results through the University Newsletter. (The results of the election are indicated on the attached listing, attachment #2, and will be published in the University Newsletter.)

7.

Ms. McElroy reported for Suzanne Bennett, Chairman of the Curriculum Committee, and moved that the Senate approve the proposed new courses and programs for submission to the State Board of Higher Education. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (See attachment #3.)

8.

Mr. Thorson reported for the ad hoc Committee on Implementation of the Final Report on the Committee on Administrator Evaluation. He moved that the University Senate direct its Executive Committee to appoint a committee to conduct administrator evaluations beginning with the fall semester, 1976. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried.

9.

The motion to approve the transfer of authority over the Student Activities Committee (SAC) from the present joint responsibility of University Senate and Student Senate to the sole authority of the Student Senate, which was postponed from the April meeting, was presented for discussion. Neil Christy moved the following substitute motion:

That the Student Senate be allocated all Student Activity funds and the responsibility of setting up student faculty committees to disperse these funds. Also, the right to veto any and all allocations of the Student Activities Committee or any other committee set up for Student Activity fund allocations.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. It was moved that the substitute motion be amended to include that non-student members of SAC would be nominated by the Committee on Committees and elected by the University Senate. The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and carried. The motion, as amended, was voted upon and carried. The original motion, as amended by the substitute motion, was voted upon and carried.

10.

Mr. Clifford moved that the University Senate endorse the Archives Committee report. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (See attachment #4.)

11.

Mr. Messenger, Chairman of the Academic Policies Committee, reported for that committee regarding the lateness of the current drop date and the matter of rising grade point averages at the University. The committee made the following recommendations.

1. The last day to drop a course without a grade for all students should be on the Friday five weeks preceding Reading and Review Day each semester.
2. That the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall contact the Dean of a College whose lower division GPA exceeds 2.70 or whose upper division GPA exceeds 3.25 in order to determine which department(s) of that college have unusually high GPAs and to determine if those high GPAs are consistent with academic standards.
3. That mini-courses or any courses that end prior to the last day to drop should have a drop date that is three class days prior to the end of the course. In the case where the drop date of the mini-course, as defined above, is later than the University drop date, the mini-course drop date shall take precedence.
4. At the end of the third class day, an instructor may submit a list of students who have not attended those meetings or contacted the instructor and the Registrar will automatically delete their names from the class roll.
5. That, as a supplement to the practice of assigning letter grades to students indicating faculty's judgment of the calibre of work in a course, each faculty member be invited to submit the names of students who, in his or her opinion, have done the most exemplary work during a given semester for inclusion on a Faculty Honor Roll.

Mr. Stroble moved to adopt the recommendations. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Mr. Kraus moved an amendment to receive the report and thank the committee for its work. The amendment was seconded and discussion followed. The Chair asked if there would be any objection to withdrawing the motion to amend and there being none, Mr. Kraus withdrew the motion. It was requested that the question be divided and there being no objection, it was so ordered.

Recommendation #1 was moved and seconded. Discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

Recommendation #2 was moved and seconded. Discussion followed. Mr. Pynn moved to amend the motion to read:

That the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall contact the Dean of a College whose lower division or upper division GPA is unusually high or low to determine if the GPA is consistent with academic standards.

The motion to amend was seconded, voted upon and carried. The motion, as amended, was voted upon and carried.

Recommendation #3 was moved and seconded. Mr. Markovich moved to amend the motion as follows: Courses that do not follow the usual schedule should have a drop date that is 2/3 of the completion of the course. The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Mr. O'Kelly moved to refer this recommendation to the Academic Policies Committee. The motion to refer was seconded, voted upon and carried.

Recommendation #4 was moved and seconded. Discussion followed. Mr. Iseminger moved to suspend the standing rules of the Senate regarding the adjournment time until completion of the agenda. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. Discussion continued on recommendation #4. Mr. Christy moved to amend the motion to include, "This shall be implemented by January 1, 1977." The motion was seconded. Mr. O'Kelly moved to amend the amendment, "except in the case of English 101 which would go into effect for the fall semester, 1976." The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The amendment to the amendment was voted upon and carried. The amendment was voted upon and carried. The motion, as twice amended, was voted upon and carried.

Recommendation #5 was moved and seconded. The motion was voted upon and defeated.

12.

Mr. Messenger requested that Mr. Ulven present and explain the recommendation from the Academic Policies Committee regarding the proposed transfer policy of the University of North Dakota for students who have completed vocational

technical programs and are working toward vocational teaching degrees. Mr. Ulven presented the following recommendation and moved its approval:

As a result of reciprocity, and the increased need for qualified vocational teachers in North Dakota, the vocational areas at the University of North Dakota, (Business Education, Distributive Education, Home Economics, and Industrial Technology), have received several inquiries from students from Vocational Technical Institutes in regard to transferring to UND in pursuant of a vocational teaching degree. In response to these requests, the Coordinating Council for Vocational Education at UND drafted the following transfer policy for vocational teaching degrees: (B.S.Ed., B.S.Home Ec., and B.S.I.T.)

1. A student completing a post secondary vocational program will be accepted in good standing at the University of North Dakota, within the colleges of CTL and HRD if the student is majoring in Business Education, Distributive Education, Home Economics, or Industrial Technology providing:
 - A. He or she meets the high school education requirements for incoming freshmen.
 - B. He or she has completed an approved vocational program of at least nine months duration.
2. During the first semester of residence the Coordinating Council for Vocational Education will evaluate the credentials of each student who has completed a vocational technical program in terms of his or her degree objectives.
3. Transfer credit will be allowed by the Coordinating Council for Vocational Education on a block credit basis in the major area at the rate of fifteen semester hours of credit for a nine month program. The thirty semester hours of general graduation requirements must be completed at UND or an academically accredited college. The credit will be added to the student's permanent record with the designation that it will apply only toward a degree in vocational teaching.

The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried.

13.

Mr. Thorson reported for the ad hoc Committee on Elections and Meetings. He called upon Mr. Ulven to speak in regard to absentee ballots. Mr. Ulven stated that since the Registrar shall prescribe the time and method for returning ballots, the acceptance of absentee ballots would require no action of the Senate. He stated that ballots in sealed envelopes, signed by the voter, would be accepted during next fall's election.

14.

Mr. Pynn presented the report of the ad hoc Committee on Governance. He moved that the Senate receive the report and act on it at the first regularly scheduled meeting in the fall. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried. (See attachment #5.)

15.

Bruce Gallagher, Chairman of the Student Policies Committee, presented that committee's report. Mr. Kraft moved to receive the report. (See attachment #6.) The motion was seconded. Mr. Crail moved to amend the motion to read, "to adopt the report." The motion to amend was seconded and discussion followed. The motion to amend was voted upon and defeated. Mr. King moved to refer the Due Process Statement to its originators to look over and revise, using recent Supreme Court decisions. The motion to refer was seconded, voted upon and carried.

16.

Ms. Hedahl presented the Report of the Council on Teaching and moved the adoption of these recommendations:

1. It is recommended that the university-wide "faculty evaluations" be continued in approximately the same manner as that implemented during the 1974-75 and the 1975-76 academic years.
2. It is recommended that the present form be continued in use with the provision that supplementary forms be developed within those departments that may wish to conduct evaluations in addition to the present university-wide forms.
3. It is recommended that in order to clarify the action of the University Senate of May 1, 1975, making the results of faculty evaluations available to Deans (if the Department has authorized the use of the results for salary, promotion, etc.) permitting frequency tabulations to establish "norms" by college and by discipline, and making results available for consideration of teaching awards - each department chairperson should be required to discuss the potential for improving instruction and the potential use of results for purposes of salary and promotion with faculty members in her or his department at an official departmental meeting, and to determine by vote if (1) there is unanimous approval of faculty members that results of the faculty evaluations be released for purposes of salary and promotion--in other words, a blanket departmental release of the information, or (2) if individual written releases will need to be obtained from each faculty member within the department before such information can be used for consideration of salary, promotion, etc.

The motion was seconded. Mr. Kinghorn requested that the motion be divided. There being no objection, recommendation #1 was moved, seconded, voted upon

and carried.

Recommendation #2 was moved and seconded. Discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

Recommendation #3 was moved, seconded, voted upon and carried.

17.

Ms. Scott moved the following recommendation from the College of Nursing regarding deficiency reports and drop dates of eight-week courses:

The College of Nursing currently offers four upper division required courses of eight-weeks duration each. Under the present policy, the intent of the University's deficiency report and drop date policies cannot be carried out for these courses. In order to comply with the intent of these policies, the College of Nursing requests Senate approval of the following statement:

"The College of Nursing will send out deficiency notices at the fourth week in an eight-week Nursing course. A drop date deadline will be established at the two-thirds point of each eight-week course after which no student may drop the course."

The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried.

18.

Mr. Bolonchuk moved adoption of the following statement:

It is a responsibility of faculty governance that faculty members participate on University Senate committees. Since this responsibility is a part of a faculty appointment, faculty members should serve on committees without additional reward.

The motion was seconded and discussion followed. The motion was voted upon and carried.

19.

A motion was made to adjourn. The motion was seconded, voted upon and carried and the meeting adjourned at 6:20 p.m.

Milford Ulven
Secretary

TENTATIVE

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

University of North Dakota
Office of Admissions and Records

LIST OF CANDIDATES FOR DEGREES

May 9, 1976

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
Dean Bernard O'Kelly

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS

Kim Thomas Albert
Mary Linn Anderson
Pamela Jan Anderson
Peggy Jane Anderson
Steve John Andrist
Brad Lee Arndorfer
Dale Ann Ash
Donn Burke Baker
Robert Joseph Balcom
Meredith Evelyn Baumann
Barbara Kay Beaman
Dianna Lynn Beck
Richard Gerald Becker
DellaRae Love Benson
Jacalyn Marie Bertsch
Lyle Richard Bopp
James Russell Botsford
Robert Lee Bowman, Jr.
Randy L. Bradbury
Patricia Louise Burke
Aime Casavant
Gregory Thomas Casement
Eugene Jerome Chelland
Dean Alan Christianson
Kathleen Rettig Collins
Bruce Patrick Conmy
James Patrick Corcoran
Daryl Brian Coulthart
Nancy Floyce Cronquist
Craig Edward DeGree
Onelia M. delBusto
Paulette Marie Diede

Tracy Earl Doe
Eileen Helen Dopson
Lawrence Dale DuBois
DeAnn Carolyn Dullum
Elizabeth Gaebe Duncan
Blaine Lynn Enderson
Dale Roger Endreson
Christine Emily Engel
Richard Norris Engen
Todd Michael Engh
Sheila Gay Fiechtner
Andrew Jay Finsness

Rick Robert Fischer
Mark Bradley Fjelde
William Daniel Flach
Elizabeth Joan Fletcher
LoAnn Marina Flom
John Louis Floro
Joy L. Flynn
Robert Russell Foss, Jr.
Leonard Hugh Fracassi
Marion Broden Frelich
Bert Richard Garwood
Mounir Ibrahim Ghaly
James Donald Gion
Jim Earl Goodrich
Scott Bradley Graham
Carmen Jean Greenshields
Bruce Robert Gustavson
Julie Beth Haaland
Joanne Harriet Hager

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -2-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF ARTS (CONT)

Julianne Marie Hanson	Diane Bowen Metzger
Gayle Marie Heid	Michael John Meyer
Janet Mary Hendry	Michael Howard Monley
Bruce John Henne	Mary Louise Mozinski
James Philip Hill	
Ray Alan Hoag	Laurie Ann Natwick
Kathleen Mary Istre	Jill Brown Newark
Christopher Paul Jacobs	David Andrew Nichols
Robert L. Jacobson, Jr.	Michele Helene Nicolai
Denise Carol Just	Theresa Marie Norton
Janis Sue Kana	Richard Craig Olschlager
Cindy Marie Kartes	Constance Louise Paraskeva
Deborah Ann Kauffman	David Allen Paulson
William Carter Keig	Theresa Carmel Perrone
Betty Jane Kemper	Bryan Paul Peters
Sharon S. Kessler	Denise Michele Peterson
Patrick J. Key	Edward M. Peterson
Susan Marie Kihle	James Edward Preston
Willard Jeffrey Kinney	Mary Therese Price
Michael Allyn Klym	Judith Ann Quern
Lavon Carol Knutson	Charlotte Louise Quill
Wayne Norman Kobbervig	Kathleen A. Ramsey
John Kolstoe	Kent Allan Reierson
Timothy Paul Krause	
Theodore Paul Kreis	Gayle Ann Neill Reiten
Todd Michael Krenelka	Caroline Margaret Renville
Charlene M. Kutz	Dean Frederick Rothchild
Terri Lynn Kvamme	Scott Martin Samuelson
Timothy Charles Lamb	Sherry Lee Samuelson
Linda Marie Lang	Robin Sue Schanilec
Mark Vincent Larson	Shirley Ann Schwartz
Paul Frederick Lehr	David F. Senn
Julie Ann Lindemann	Byron Paul Sieber
Richard Robert Lofthus	Michael Jon Sievers
Joe A. Luger	Jerry Michael Smith
Fred Addison Lukens	Kendal R. Sorenson
Patricia Ann Lund	Jonathon Dean Sorum
Cynthia Kay Lutz	Deborah A. Stavedahl
Steven Richard Lynch	Edward Eugene Stine
Kristin Majkrzak	Stephen Lynn Sturlaugson
Rodney Jay Meadows	Deborah Joan Swanson
Patricia Kay Mears	Marlene Ann Tetrault
Kenneth M. Mentz	Stephen Erick Thorness

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -3-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR ARTS (CONT)

James Forster Twomey
 Mark Weston Unkenholz
 Camillo Jose Villamizar
 Vicki Diane Voskuil
 Debra Angele Walery
 Gregory Allen Wallace
 Wanda Jean Weber
 Wendy Grayce Weber

Steven Alan Weisser
 Jerry L. Whipple
 John Mark Wilke
 Freddis Jensene Williamson
 Kathryn Wilson
 Rodney Allan Wilson
 Andrea Beth Winkjer

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

Elizabeth Ann Allan
 Daniel Arnold Anderson
 Eric Lynn Anderson
 Kyle Robert Bailey
 Brad Alan Baldwin
 Jeffrey Lynn Bengtson
 Timothy George Berg
 James Wendell Berglie
 Sharon Lee Berndt
 David Gregory Bjerklie
 Peter Fredrick Bjorlie
 Scott Patrick Boss
 Karen Lucile Brekke
 Alan Dwight Burchill
 Patricia Ann Burger
 Henry Matthew Busch, Jr.
 Cecilia Marie Conway
 Paula Jan Crawford
 Paul Nathan Crosby
 Douglas Thomas Davis
 Daniel Howard Dukelow
 Elizabeth Lee Engelhardt
 Jerrold Jay Erickson
 Peter Feng
 James Arthur Flanders
 Marie Elisabeth Flanders
 David George Ford
 James Richard Forseth
 Steven Clair George
 Gregory James Gores
 Arne Harlan Graff
 Vincent Dean Gravidahl
 Robert Manvel Green

Steven Ray Hallquist
 James Edward Halvorson
 Greg Alan Hanson
 Paul Ronald Hanson
 Brenda Marie Haugen
 Steven Glenn Haugen
 Steven H. Hinrichs
 James Arthur Holmstrom
 Louis Robert Iverson
 Joel Patrick Jahraus
 Steven Taylor Jarnagin
 Thomas Ray Johnson
 Yasmin Elizabeth Johnston
 Susan E. Jorve
 James Michael Key
 Paul Bernard Kilzer
 Jetta Lou Kleinsasser
 William Francis Landry
 Ronald Lee Laudon
 Steven S. Leigh
 Mary Joan Lewis
 Mark Edward Mering
 Kent William Neuenschwander
 Carl Robinson Noble
 Bradley Alan Norgart
 Steven Forrest Olson
 James L. Ormand
 Guy Gordon Otteson
 John M. Parkman
 Phred Steven Petersen
 Davis Cory Peterson
 Gregory Michael Pfister
 Paige Beth Plagge

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -4-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (CONT)

Kenneth S. Quam	Janet Elizabeth Shuman
Lee J. Redington	Mary Sieracki
William Richard Reulbach	Steven J. Sletten
Suzanne E'Laine Richmond	Midge Frances Slone
Larry Joseph Ritzo	Richard Russell Solberg
Harold Theodore Rodenbiker, Jr.	Hugh Lee Springer
Kathleen Suzanne Rogers	Jerome Charles Stenehjem, Jr.
Benedict Roller	Janette Marie Stoner
Jerry Ray Rollness	Paul Henry Tomasek
Paul Martin Ronnigen	Victor Lenton Treadwell
Mitchell Dean Saure	Allen Curtis Veit
Richard Allan Schmidt	Walter Glenn Wilder
Carl Henry Schwensohn	Susan Lynn Wilson
Ron Jay Seeley	

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN FISHERY AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Lee Arthur Brundin

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CHEMISTRY

Garth Dean Luer

CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

Dean Vito Perrone

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION

Paula Marie Ahles	Nancy Marie Bradbury
Gayla Jane Anderson	Genevieve Ann Brandt
Jody Lea Anderson	Guttorm Torleif Brekke
Clifford Avron	Shelley Jane Broten
Beverly Ann Baker	Barbara Jo Brown
Jeanne Marie Baumgartner	Vicki Lynne Brown
Robert M. Belanus	Jane ReNae Bruse
Diane Jacqueline Berg	Paula Dee Bry
Hazel Berg	Dennis R. Burkhardt
Mary D. Blaisdell	Ben Keith Burshia
William Robert Blake	Ruth Yazzie Burshia
Mark David Blaske	Jennifer Linn Bursik
Paul Ervin Boese	Camille Ann Caldis
Cynthia Kay Bohlman	Heather Dee Cameron

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -5-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION (CONT)

Joe R. Campos	Rebecca Lou Hartness
Mike D. Carpenter	Randi Jean Hector
Sharon Marie Chasing Hawk	Robert James Heinley
Gregory George Chyle	Mary Kay Helenske
Bonita R. Clarys	Louis Mitchell Henkenius
Jeanette Marie Cook	Francis Patrick Hennessy
Raymond John Crea	Cheryl Ann Henry
Wekota Nevada CrowGhost	E. Paul Melgoza Hernandez
Polly M. Cuskelly	Laralie Glee Higginson
Mary Lynne Davenport	Jean Kathleen Hildebrant
Viola A. Delorme	Stephen McDonald Hill
Diane Marie DeMars	Catherine Melonie Hjelseth
Corrine Kay Dethloff	Barbara Ann Hoffman
Deborah Ellen Dick	Betty Marlene Hofland
Rebecca Ann Diede	Nancy Jean Hughes
William Henry Dorn, Jr.	Andrea Christine Jacobson
Barbara Carol Downham	Beverly Ann Jacobson
Terry Carol Drescher	Mary Louise Jacobson
Thomas Michael Driscoll	B. Arnold Jefferson, Jr.
Diane Janet Davidson Duchscher	Coretta Louise Jefferson
Mary Ranae Durkin	Daniel Royce Johnson
Susan M. Dusek	Jean Marie Johnson
Frances L. Dusterhoft	Nancy Gail Johnson
Robert Bruce Eaglestaff	Peggy Ann Keil
Marjorie Joanne Edwards	Susan Marie Keller
Cheri Lynn Eifert	Corrine Louise Klein
Rahn Sherwin Farder	Julie Ann Klein
Charles Thomas Feist	Eldon Ray Knight
Jane Elizabeth Ferguson	Judith Ann Knight
Margaret Anne Fleck	Irene Janice Koller
Jeanne M. Foss	Thomas L. Kraft
Sandra Lee Gaudry	Jill Lenette Kramer
Elaine Hale Geary	Debora Marie Krueger
Kitty Gillespie	Shelley Ann Langheid
Augustine Martin Gleason III	Phyllis LeAnn LaQua
Shirley D. Gores	Dena Maria Larson
Deborah Jean Graalum	Diane Alayne Larson
Gwen H. Gray	Mark Virgil Larson
Susan Kay Green	Karen Lee
Meralle Eileen Grinnell	Gloria Louise Lembke
Timothy A. Guler	Kevin E. Locke
Don Wallace Gunhus	Jane Huso Lukens
Jay Steven Gustafson	Anne Naron Massey
Thomas William Hall	Rynell Mitchel Mather
Gordon Louis Hangsleben	George J. Matsen

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -6-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN EDUCATION (CONT)

Robert Allan Matz	Ginine Kay Ruud
Patricia Ann McClintock	Brenda Jean Sandvik
Jane Emily McCoy	Jean Marie Saueressig
Michael W. McCullough	Daniel Dean Schnackenberg
Michael Jon McMorrow	Melodye Jean Scoby
Fonda Fay Meidinger	Terri Renae Senger
Pamela Jean Meidinger	Jerry Michael Shea
Nell Louise Mertz	Jane Ellen Stallman
Catherine Anne Miller	LaRae A. Stauss
Robert Elmer Moe	Rose Ann Steenhoek
Elizabeth Ann Molland	Brenda Lou Stenberg
Debra Ann Monger	Keith Alan Stenehjem
Janeene Lois Monley	Judy Ann Stokke
Sandra Jane Morris	Nancy Kay Stone
Charles Lambert Mougey	Debbie Jean Stromme
Margaret H. Mougey	Norma Rae Stuhlmiller
Christine Mary Nelson	Ione Signe Swenson
Clifford Allen Nelson	Michael Lee Thompson
Renee Marie Nelson	Beverly Ann Thorness
Anne Catharine Nutter	Patricia Ann Thorpe
Leah Marie Oland	Dorothy L. Thunem
Frank E. Onufray	Alaine Marie Toso
Christine Kay Opdahl	Wayne Allen Triska
	Wayne Joseph Trottier
Cynthia Kay Orstad	Yat-Sam Tsai
Creighton John Overmoen	Kathleen Jo Ulland
Coralee Ann Paterson	Karla Jean Unkenholz
Sonja Kay Paulson	Donald J. Vangsnes
Janice Marilyn Pedden	Peter Dunlap Van Ness
Jonathan Andrew Penry	Barbara Marie Vettel
Jay Pierre Potulny	Leo F. Vipond
Ann Marie Radke	Lois Ann Vollum
Mary J. Radtke	Virginia E. Walking Bull
Jennifer Katherine Ray Ralston	John Francis Weigel
Agustin Garcia Ramirez	Juel Hope Weist
Isabael Syvilla Ramos	Rebecca Marie West
Susan Bea Ratzlaff	Mary Kay Winbauer
Joan Angelique Reis	Terrence Raymond Yellow Fat
Nicki Jo Richardson	Rebecca Ann Yunker
Rebecca Darlene Rindel	Madonna Mae Zhorela
Jane L. Roden	Pamela Jean Ziegler
Joan LoRayne Rogers	
Deborah Travis Rose	
Deborah Joanne Rufsvold	

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -7-

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND MINES
Dean Alan G. Fletcher

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CHEMICAL ENGINEERING

Charles Lynn Andrews
Dennis Wilmer Finken
Frank Johnnie Golde
Cynthia Mary Helenbolt
Gregory Francis Helma
Jeff Kirk
Linda Faye Krank

Dwight Eldon Larson
Benedict C. Lee
Allen Jeffrey Neumann
Raymond Lee Panzer
Gregory Stephan
Don Kerry Thurow

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN CIVIL ENGINEERING

Cal J. Gendreau
Harvey Allen Gullicks
Gary Allan Lasham
John Patrick Meek
Glenn Jay Olson

John Kenneth Oss
Chris Arnold Vann
Charles S. Vein
Kenneth A. Vein

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING

Donald Charles Christianson
Larry Delmar Drader
Philip Howard Ermer
Stuart Bryan Foss
Chien Nguyen

Alan John Norgard
James Duane Sagmiller
Dana Rolland Scherer
Daniel Roy Schmitt
Michael James Severson

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN GEOLOGICAL ENGINEERING

James Wesley Wilson

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INDUSTRIAL ENGINEERING

Joe Thomas Dickinson

Willard R. Tormaschy

DEGREE BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING

Bruce Dallas Bohnsack
Jack Robert Christofferson
Robert Merle Cole
Timothy John Coleman

John Ronald Haugen
Eugene Carl Johnson
Steven Ernest Wold

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED-8-

COLLEGE OF FINE ARTS
Dean John H. Rogers

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF FINE ARTS

Scott Calvin Archer
Lornetta Marie Boyer
John Micheal Cunningham
Nancy Maude Dickinson
David Owen Hertsgaard
Melissa Kay Jacobson

Carol Evelyn Johnson
Michael Dean Kinghorn
Mark Steven Kolstoe
Mark LeRoy Stromberg
Joel E. Vig

COLLEGE FOR HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT
Dean Henry J. Tomasek

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION

John LeRoy Ekblad
Brian Jeffrey Grover
Martin Joseph LeClair

James Donald McCaig
Steven Michael Neu
William Alan Stewart
Stephen John Swanke

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN HOME ECONOMICS

Yvonne Lucille Batko
Sally Ann Bender
Kathleen Julie Bohnsack
Genevieve Cyd Ferg
Jewell Elaine Herzog

Dawn Elizabeth Klevberg
Michele B. Redington
Elaine Schaan
Cheryl Ann Vandagriff
Margo Sue Youngern

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY

Donald Keith Beneda
Larry Laverne Hartje
Dean Rodney Hermanson

Dale Joseph Kasowski
Wayne Lawrence Keplin
Thomas Wayne Klabo

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN LIBRARY SCIENCE AND AUDIOVISUAL INSTRUCTION

Patricia Doreen Ferguson

Robert James Lembke

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

Sheila Faye Allen
Gwen Marie Bartolacci
Marvin Wilbert Christianson
Donna Marie Durand
Arthur Paul Horgen

Peggy Ann Jensen
Robert Paul Johnson
Barbara Ann Nelson
Rita Marie Nimz
Nancy Jo Thompson

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -9-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN SOCIAL WORK

Paulette Ann Baranick
 Joseph F. Beditz
 Steve Edward Boelter
 Beverly Clare Bosch
 Jane Olson Croeker
 Donna R. DesJarlais
 Carla Jean Frison
 Holly Rochelle Froemke
 Delwyn David Hager
 Dayl Lynne Harding
 Andre' Marie Ivanoff

Roger Lee Johnson
 Earlene F. Kirkeby
 Donna Marie Kirschenmann
 Ronald Roy Krause
 Rebecca Jane Mattson
 Linda K. Nagel
 Charlotte Lavonne O'Keefe
 Janet Marie Gould Price
 Susan Marie Gronland Rutherford
 Barbara Lynn Stenberg
 Leslee Thorpe

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
 Dean Clair D. Rowe

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Bruce L. Albrecht
 Wayne H. Albrecht
 Gary Lee Allen
 Randall Gerald Amundgaard
 Perry Vaughn Bakke
 Ronald Dale Becker
 Ann Elizabeth Beithon
 Sanford Brecht Berg
 Mary Jane Berger
 William James Bergeth
 Keith Audry Blaisdell
 Jess Shepard Bodelson
 Allan Ray Bosch
 Harlan Duane Braaten
 Keith Howard Brauns
 John Joseph Brennan III

Curtis Lee Bruun
 Jill L. Burchill
 Geoffry Lynn Bush
 Donald Charles Butler
 Warren Dennis Carlson
 Carleen Gail Carpenter
 Charles Lee Cavanagh
 William P. Cawley
 Michael Yan Ming Chan
 Felix Shinmau Chiu

Jay Dean Collett
 Timothy E. Coutts
 James Anthony Cricenti
 James Dwight Delling
 Terry Lee Devitt
 Wesley Lyle Dick
 Gary Joseph Docktor
 John Edward Dolleslager
 Timothy Raymond Downes
 Daryl Evan Drader
 Cathy Lynn Dukelow
 Floyd Gerald Dullum
 Debra Diane Eblen
 Beth Helene Eder
 John Steven Eisenbeis
 Roger Mark Ellingson
 Mike John Endres
 Barbara Ruth Eylands
 Jane Helen Fercho
 Henry Charles Fietzek, Jr.
 Roy Michael Fillion
 Lonny Steven Flaagan
 Todd William Foss
 Keith Fugere
 Perry Richard Garske
 Marvin Richard Giese

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -10-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (CONT)

Everett Yale Gilfillan, Jr.
Neil Thomas Gillund
Nolan Thomas Glock
Robert Glumac
Raymond George Gooch
Debra Ann Goosen
Larry D. Haaven
Patrick Kevin Halligan
Jacquelyn Gail Hanna
Randall Keith Hanson
Terrance Neil Hanson
Jerome Ken Harlow
David Glenn Hartness
Curtis Orville Haug
Gail Jean Hemmersbaugh
Bruce Alan Hendrickson
Carol M. Hensrud
Scott Allen Hewitt
Candice Sue Holte
Wade S. Homan
Judith Ann Homdrom
Ralph Edward Hooper
David Alan Hornung
Donald Douglas Hutson
Michael Gordon Indvik
Steven Omar Ittner

Don Ray Jemtrud
Benjamin Harold Jensen
Garth Howard Johnson
James Duane Johnson
Peggy Ann Johnson
Betty Lou Jones
Patricia M. Kalil
Joy Reyne Kary
Ruth Joan Kary
Jeffrey Paul Kempf
Mark David Keogh
Patrick P. Klier
Mark Eric Klingaman
James David Klundt
Jerilyn Ardell Knoff
Duane Alan Kragness
Deborah Kay Krogen
Charles Jacob Lang
Beverly Ann Langley
Jean Marie Langseth
Frank J. LaQua

Ricki Eugene Larson
E. Diane Laub
Keith Allen Legrid
James Milton Lochow
Del Patrick Lusso
Roger Alan Lutz
Domenic Magazu II
Guy William Maxwell
Gregory Thomas McFarland
John Thomas McKenzie
Gary Meidinger
Kenneth Donald Meland

Leslie Harland Michels
David Lynn Miedema
Blair Kent Mitzel
Dale Kenten Nelson
Deborah Rosine Neumann
Robert Albert Neumann
Gerald Allen Nolte
Lyn Cameron Norberg
Bradley Reed Nord
Mark Allen Nystuen
Thomas Joseph O'Halloran
Bradley David Olson
Gregory Arthur Olson
James Iver Opdahl
Mark Jon Ouradnik
Alph Peter Overby
Carol Ann Peterson
Joseph P. Peterson
Linda Lili Peterson
James Garland Price
Kenneth I. Purdy
Ronald Eugene Quinn
Kim Edward Reiersgaard
Michael William Renner
Thomas Howard Risdal, Jr.
Scott Samuel Rogers
Ross William Rolshoven
Rebecaa Lynn Rose
Eugene Lowell Routledge
Jeffrey Lynn Ryan
William Vincent Ryan, Jr.
Bruce R. Salzsieder
Anthony J. Sandbo
Douglas Mark Schaan

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED-11-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION (CONT)

Marc Jon Schenkey
 Timm David Schimke
 Ronald Allen Schley
 Joseph M. Schmitt
 Judd Bryan Schulke
 Stuart Cole Seaborn
 Dave F. Senger
 Roberta Burns Senn
 Mark David Shide
 Robert Wayne Short
 Catherine Ann Simonson
 Paul Edward Smith
 Sylvia Ilene Smith
 Patricia Ann Staveteig
 Kenneth Arlen Stavheim
 Charles Wayne Steel
 James Herbert Stewart
 Kent Bradley Streibel
 Craig Thomas Stromme
 Steven Kent Swenson
 Michael Don Syvertson
 Henry James Thilmony

Dale Allen Thompson
 John Louis Thorpe
 Randal Howard Torgeson
 Beverly A. Ulland
 James Timothy Voiss
 Scott Cameron Volk
 Terrence Joseph Volk
 David Leroy Vosseteig
 Monica Lynn Wagner
 Marvin Joseph Wanner
 Thomas Kent Watson
 Loel Jean Weber
 Bradley Paul Wells
 Timothy Joseph Whalen
 Jon Edward Willman
 James Galen Wilson
 Judith Marie Wold
 Theodore Peter Wolters
 Steven Lloyd Wonnenberg
 James Joseph Wosepka
 Jerry Dale Wulf

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Everett Orville Doolittle, Jr.
 Bruce John Gallagher
 Patrick Lee Headrick
 Carl David Hokenstad
 Lynn Harley Kaspari
 Stanley Charles Leach

Dean Harriman Neal
 Ronald Keith Parrish
 James Andrew Roden
 John Steven Schneeweis
 Thomas Allen Stroup

COLLEGE OF NURSING
 Dean Margaret Heyse

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING

Deborah June Beaton
 Marilyn Renee Bjerke
 Deborah Kay Bjone
 Susanne Marie Boss
 Shelene Claire Ann Brekke

Cindy LaRae Buck
 Nancy I. Carpenter
 Connie Marie Christl
 Gail Paur Confer
 Kathy Lindstrom Dagoberg

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -12-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN NURSING (CONT)

Paula Ione Dahlen	Jean Louise Naismith
Nhu Quynh Dao	Clarice E. Nelson
Siri Jane DePaolo	Sherry Kay Nelson
Lynn Ellen Dick	Terri Lynn Nelson
Faye Marie Dunnigan	Roxanne Nienas
Bonnie Kay Eck	Connie Lynn Olson
Judy Kay Erickstad	Virginia Lee Paraskeva
Barbara Kay Hewitt Estill	Barbara Joan Pellman
Duane Allen Furaus	Patricia Jane Peterson
Juanita Marie Gion	Brenda Ann Raatikka
Cynthia Karen Halvorson	Alice Diane Rambeck
Linda Kay Hamilton	Susan Irene Riese
Ann Louise Hegle	Nancy Ellen Robinson
Diane Rae Holm	Pauline Jane Roll
Barbara Jean Hoyt	LouAnn Marie Rondorf
Cora-Len Mary Hutton	Barabara Taylor Rose
Lynne Celeste Ihry	Margaret Grace Saethre
Ruth I. Jacobs	Lorrel Fae Schadewald
LaDonna Kay Johnson	Joan Renae Spoonland Schanilec
Holly Moira Johnstone-Dunnigan	Patricia Jo Schindler
Carol Jean Kappel	Linda J. Spitzer
Wanda Kathryn Klipfel	Lynn Marie Spitzer
Kathleen Jewel Kopseng	Ann Marie Thomas
Kerry Jane Krabseth	Joan Beth Thompson
Susan Bliss Kvasager	Rebecca Grace Thorson
Patricia Ann Landman	Richard Thomas Turman
Paula Marie Larsen	Greta Marie VanDyke
Marlene Mae Lindberg	Loretta Vaplon
Karen Plutowski McFarland	Paula Kay Weible
Karen Loraine Miller	

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED-13-

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE
Acting Dean Neil R. Thomford

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN PHYSICAL THERAPY

Jo Louise Bullis
Virginia Laurencia Cole
Todd Allen Covington
Thomas Patrick Donahue
Mary Linda Hansen
Betty Lou Hindemith
Beverly Jane Johnson
Gail Marie Johnson
Shawn Michael Kelly
Renee Claire Kollin

Clifford Wayne LaFreniere
Diane Kay Monteith
Steven David Rekken
Mary Kathleen Roman
Bonnie L. Spaeth
Amy Joleen Tallackson
Shannon Marie Tangen
Ronald Lee Torkelson
James Patrick Weisgerber
Cecily Wharton

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICINE

Thomas Anthony Abe
John Robert Alm
William Robert Austin
John Robert Baird
Deborah Ellen Banker
Roger James Bauer
Timothy Donald Beddow
John Earl Beithon
Joel Reed Bender
Daniel George Berntson
Dean Adrian Bruschein
Roy Gene Burt
Brien William Dyer
Timothy Karmen Faul
Richard Mark Fraser
Jeffrey Alan Gilles
Stanley W. Green
Rebecca Jean Hermes Hafner
Dwight P. Hager
Mark A. Hinrichs
Timothy E. Hurley
Wayne L. Jansen
Walter Sanfrid Johnson, Jr.
David Kent Jose
John Patrick Joyce

Thomas Wayne Kempf
Michael Joseph Kihne
John Patrick Lavelle
David Stephen Lewis
Robert J. Littmann
Davonne Sheryl Loup
Rodney Allan Ludwig
Thomas Erland Lundeen
John Jerome Malloy
Timothy Arthur Mjos
Carol Jane Nelson
Mark D. Odland
Wesley E. Parkhurst, Jr.
Benjamin Pease III
James Byron Presthus
Bernard Butch Ram
Veronica Joan Schirber Rosenau
Lou Rudolf
Jerome Matthew Sampson
Warren Vincent Schubert
Robert James Sciacca
David Nelson Skurdal
David Marc Sloven
James Michael Sornsin
Sheldon Edmund Spencer

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -14-

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN MEDICINE (CONT)

Catherine Marie Spier
 Steven Paul Strinden
 Lyle Sheldon Thorstenson
 Stephen Joseph Tinguely
 Ronald Lynn Wagner
 Rebecca Mae Welde

Barbara Hanson Whalen
 Timothy Earl Whalen
 Mark Warren Whitman
 James Allen Wilkens
 Lawrence Woodrow Wilson
 Douglas Matthew Zerbe

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF MEDICINE

Robert Marshall Arusell
 Bruce Mitchell Carlisle
 Lee Allen Christoferson, Jr.
 Bruce Lane Dahl
 John Gilbert Eaton
 Karen Ann Engebretson
 David Carl Engstrom
 John Albert Erickstad
 Thomas Lee Evans
 Roger Donald Fincher
 Barry Alan Graham
 Donald Raymond Graham
 Larry Orville Halvorson
 Robert Wayne Hamilton
 Frank Edward Hartwig
 Wesley Kent Herman
 Terry Lee Hoff
 Maria Daria Hordinsky
 Robert Alan Johnson
 Donald John Fredrick Kammerer

Daniel Joseph Kangley
 James Richard Kauphusman
 Paul Bernhard Knudson
 Daniel Robert Kurtti
 Douglas Lee McDonnell
 Vaughn Henry Meyer
 Patrick Frank Moore
 James William Nagle
 Corey Lee Nyhus
 James Harold Olson
 Leroy Curtis Olson
 Philip James Price
 Francis Collin Rash
 Jay Allan Rich
 Benjamin Wilbur Sheppard
 Terrence Abraham Stoll
 Ronald Dean Tello
 Michael Thomas Vandall
 Charles Robert Volk
 Floyd Hannon Worley

SCHOOL OF LAW
 Dean Robert K. Rushing

DEGREE OF JURIS DOCTOR

Terry Lee Adkins
 Larry Michel Baer
 David Ryan Bailly
 Bradley Wayne Berg
 Jon Henry Beusen
 Kelley Paul Boyum

Chris Martin Bradford
 Gerald Irving Brask, Jr.
 Jay Vernon Brovold
 Kent Alan Carlson
 Richard Gilman Carver
 John Michael Christensen

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED-15-

DEGREE OF JURIS DOCTOR (CONT)

Richard Allen Clapp	Michael Scott McIntee
Charles Wickham Corwin	William Wayne McLees, Jr.
Elliott Terrance Dennis	Thomas J. McSweeney
Collin Paul Dobrovolny	Thomas Kevin Metelmann
Shirley Ann Dvorak	Charles Silvene Miller, Jr.
Dwight Carmen Eiken	Patrick Robert Morley
Vince H. Ficek	Craig Stefan Nelson
Sean Gerard FitzMaurice	Michael Dan Nelson
Deborah Kay Fohr	Larry Francis Nordick
John Stephen Foster	Alice Kinsella Olson
Timothy E. J. Fox	Dennis Leslie O'Toole
Robert James Gagen	Peter S. Pantaleo
Sharon Ann Gallagher	James Richard Paulson
Donna Dunkelberger Geck	Donald Lee Peterson
Mark Lawrence Greenwood	Cynthia Ann Phillips
John Ralph Gregg	Mark Douglas Refling
William L. Guy III	David Michael Reiten
John Billy Hansen	Jerome Leroy Renner
Jane Catherine Heinley	Richard Francis Rosow
Ronald Lloyd Hilden	Alvin Lee Royse
Dean A. Hoistad	William Delaney Schmidt
Robert Bryan Hunter	Anne Cameron Sharick
Paul Jay Ihle	Steven Michael Shermoen
Andrew Collett Imes	Harold Leonard Siegelman
Barbara Lee Ingwersen	Mikal Jerome Simonson
Ilona Jeffcoat-Sacco	Robert James Slorby
Gregory Paul Johnson	Warren C. Sogard
Joel David Johnson	Ronald Wayne Spencer
Linus Johnson	John Scott Steinberger, Jr.
Mary Ann Johnson	Steven Arthur Storslee
Scott William Johnson	Roger Lee Sullivan
Keith Nolan Jones	Paul Robert Thorwaldsen
John Allen Juelson	David Walter Tiistola
David Allen Kolstoe	Ivan Allen Tschider
Joseph H. Kubik	Robert Jerome Udland
Thomas John Kuchera	Steven L. Vogelpohl
Charles William LaGrave	David Earl Walker
Steven Lee Latham	Richard C. Wilkes
Stephen Dwight Little	Mary Jane Wrenn
Jeanne Reisenweber Lyke	Boyd Lewis Wright
William Alexander MaKenzie	
Douglas Gregory Manbeck	

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -16-

GRADUATE SCHOOL
Dean Alice T. Clark

DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

Curtis Allen Anderson	Linda Sue Mason
Kenneth Lee Anderson	Wallace Thurston McIntosh
Walter Christian Anhalt	Ronald Lawrence Nelson
Bryan Lee Bennett	Gary Jeffrey Oos
Karen Marie Bohn	Neil Dupuy Reed
Arthur L. Christie	Gregory James Schmalz
Bruce Allen Duller	David August Shavalia
Claire I. Foreman	Mary Paulson Simonson
Helen Gayle Fouts	Jerome Patrick Skogmo
Katherine Anna Freeman	Jeanne Evelyn Soll
Vance R. Gillette	Melford Selvyn Sorenson
Paulette Carol Hansen	Craig David Stevens
Robert Arlyn Harms	Lee Wayne Updike
Janice Elaine Hemish	Robert Harry White
Jack William Hurley	Dennis D. Wortman
Bernard Floyd Huatt	Masaki Yasue
Steven Wayne Jasperson	Richard Elmer Zabriskie
James LeRoy Jones, Jr.	

DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

Ove Kjell Bakken	Randall Edward Merchant
Byron Michael Bennes	James Ensign Merritt
Patrice Raye Giese	Patrick Eugene Miller
Ellen M. Glood	Myrna Ann Moore
Michael Carl Gunvalson	Carol Ann Moss
Francis Thomas Hartnett III	Thomas Lee Nowatzki
Beverly Ann Honkola	Kenneth Cornell Olson
Larry Robert Honl	Richard John Peters
Curtiss Dean Hunt	Richard John Peterson
Kathleen Carole Jacobs	Donald Louis Rubbelke
Steven Lynn Karpenko	Terese Ann Satrom
Teresa Judy Kjelskus	Glenn David Schaible
Ronald Lorents Lima	Gill Michael Sorg
Michael Robert Maleske	Eric O. Uthus
David Walter McClenon	Dennis Numan Winslow

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -17-

DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

James Terry Appelhans
 Keith R. Attenborough
 Jay Dawson Carter
 Richard Allen Chandler
 Kenneth Rex Childers
 Barry Frank Nass
 George William Niece
 Glenn Irvin Olsen
 Jerry James O'Neal

Jerry Robert Pfeifer
 Kenneth Roger Race
 Anzideo Ranalli
 Alan Robert Tawse, Jr.
 Allen Stuart Taylor, Jr.
 Ronald Bruun Tronier
 James Scott Ugan
 Larry Francis Willers
 Dick Howell Young, Jr.

DEGREE OF MASTER OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Richard Scott Blecker
 Jack Carpenter Langston
 James Andrew Rohrer

Gary Clinton Rose
 Stephen Michael Stolicny, Jr.
 Michael Eugene Zainhofsky

DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

Eldon Duane Brothen
 David H. Horken
 Hubert Loucurtiss Ivie
 Barbara Eliane Ochiltree
 LeRoy Harold Rice
 Duane Garlen Skare

Sylvia Elaine Stites
 Dale Bruce Taylor
 Paul L. Upsahl
 Connie Ellen Walter
 Everett Maynard Werness

MASTER OF SCIENCE TEACHING

Charles Michael Baxter

SPECIALIST DIPLOMA

Dennis Michael Crawford
 Nancy Lee-Borden

Gary Stuart Mitchel

DOCTOR OF ARTS

William E. Maynard

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Ervin Franz Garbe, Jr.
 Marilyn Jean Guy
 Lois E. Petersen

Michael William Radis
 Michael S. Worner

TENTATIVE-NOT TO BE RELEASED -18-

DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Verna Lee Baumhoefer Brantley
Mitzi Mallarian Brunsdale
Mary B. Carman
Phyllis Elaine Lanes Johnson

Timothy Wacht Joseph
Edward Silling
Charles David Sullivan

SPRING, 1976

SAMPLE BALLOT

Committee	Continuing Members	Term Expires	Nominees	Term Expires
ACADEMIC POLICIES	Larry Dobesh - Econ	(77)	<u>ELECT TWO</u>	
	Robert Seabloom - Biol	(77)	Miller, Nancy - CTL	(78) _____
			Moe, Ron - E. Engr.	(78) <u>X</u>
			Smith, Glenn - History	(78) <u>X</u>
ACADEMIC STANDARDS	John Brushmiller - Chem	(77)	<u>ELECT TWO</u>	
	Sheldon Schmidt - CTL	(77)	Anderson, Donald - Marketing	(79) _____
	Guilford Fossum - C.Engr	(78)	Cole, Duane - Physics	(79) <u>X</u>
	Lucy Schwartz - Lang	(78)	Shurr, Agnes - Nursing	(79) <u>X</u>
ATHLETIC BOARD OF CONTROL	LaVernia Jorgenson - HPER	(77)	<u>ELECT TWO</u>	
	John Tyler - Psych	(77)	Apanian, Ronald - C. Engr	(79) <u>X</u>
	Gary Johnson - Geog	(78)	Eickhoff, Luvern - Ind Tech	(79) _____
	John Williams - CTL	(78)	Peterson, John - BVED	(79) <u>X</u>
CONTINUING EDUCATION	Maurice Russell - Media Ed	(77)	<u>ELECT TWO</u>	
	Glenna Rundell - Music	(77)	Daws, Kenneth - Social Work	(79) <u>X</u>
	Terrence Williamson - Mark.	(78)	Khactu, D. H. - Economics	(79) _____
	Ervin Behsman - CTL	(78)	Norman, Virginia - Nursing	(79) <u>X</u>
CURRICULUM	Suzanne Bennet - F.A.	(77)	<u>ELECT TWO</u>	
	Ivan Dahl - CTL	(77)	Karner, Frank - Geology	(79) <u>X</u>
	Herbert Auer - Ind Tech	(77)	Kauffman, Richard - Economics	(79) _____
	Jacquelyn McElroy - Vis Arts	(78)	Schwartz, Paul - Language	(79) <u>X</u>
	Glenn Prigge - Math	(78)		
	William Wrenn - Biol	(78)		
FACULTY RESEARCH	Alan Cvancara - Geol	(77)	<u>ELECT TWO</u>	
	Robert Korbach - Econ	(77)	Hiltner, Arthur - Accounting	(79) _____
	Ronald Engle - T. Arts	(78)	Murray, Stan - History	(79) <u>X</u>
	Theodore Reiff - Med	(78)	Smiley, Larry - CTL	(79) <u>X</u>

Committee	Continuing Members	Term Expires	Nominees	Term Expires
HONORARY DEGREES	Paul Kannowski - Biol (77) Mary E. Caldwell- Engl (78) Henn Soonpaa - Physics (79) Gerald Flynn - CTL (80)		<u>ELECT ONE</u> Boehle, Bill - Music (81) Peterson, Russ - CTL (81)	_____ _____ _____ X
HONORS	Mary E. Caldwell- Engl (77) Norman Kulevsky - Chem (77) James Harrell - Physics (77) Fikret Ceyhun - Econ (78) Francis Jacobs - BioChem (78) Raymond Podell - Ind Tech (78)		<u>ELECT TWO</u> Glassheim, Pat - Humanities (79) Ring, Ben - Philosophy (79) Tokko, Mok - Comp. Sci. (79)	_____ X _____ X _____
LIBRARY COMMITTEE	Lucy Schwartz - Lang (77) Mark Henry - Econ (77) Robert Mullins - Phil (77) William Boehle - Music (78) Ruth Gallant - CTL (78) James Kelleher - Microbio (78)		<u>ELECT THREE</u> Dando, William - Geography (79) Holland, F. D. - Geology (79) Simpson, Leo - Management (79) Vivian, J. F. - History (79)	_____ X _____ X _____ _____ X
BOARD OF PUBLICATIONS	NO CARRYOVERS		<u>ELECT ONE FROM JOURNALISM</u> Deats, Tom - Journalism (77) Stephens, Rick - Journalism (77) <u>ELECT TWO</u> Christensen, Bonniejean-Engl (77) Perry, David - Soc. Wk. (77) Turner, Mike - Speech (77)	_____ X _____ _____ X _____ _____ X
QUARTERLY JOURNAL	Fikret Ceyhun - Econ (77) Jung Lee - Rel. Stud (77) Bonniejean Christensen-Engl (78) Norton Kinghorn - Engl (78)		<u>ELECT TWO</u> Engle, Ron - Theatre Art (79) Facey, Vera - Biology (79) Iseminger, Gordon - History (79)	_____ _____ X _____ X

Committee	Continuing Members	Term Expires	Nominees	Term Expires
ROTC COMMITTEE	Earl Mason - Richard Beringer-	C.Engr (77) Hist (78)	<u>ELECT ONE</u> Kraft, Harold - HPER (79) _____ Larson, Omer - Biology (79) <u>X</u>	
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	Linda Ochs - Francis Howell -	HPER (77) Physics (78)	<u>ELECT ONE</u> Beaubien, Gerald - Marketing (79) _____ Murray, J. Dennis - Psychology (79) <u>X</u>	
STUDENT POLICY	Robert Snortland- David Beach - Betty Gard -	MechEngr(77) Speech (77) Library (78)	<u>ELECT ONE</u> Neidlinger, Susan - Nursing (79) <u>X</u> Skorupski, Kaye - St. Opp. (79) _____	
SUMMER SESSION	Francis Howell - Larry Dobesh - Myron Bender - Shirley Sanderson-	Physics (77) Economics(77) Ind Tech(78) Home Ec (78)	<u>ELECT TWO</u> Lundberg, Stuart - Accounting (79) _____ Piper, Donald - CTL (79) <u>X</u> Wells, Barrie - Music (79) <u>X</u>	
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	Lowell Thompson - Lyle Mauland - Alan Fletcher - James Rue - George Schubert -	CTL (77) Math (77) Engr (77) Math (78) Sp.Path.(78)	<u>ELECT TWO</u> Koss, Allen B. - Nursing (79) _____ Lawrence, Gerry - Humanities (79) <u>X</u> Medalen, Rod - Accounting (79) <u>X</u>	

PROPOSED NEW COURSES AND PROGRAMS
SUBMITTED TO
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA SENATE
AND
STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

NEW COURSES ADDED

CTL	491	Senior Project in Early Childhood Education	2-4 credits
CTL	495	Independent Study in Early Childhood Education	1-4 max 8
CTL	537	Play in Development and Early Childhood Education	2
CTL	538	Organization, Administration and Supervision in Early Childhood Education	2
Engineering	595	Design Project	3-6
Geology	321	Earth Materials IV: Geochemistry	3
Law	130	Property I	3
Law	132	Property II	2
Law	160	Legal Process	3
Law	279	Legal History	2-3
Marketing	380	Internship in Marketing	2-4 max 4
OT	385	Occupational Therapy in Psychosocial Treatment	2
Psychology	492	Tutoring in Psychology	2 max 4
Psychology	494	Special Topics in Psychology	1-3
Psychology	594	Special Topics in Psychology	1-3
Psychology	595	Seminar in Psychology	1-3
Sociology	334	Social Participation	2-4
Sociology	351	Corrections	1-4
Sociology	408	Industrialization in North Dakota	1-4
Sociology	430	Sociology of Education	3
Sociology	450	Deviance	3-4

Visual Arts	375	Brush Lettering and Sign Painting	3
Visual Arts	384,385	Jewelry and Small Sculpture	6
Visual Arts	550	Ceramics	1-6 rept. 12
VED	541	Directed Study in Vocational Education	1-2

COURSES DROPPED

Aviation	300	Airline Travel Management	3
Aviation	393	Professional Pilot Lab III	1
Aviation	394	Professional Pilot Lab IV	1
Biology	405	Biology for Elementary Teachers	4
Law	112	Torts II	2-3
Law	130	Anglo American Legal History	3
Law	160	Legal Research and Writing	1
Law	172	Property	3
Law	279	Legal Process	2
Physics	312	Intermediate General Physics	3
Psychology	513	Seminar in the Teaching of Psychology	1
Psychology	535	Seminar in Physiological Psychology	3
Psychology	536	Seminar in Psychology	2 or 3
Psychology	576	Seminar in Clinical Psychology	2
Visual Arts	356	Ceramic Raw Materials	2
Visual Arts	501	Oriental Art	3
Visual Arts	502	Nineteenth Century Art	3
Visual Arts	509	Scylpture Workshop F/Art Teachers	2
Visual Arts	514	Art in Elementary Education	2

Visual Arts	516	Watercolor	2
Visual Arts	518	Etching and Engraving	3 rept. 9
Visual Arts	591	Studio Problems	1-4

NEW PROGRAMS

1. Master of Fine Arts in Visual Arts Degree Program
2. Master of Vocational Education

POLICY STATEMENT ON UNIVERSITY ARCHIVES

I. ESTABLISHMENT

- A. The University Archives exists to serve as the depository of historical materials for all the divisions and departments of the University of North Dakota.
- B. The University Archives is an integral part of the North Dakota Room, a unit of the Chester Fritz Library.
- C. The University Archivist is appointed by the President on recommendation of the Director of Libraries with the concurrence of the Archives-Records Committee and the History Department.
- D. Provision shall be made in every University Library budget for materials, supplies, and secretarial and professional assistance for the University Archives.

II. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY ARCHIVIST

- A. The University Archivist is responsible for collecting, organizing, and maintaining the University Archives as a regular function of the North Dakota Room. The Archivist and the North Dakota Room staff are responsible for answering reference requests from users of the University Archives in accordance with Library policies and procedures, including those recommended by the Archives-Records Committee.
- B. The University Archivist encourages the establishment of a records management program on campus, but is not responsible for administering that program.
- C. The University Archivist is an advisory member of the Archives-Records Committee and makes reports to that Committee and to the Director of Libraries.

III. CONTENTS AND FORM OF THE ARCHIVES

- A. The following types of records are solicited for inclusion in the University Archives:
 1. Records of the governing boards of the University of North Dakota (Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, Board of Administration, and State Board of Higher Education);
 2. Official correspondence, minutes, reports, and publications originated by academic and administrative units of the University;
 3. Minutes and records of University governing bodies and councils (e.g., University Council, Deans' Council, University Senate, and Student Senate) and committees (Presidential, Senate, and others):
 4. Student theses, dissertations, and publications;
 5. Records of student organizations and activities;
 6. Faculty publications;

7. Records of organizations associated with the University;
8. Pictures, slides, films, tapes, and computer-generated materials relating to the University;
9. Non-university publications dealing with the University.

B. Whenever feasible, the original record will be considered the archival copy. Selected archival records may be accepted in a microform or be microfilmed to ensure preservation without limiting use or to promote use. A microfilm copy will be deposited in the University Archives and a copy may be deposited elsewhere for security purposes.

IV. ACCESS AND USE

- A. University records are accessible to the public, unless otherwise provided by law.
- B. The University Archivist is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations regarding the use of University Archives.

V. ARCHIVES-RECORDS COMMITTEE

- A. The President of the University of North Dakota appoints a standing Archives-Records Committee consisting of two faculty members (alternating two-year terms), one alumni member (two-year term), one student member (one-year term), one administration member (one-year term), and the University Archivist (advisory member). The Committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Director of Libraries.
- B. In the event a University Records Management Program is established, the Records Manager shall be an advisory member of the Archives-Records Committee.
- C. The responsibilities of the University-Records Committee include:
 1. Encouraging campus-wide support for University Archives;
 2. Establishing procedures for transferring archival records from University offices to University Archives;
 3. Developing specific policies governing access to and use of University Archives;
 4. Establishing policies and procedures for retention or disposal of University records;
 5. Consulting with the Director of Libraries and the History Department in recommending the appointment of the University Archivist;
 6. Coordinating the University Archives with a University Records Management program, as such a program is developed.
- D. The Archives-Records Committee elects in the fall one member to chair for the year, meets periodically with the University Archivist during the school year, and provides an annual report to the President of the University of North Dakota, to the Director of Libraries, and to the History Department.

REPORT TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE

This past fall the University Senate appointed an ad hoc committee on Governance. The committee was charged by the Executive Committee to review:

- a) The role of the Executive Committee
- b) The size of the Senate and mode of election
- c) Senate committees
- d) Role of the University Senate
- e) Definition of Faculty

The Committee members are:

Ronald E. Pynn, Chairperson (Political Science)
William Bolonchuk (HPER)
Henry Tomasek (HRD)
Jerry Tweton (History)
Jon Strobel (Student)

1. Senate Executive Committee

The ad hoc committee feels it necessary to expand the role of the Executive Committee and to provide greater continuity from year to year. We recommend a change in its composition. We also recommend an enlargement in its functions, noting specifically an elaboration to point 5 of the "Functions and Responsibilities" for the Senate Executive Committee and the addition of points 6 and 7.

A. Composition

Chairman
Vice Chairman
Past Chairman (ex officio)
Faculty Representatives (2) (one elected each year,
serving for two years)
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Student (1) (Elected annually)
Registrar, serves as Secretary

B. Functions

1. to call special meetings of the Senate
2. to change the time of the regular meeting in emergencies
3. to prepare the agenda
4. to approve the minutes of the Senate meetings
5. to act on behalf of the Senate when a meeting of the Senate does not seem justified. Subsequent to the action taken by the Executive Committee, the committee will report to the next meeting of the Senate to seek approval for the action that was taken by the Committee.

6. to monitor the implementation of Senate legislation passed by the Senate
7. to coordinate action between the Senate and its committees. All Senate committees shall report their activities to the Executive Committee at least once during the academic year.

2. Senate Committees

The ad hoc committee reviewed the number and functions of Senate committees. A questionnaire was sent to faculty and administrators. The results of that questionnaire are attached as Appendix A.

This ad hoc committee makes no specific recommendations, but does include the ad hoc and scope reports which make specific recommendations regarding the committee structure, attached as Appendix B.

3. Size of the Senate

This ad hoc committee makes no specific recommendations but would focus attention on the results of the questionnaire and previous recommendations addressed to this committee by previous committees studying the issues.

4. The Constitution

The University Constitution is out of date. It contains numerous conflicts with the new Faculty Handbook.

The ad hoc committee recommends the Senate refer the Constitution to the codification committee for revision or address the issue in some appropriate manner.

5. Definition of Faculty

Based on an examination of relevant documents and a survey of Deans and Chairpersons, the Committee on Faculty Governance established by the Senate of the University of North Dakota concludes that:

-3-

- a) Several documents of the University with regard to definition of faculty are not in harmony. See Appendix C.
- b) Resulting definitions by colleges, schools, and departments show great variety especially with regard to voting and eligibility for offices or committees.
- c) No serious conflicts, but some minor confusion, seems to exist because of the lack of uniformity.

The Committee recommends:

- a) That the Codification Committee bring the UND Constitution and Handbook into harmony.
- b) That the accepted definition of faculty be that used in the Handbook.
- c) That each college, school and department provide specific rules for voting and eligibility for offices and committees in their rules of governance.

UNIVERSITY SENATE SURVEY

The University Senate has appointed an AdHoc committee on Senate Governance.

WOULD YOU PLEASE GIVE US YOUR OPINION WITH REGARD TO THE FOLLOWING?

1. Generally speaking, do you feel that the University Senate is doing a good job?

44 Yes

29 No If no, why do you think so?

2. Generally speaking, do you feel that University Senate committees are doing a good job?

50 Yes

17 No If no, why do you think so?

3. From time to time some people or committees have recommended changes in Senate structure and operations. In which areas do you think change should be made?

a. Size: Presently composed of 42 faculty, 21 administrators and 14 students.

40 Reduce

4 Increase

34 Keep as is

b. Term of office of Senators: Presently "at large" members of the Senate serve for two years, college representatives serve for one year, and students serve for one year.

58 Leave as is

18 Increase term

c. Method of selection of Senators: Presently 21 administrators are ex-officio, 42 faculty are elected by the faculty, and 14 students are selected by Student Senate.

43 Leave as is

39 Change If change, what do you recommend?

- d. Executive Committee of the University Senate: Present description of functions:
- 1) Call special meetings of the Senate
 - 2) Change time of the regular meeting in emergencies
 - 3) Prepare Senate agenda
 - 4) Approve minutes of Senate meetings
 - 5) Act on behalf of the Senate in emergencies when a special meeting of the Senate does not seem justified.

8 Increase authority
3 Decrease authority
63 Leave authority as is

- e. Committee meeting time: Presently no set time is established.

37 Leave as is
39 Establish a set time such as Thursday afternoons of the second, third, fourth weeks of the month

4. Have you ever served as a University Senator?

30 Yes If yes, "at large" member 12 or college member 10
54 No both "at large" and college member 7

5. Have you ever served on a University Senate or university-wide committee?

65 Yes If yes, would you please name one or several and give your opinion of its effectiveness.
17 No

6. Should committees of the Senate be required to report to the University Senate?

75 Yes If yes 28 On a semester basis
8 No 41 On an annual basis

7. Are you currently a Senator?

18 Yes
66 No

1. Generally speaking, do you feel that the University Senate is doing a good job?

Yes Responses (Question 1)

I have severe reservations about the effectiveness of what the Senate does since the major influence and determination of what does or does not happen on campus is a direct result of allocation of money and the senate (and faculty) have very little meaningful input on such decisions.

Because there are no major problems at present. There is room for improvement in operation when the agenda is heavy.

A person could question whether it has any "real" authority.

Their job could be simplified a great deal if their numbers were reduced.

The "yes" is qualified. The Senate this year has not accomplished much at all, surely has not been as effective as during the past 2-3 years. Senate should be more aggressive, should be doing more than keeping house, as it has been doing this year. Areas where action is needed - evaluation of administrators, accountability of administrators and senate committees, more aggressive and imaginative in pressing for better salaries, fringe benefits. Senate has done well on faculty governance, but it is slacking off too much in this area.

Although lately it seems that there is an unfortunate trend toward inactivity.

Only suggestion - refer all items to appropriate committee first.

No Responses (Question 1)

The same old faces and their proteges keep being elected (political games). Also most of the deliberations are trivial. This is only a means for administrators to use "buck pass".

Does not take strong, effective Position on certain important issues.

Does little - mainly sends to ad hoc committees. Too big and does not have (or take) a strong legislative position.

Poor attendance records - cancelled meetings. The Senate considers everything but money - obviously an important matter. Why?? The President's budget committee should be abolished in its place there should be a budget committee of the Senate to request funds and distribute them.

Generally ineffective; moves too slowly - am unaware of what they do do, or have done this year, though I try to keep up with University affairs.

It meets irregularly and then finds it difficult to maintain a quorum. Its agenda also appears to be a sometime thing, frequently composed on an ad hoc basis and generally without much continuity from semester to semester, or year to year.

Too large. Too many members don't do enough home work. Too much talking by self-styled saviors such as Oldknow, Thorson, Lewis, Strentz, etc.

Not active enough.

No Responses - Continued (Question 1)

They probably don't have much input on items of real importance to faculty. They do a great job deciding dates for adding and dropping courses, etc., but I think they have not always faced the issues and problems of the University. For example, programs have been added and expanded without regard to how they really affect the University as a whole, financially, and otherwise.

Don't believe they deal enough with matters that directly effect faculty working conditions, welfare, well being, etc. Too much administrative initiated topics and not enough from faculty viewpoints. This may be because of too many administrators on the senate.

The body is too large. Its members do not run for the office, they are not elected because they stand for some definable position, and most of them do not perceive themselves as having a constituency they must represent and with whom they must keep in touch. They do not, and cannot, devote adequate time to their jobs as Senators.

I don't think the University Senate represents fully the attitudes of the faculty at large. I also feel the Senate should be taking a more active role in improving faculty salaries.

I think the faculty evaluation recommended by the senate stinks. Only people who don't have anything else to do serve on senate.

Lacks focus - size seems to make difficult decisive action.

There are so many members that individual members do not accept the proper responsibility, i.e., too many meetings cancelled for lack of a quorum. Further, the composition of the Senate is not balanced, i.e., too many administrators, many of whom are not directly concerned with University Governance as a concept.

Most senate members fail to take the time necessary to understand the agenda items. There is very little flow of information from the constituency and little is encouraged. The size is too large to be effective; most members assume someone else will do the necessary work.

Too slow. Too removed from their constituents. The same individuals are continually chosen as representatives. Very little communication takes place between the representative and his constituents.

It seems to me like nothing of "real" importance (that makes a real difference) is acted on and as a result interest is very low. It also seems to me like the University Senate does much "tinkering" and makes few far ranging and far sighted changes.

It is too frequently a body for ratification or veto and particularly the latter. There is too much of a tendency to avoid bringing issues to Senate if possible because actions take too long and often seems capricious.

Hard time getting quorums - have a penalty - miss two in a row - out - vacancy declared. Obey the intent of our state public meeting law - discussion of honorary degrees cannot be a secret (private meeting). Used primarily for administrative purposes - not other areas.

No Responses - Continued (Question 1)

There is an obvious lack of leadership and even interest on the part of many Senators. Once elected, they forget their constituency and often fail to attend meetings, let alone have meaningful programs or measures to propose.

The total operation is too cumbersome - takes too much time to get things done. The University Senate should be a University-Faculty Senate. There are too many administrators inhibiting the faculty. Administrators should be called in as resources persons, and should not have the power to vote.

Fee issues discussed - University Senate could always deal with unfinished business from previous year. Apathy of members.

Seems to be ineffective, Senators don't even attend the meetings. Need a change so interested people are elected, not the popular people who don't give a damn.

Members do not seem to take enough interest to attend the meetings this year! Possibly too much red tape involved to get anything considered or passed.

It is too large.

Too much absenteeism. Too many persons just sit and listen without input. Perhaps a required written statement on important decisions wherein the senator tells why he or she voted a particular way is necessary for an informed faculty electorate.

Lack of interest and experience on part of student members. Low attendance at meetings.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 1)

No opinion - what is it doing?

Could be first priority to members?

Neither a good or poor job. Faculty interest and enthusiasm seems apathetic.

Don't know. The lack of agenda for recent meetings must mean that UND has no significant problems - or that Senate members have no time to consider the problems.

Only so-so. They do not get at basic questions, such as the mal-administration of this University.

I have no idea whatsoever of what the Senate does. For all I know, it doesn't exist.

Do they meet often enough? Uncertain - I think there is more they could be doing. AAUP shown more initiative in some areas.

Not sure - seldom are such organizations doing any pace-setting and that is lacking. For example, what did Senate pick up and continue from SCOPE?

 2 Don't know 1 Neutral 1 No response

2. Generally speaking, do you feel that University Senate committees are doing a good job?

Yes Responses (Question 2)

Have no reason to believe otherwise.

Again, I have reservations. Some committees on which I have served have worked hard and had a real impact on their area of responsibility. On the other hand, other committees have seldom (never) met; when they have met it has been either to listen to some administrator or to "rubber stamp" his actions. Such committees should (I feel) be abolished and their role as "watch-dog" (???) be reviewed.

There are committees which are total failures.

The ones I have served on seem to be on target most of the time.

Effectiveness of each committee varies with the chairperson's concern and ability.

Qualified by the word "generally". Some committees meet regularly and frequently, but some might just as well not exist - they are either not called into session or do not accomplish very much.

In general they certainly are - however there are some committees that are serving no useful purpose in their present state.

No Responses (Question 2)

Have heard some don't even meet. Summer session committee - have been told it doesn't meet. What is it for if it doesn't meet. University College - have been told it doesn't meet. Same question as above.

Many (some?) of them do not even meet; there is often no publication of their functions or actions (I understand some do not even report to the Senate); their powers are often vaguely defined; and in some cases there is a credibility gap, e.g., members of the athletic committee receiving free tickets.

Very little is heard from them - very little input from students or faculty is requested.

I think there is much variation. You need a better organizational model - same by-laws or rules for each committee - minutes - annual reports, etc. to be handled by each committee. Have any secretary of the faculty to handle this.

They do not meet on a regular basis. Their agenda should be published in advance, and there should be publicity, i.e., in the campus newspaper concerning their activities.

I believe many of the Senate committees allow issues to be watered down or killed rather than being aggressive and assertive.

Some do and some don't. The committees should be looked at carefully and some eliminated.

No Responses - Continued (Question 2)

If a committee is given a serious task the University should recognize the need to give its members the released time to handle the task - it rarely ever does so. The committee should have to make public reports on a regular basis to the Senate members with copies available to all faculty - most committees operate in a vacuum. All too frequently committees are asked to confirm decisions already made elsewhere.

Some have done outstanding jobs. Many have very little value.

Whatever they do, they have not kept us informed about it.

Some appear to be functioning as envisioned; but others give too many impressions of being honoraria in disguise with few if any missions. It is not clear to me, either, Senate assumes much responsibility for some of these committees or exercises anything in the nature of follow-up supervision.

A few yes - like library and honors. Most no - some ineffectual and seldom meet - as Summer Sessions. An honorary degree for Kleppe is shameful.

Just fair. Too much discussion yet no effective, real power.

There are a few who "keep the law" and the rest mostly waste time coming up with recommendations which are ignored. Most of these are used as scapegoats to make unpopular administrative decisions.

Some are but some seldom if ever meet and the Senate has not received regular reports from its committee.

They should be more concerned with "policy-making" rather than administrative decisions.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 2)

Unable to judge - have seen few reports. On faculty evaluation more work is needed.

Some yes, some no. Some committees work very hard. Others are seldom if ever convened.

Neither a good or poor job. Does a feeling of committees are not an effective means to decision-making exist?

I have no idea whatsoever of what the Senate does. For all I know, it doesn't exist.

I don't know, but I doubt it! I wonder if the University Senate collectively or as individual members feel that the Senate has any real power or leadership role.

8 Don't know 1 Neutral 4 No response

3. From time to time some people or committees have recommended changes in Senate structure and operations. In which areas do you think change should be made?
3. a. Size: Presently composed of 42 faculty, 21 administrators and 14 students.

Reduce Responses (Question 3a)

Students.

Keep ratio of faculty to administrators. Reduce number of ex officio members. Reduce number of students.

Drastically!!! (Should be about one-third its present size - a maximum of 25-30.

Includes "administration" - chairpersons. Or increase number of faculty including non-chairpersons.

By 33% or more.

One representative from each college. No at large.

Senate seems stifled - smaller size might increase effectiveness.

It needs to be notably smaller - perhaps as much as 1/2 its present size and the proportion of administrators needs to be reduced.

Administrators and students.

In half and double again in half numbers (reduce) of administrators.

And provide for removal and re-elections concerning those who fail to attend regularly.

Administrators.

Decrease number of administrators. Decrease number of students. This is to be "faculty" senate.

Administration representation.

Increase Responses (Question 3a)

Faculty.

Faculty only.

Keep as is Responses (Question 3a)

Generally satisfied with the size, not too small to be unrepresentative, not too large to be unwieldy.

Unless those within have good reason to change and agree to do so.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 3a)

Reduce administrators. Keep as is faculty.

The governing body of any university should be the faculty. But the 35 administrators and students form a large enough bloc to render faculty government a fiction.

Reduce administrators, increase students - make the representation more representative of the University population.

4 No response

3. b. Term of office of Senators: Presently "at large" members of the Senate serve for two years, college representatives serve for one year, and students serve for one year.

Leave as is Responses (Question 3b)

Could be increased to 3 and 2 years respectively.

Reduce number of students.

Increase term Responses (Question 3b)

Minimum 2 year terms.

Unless rotational.

Three year terms for all elected members.

One year simply isn't enough to establish an effective political base.

Of college representatives.

For college representatives to two years.

Increase college representative term to two years.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 3b)

Make them all two years.

Have all faculty elected from the colleges. Block voting has destroyed the "character" of truly representative "at large" elections.

Two year terms for all.

All faculty permanent members.

Leave as is for student representatives. Increase term perhaps three year periods.

4 No response

3. c. Method of selection of Senators: Presently 21 administrators are ex-officio, 42 faculty are elected by the faculty, and 14 students are selected by Student Senate.

Leave as is Responses (Question 3c)

But reduce student numbers.

But reduce number.

Change numbers not method.

Need to know what reasons were (are) given for changes.

If Senate is made smaller it should meet more often and schedule regular hearings for the Senate committees to make committees more responsive to Senate.

The process seems O.K. but it seems to me that such a representation does not represent the University population.

Change Responses (Question 3c)

Reduce the number of ex-officio or at least have some without vote such as: Registrar - recorder only, no vote, etc. Ratio should be the same as the so-called "budget ratio" of 15% for administration which would have on the basis of 42 faculty, 14 students only 8 administrators, with vote.

Reduce number of ex-officio administrator members by (1) limiting the number of vice-presidents to one - obviously the academic vice-president; (2) limit the number of deans to two or three at the most. They may elect their own representative; (3) election of all members should provide for alternates to ensure full turn outs to meetings and adequate representation of constituencies.

Student members should be elected by their constituency to avoid possibility of packing.

Reduce number of administrators and increase number of faculty.

Not require each faculty member to initial list when voting. I would vote if I didn't have to walk across campus just for that.

Study ratio of each category for appropriate representation.

Fewer faculty at large, more faculty by college.

Select less administrators.

Fewer administrators.

Decrease the number of administrators, faculty, and students. However, the ratio should be about the same. The problem is the number of administrators; if none of these can be cut, then the present arrangement should continue.

Eliminate students from Senate.

Change Responses - Continued (Question 3c)

Reduce size. Change in selection. Ratio appears satisfactory.

Drop the administrators.

Reduce all 3 sectors by 1/3.

Reduce faculty to about 30, students to about 10.

That the number of administrators be reduced, and that the administrators elect a limited number from among themselves just like the faculty.

Have only faculty designated representation on the senate - elected by faculty. No ex-officio members (except the president and vice presidents). All others elected members.

Administrators tend to be millstones when it comes to change or faculty interests.

Some of the administrators should be elected rather than ex-officio.

Reduce the number of administrators and students.

Too many ex-officio administrators - either rotating poor, or election and a smaller percentage.

Cut out administrators and make purely advisory or make final decision power in senate. In other words, let's get the administrators responsible having to make and take responsibilities for actions and get the teachers back to teaching and research.

Why should very nearly every administrator with any title at all automatically be a member of the Senate? Why should vice presidents for Operations and Finance (and perhaps even others) automatically be members of a group supposedly primarily concerned with academic matters? Why should every dean automatically be a member of Senate - particularly those who do NOT represent a college (or school) which has a faculty? Why should the Director of Indian Studies be a member automatically any more than the Director of the Computer Center, for example? How about 7 administrators, 14 faculty, and 4 students (25 total) - with department chairmen in a category separate from the faculty (they really are more administrators). Perhaps even the President should not always be a member - other administrators should be resources people.

Reduce number of administrator and hence number of faculty (2 faculty for every administrator). Reduce number of students.

Reduce by 50%.

Fewer administrators - call them when they are needed.

Reduce number - eliminate most ex-officio (ppor attendance - no interest - example Vice President Operations - Vice President Finance). Eliminate "at large elections" - make everyone representative of a college. Allocate positions on the basis of average students enrollment over the past (?) years.

Change Responses - Continued (Question 3c)

Need some changes. How assure "representative" members? I'd evaluate suggestions from various higher education sources, e.g. Carnegie Comm.

Reduce the number by 10 to 20 members.

Student senators elected by the student body directly.

I recommend the change originally recommended by the SCOPE subcommittee (I was a member of that committee) the University Senate Sub-Committee of the University Executive Management Study Committee.

Many administrators are chairpersons, thus increasing administrative point of view. Study to be done by committee; include the possibility of a rotational system? Departmental representative? Probably overrepresented currently?

21 administrators seem extremely high.

Leave off administration.

I would like to see a much smaller senate - perhaps 14 faculty, 7 administrators and 3 or 4 students. I would have the administrators, including department chairmen, elect their members, and elect all the faculty at large. The president could be presidor and vote only in case of ties. I think there would be far better participation in a small group than one so unwieldy as the present one.

Reduce the proportion of ex-officio administrators, especially if their job has little to do with academic matters. Perhaps for the remaining administrators an election should be held.

Have all faculty elected form the colleges. Block voting has destroyed the character of truly representative "at large" elections.

Perhaps reduce the size to about 25 - 14 elected faculty, 7 elected administrators, 4 elected students - all at large. Perhaps even give faculty or senate a slightly reduced load to be able to better function as a senator.

All faculty members should be members of the Academic Senate.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 3c)

21 students - 21 faculty - 21 administrators.

If ex-officio remains reduce number significantly. Have election of administrators with only a few in the ex-officio category - I believe Dean's Council, for example, represents a larger extent many of their concerns.

1 No response

3. d. Executive Committee of the University Senate: Present description of functions:
- 1) Call special meetings of the Senate
 - 2) Change time of the regular meeting in emergencies
 - 3) Prepare Senate agenda
 - 4) Approve minutes of Senate meetings
 - 5) Act on behalf of the Senate in emergencies when a special meeting of the Senate does not seem justified.

Increase authority Responses (Question 3d)

Increase authority and duties. Committee reports to Executive Committee to Senate?
If it would increase efficiency.

Decrease authority Responses (Question 3d)

With a smaller Senate such a committee wouldn't be necessary.

Leave authority as is Responses (Question 3d)

Up to members.

Maybe increase the overall authority of the University Senate.

Except for #5 - this is loose; too much authority.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 3d)

Provide more leadership.

Increase authority if size cannot be reduced (of Senate). Leave authority of University Senate as is if size can be reduced.

Am not aware if there is a need to change.

I don't know how but it probably needs some change.

7 No response

3. e. Committee meeting time: Presently no set time is established.

Leave as is Responses (Question 3e)

Up to members.

Establish a set time Responses (Question 3e)

This might help but even so there will be problems in scheduling.

When action is needed.

And cancel classes!!

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 3e)

This could be helpful on occasion - but must fit schedules of those involved.

A free hour ought to be established in the schedule to aid committees. It would be helpful if no classes were scheduled, say 12-2 pm Thursday.

Study feasibility of a solid week once a year for committee work, i.e. at end of academic year.

Leave as is. Establish a set time such as Thursday afternoons of the second, third, fourth weeks of the month.

5 No response

4. Have you ever served as a University Senator?

(No one commented in addition to yes-no responses.) 1 No response

5. Have you ever served on a University Senate or university-wide committee? If yes, would you please name one or several and give your opinion of its effectiveness.

Yes Responses (Question 5)

Academic Procedures - Effective committee but perhaps too inconsistent.
SCOPE - Hard working in general and reasonably effective.
University College - Inadequately active. Must be window dressing.

Committee on Committees - Effective.
Curriculum - Effective.
Student Relations - (Many years ago) Effective at that time.

Honor's Committee - Too idealistic, too intangible for me.
Academic Procedures Committee - Good, solid, constructive efforts.

Administrative Procedures - Working very well and hard. Long hours almost weekly.
Recommend its policy on what is or is not allowed on petitions be summarized annually to help chairpersons and advisors to do a better job.

Library - Effective.
Student Relations - Effective.
Cultural Affairs - Ineffective.

Academic Procedures Committee - An interesting and effective committee.

Academic Policy - (Six years ago) Worked well.
BOSP - Worked well when students showed up for meetings.
Lectures - Generally a pleasant committee. Seldom were there any major problems.
And there are pleasant benefits, e.g. contact with well-known experts.

Yes Responses - Continued (Question 5)

ROTC - Necessary.

Student Relations - Potentially a very good committee, however it seemed to have little or nothing to do.

Council on Teaching - Very effective.

Administrative Procedures - Generally very good. Suffers from special interests of each member (at times) and sometimes lack of consistency.

Academic Policy Committee - Usually ineffective; too often swayed by emotionalism.

Curriculum Committee - Important, but too often bogged down in unnecessary concerns. A system needs to be developed to put more responsibility directly in the hands of the respective colleges.

Continuing Education - Absolutely awful. It never met!! And there is a great need for this entire area to be evaluated since it is very poorly run.

University College - Never met!!!

Plant Services - O.K. Effective, but where is it now??

Council on Teaching - Hard working. Increasing in effectiveness. Needs working budget.

Committee on Committees - Members are aware of problems in governance but feel they lack the mandate to initiate change.

Proliferation of Degrees - Satisfactory.

Promotion Committee - Effective, fair.

Academic Standards - Excellent.

Academic Policies - Excellent.

Plant Services (Parking) - Fairly effective, review of parking policy was an important function several years ago.

Administrative Procedures - No opinion.

Academic Freedom - Slow but satisfactory accomplishment.

University Charter - Same.

Library Committee - Not very effective. Particularly with financial situation of library.

Bicentennial Committee - Things got done. A lot of individual activity of its members.

Administrative Procedures Committee - Very effective.

University Governance.

Student Activities - Demands on time very high. Pretty effective.

Board of Publications - Frustrating experience. Responsibility without authority.

No way of effective control (economic or content) of publication.

Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Evaluation - Effective.

Yes Responses - Continued (Question 5)

Student Activities Committee - Excellent. Met regularly. Made decisions. Good discussions.

Curriculum - Moderately effective.

Library - Very effective, met regularly and frequently, most members took membership seriously, worked hard, decisions were deliberative, aided in the administrative decisions in the library. Members have sense of getting something done.

Graduate Committee - Very effective, one of the hardest working committees on campus, members take responsibilities seriously, long hours put in on work before sessions, highly effective in decisions and having decisions honored.

Student Policy - One of the most frustrating experiences I've ever had, difficult if possible, to determine charge, direction, tasks perhaps too large for the committee.

Tenure - As presently constituted and charged, the committee is almost worthless. Should be revised, allowed to assume or given more responsibility, e.g. in the area of grievances, tenure procedures, etc.

Academic Policy Committee - Effective.

Student Relations Committee - Very little activity but should remain in existence to be available if needed.

Academic Standards - Does a good job.

Library - Simply a sounding board for Director of Libraries, instead of committee input. Means well but does not consult faculty as much as would be polite and adviseable (my opinion only).

Summer Sessions - Well organized; would have appreciated data prior to meetings.

Administrator Evaluation - At times there were operational questions - e.g. regarding finances, or even wondering what would be useful to the Senate to develop next, and there is no way to pursue those items except on your own which I found a hit-or-miss operation. Once, seeking help through Stan Murray, he suggested that an Executive Secretary could provide some follow-up if warranted. During a developmental process, questions do arise and efficiency would increase if there were mechanics to handle questions.

Although political bodies often do "popular" things, such as voting for Administrative Evaluation, I always doubted that there was any commitment to that project. (It was rather like being for motherhood!) Although I think we performed well, and did the job, the process could not be integrated with what (if anything) was needed by or useful to the university through the Senate. I suppose that would require interpretation of the wishes of the Senate and an evaluation of their intent. The tendency to take the easy way out probably cannot be avoided, but at times the Senate needs to be taken to task for operating from questionable or non-existent values.

Academic Standards - Chairperson should not be the Registrar (acting). Written agenda for committee would be helpful.

Honors - Committee never met - is this taken into consideration for future years. (Apparently this committee hasn't been functioning for quite a while.)

Council on Teaching - I feel it is very effective, and can probably be even more so.

Yes Responses - Continued (Question 5)

Library - Not effective at times.
 University College - A committee in name only.
 Convocations - No longer exists.
 Admissions - No longer exists.

University Library - Fair.
 University Bookstore - Fair.
 Academic - Poor.

Library Committee - Very effective.
 Student Academic Standards - Effective.

Academic Policy Committee - Effective in so far as its power goes, to recommend only. Very ineffective in creating any change positive or negative. It seems that the whole Senate and committee structure is really designed, probably unconsciously, to promote no change condition. Since Senate seems to accomplish so little and deal with so few really critical issues, and faculty and students must steal time from busy schedules to participate it is no wonder that it takes a long time to accomplish anything and that so little is done.

Faculty Lecture - Working well.
 Honors Day - Working well.

Curriculum - It wastes most of its time on petty detail and has little time to devote to the basic problem of seeing whether the university offers a reasonable and balanced educational fare.
 Honors - It has been very effective, but I think it has lost much of that effectiveness. It does too much routine and not enough toward breaking new ground. It should return to its original basis as a self-selecting committee.
 Library - A dedicated and hard working committee that has almost no administrative support and not too much faculty and student support.

Founders Day - Well run, concise, and follow-up for critique and suggestions for the following year.
 Student Publications - One year term insufficient - complex decisions, etc. often carried over from year to year. No continuity.

Plant Services - Seemed to do very little.
 Athletic Board of Control - Duties not defined.

Curriculum - I think it was an effective committee. It met regularly.
 University College - Useless. One meeting in two years with no matters of consequence for University College. Should disband or find duties better delineated.

Bookstore - Very ineffective. The committee is usually informed of policy but has no role in making it; it is even impossible to determine the chain of command by which decisions are made. Budgetary matters are the most mysterious of all.

Subcommittee of SCOPE - Task was identified and reached effectively.

Bookstore - Ineffective, not enough meetings, no meaningful input.

Yes Responses - Continued (Question 5)

Academic Policy and Academic Standards - Both were committees meeting regularly, for purposes clearly defined. Committees worked hard to fulfill obligations and served useful purposes.

Continuing Education - Met regularly, but only to hear about what was being done. Never were any policy decisions made by the committee; indeed, I don't believe we even "rubber stamped" actions by the Dean.

University College - The most useless committee I ever served on. Why does the Senate allow it to exist?? We met once - no action, no "rubber stamping", no oversight of University College responsibilities - NOTHING!!

Student Policy and Student Activity - Quite effective.

Curriculum - Needed.

Academic Procedures - Not needed. Leave decisions and responsibility with dean and departments.

Athletic - A farce! Has a senate constitution - ignored by president and athletic director.

Faculty waste time and then recommendations are many times ignored. Let's get University governance straightened out by making clear who are the chiefs and Indians and get rid of bad ones at each place.

Summer Sessions - Could be effective if it met on a fairly regular basis.

Honors Committee - It seems to function reasonably well. There is good spirit and input by the faculty on this committee.

Board of Student Publications - Needs to have its relationship to other governing bodies (Student Senate, etc.) better defined.

Honors - Committee is effective and should certainly be continued.

Computer Committee - Very effective in improving communications and cooperation between Computer Center and computer users. The advice of the committee members is very helpful to the Computer Center director in some instances.

Board of Student Publications - Too much authority by students.

Athletic - A waste of time. Results are already predetermined.

Athletics - Rubber stamp for athletic director. Do away with free athletic tickets to members - no other committee receives compensation.

Honors - Excellent, but too large. One of the most dedicated academically minded. Other committees usually met too often with little agenda planning and accomplished very little for the term involved.

Curriculum - Excellent committee that meets an average amount of time and plays curriculum watch dog very effectively.

Computer and Data Processing Committee - Good committee and good administration of center and good working relations with students.

Yes Response - Continued (Question 5)

University College - Useless. In two years we had one meeting and that was to select a representative to the Council on Teaching. Have never discussed a matter pertaining to University College.

Academic Standards - Good. Accomplished what is designed to do, meets when necessary and operates effectively.

Student Activities - Very time consuming and lots of work but necessary and usually does a good job.

Faculty Research - Excellent.

Computer and Data Processing - Excellent group but the president does not consult adequately with the group.

Faculty Evaluation of Research - It was an eye opener for me; the purpose seemed positive.

One was effective, one was not.

Honors - This committee meets frequently and works closely with director and secretary. Effective.

Tenure - When the need arises - effective.

Honorary Degree - Effective.

Library - Effective as far as funds go.

Academic Standards - Very necessary and worthwhile.

Athletic Board of Control - Lack means of effective input, dominated by past policy and administration.

Board of Publications - Could be unnecessary.

Honors - Quite effective.

Faculty Research - Highly effective.

3 No response

6. Should committees of the Senate be required to report to the University Senate?
If yes, on a semester basis or annual basis.

On a semester basis Responses (Question 6)

Could vary.

At least to executive committee.

On an annual basis Responses (Question 6)

And briefly.

But staggered, not all at end of year.

With a specific date.

No Responses (Question 6)

They should report to the executive committee - unless called by the Senate.
But should have reports available on request.

Miscellaneous Responses (Question 6)

On a semester basis. On an annual basis. Depending on nature of problems and objectives of the committee.

As committee activity warrants.

Perhaps through executive committee.

5 No response

7. Are you currently a Senator?

(No one commented in addition to yes-no responses.) 1 No response

Miscellaneous Responses Regarding Survey

Good questionnaire!

Overall university committee duties need to be defined. New committee people need to know their authority, if any, and responsibility to the committee.

By my count, women have 1/2 the chance of getting on a committee as men. The voting system tends to keep the same sort of people on, even in years when the committee on committees has tried to increase the number of women candidates.

I think we are working the wrong problem. The University Senate is a stamp for Twamley. As long as the money to UND is finite the Senate can't do much.

The Senate is simply too large a body to function effectively on a day-in-day-out basis.

April 21, 1972

Recommendations
the Scope Commit
on Senate

1. The size of the Senate should be reduced to facilitate participation by all members and to strengthen the democratic function of the body. It is proposed that the size be established at a fixed number of 44 to be composed of 12 from administration, 24 from the faculty and 8 from the student body.
2. It is recommended that the administration be represented by the president and 11 other administrators who shall be elected by Vice Presidents and Deans from among the Vice Presidents and Deans. It is proposed that they be elected for one-year terms to take office in the fall.
3. It is recommended that the faculty shall be elected as follows: One from each college and the remainder at large as is currently the practice. It is suggested that the terms of the college representatives be two years. It is suggested that the term for at-large members be three years. An individual shall be limited to two successive terms in any combination.
4. It is recommended that the students be represented by the president of the student body and 7 others, all of whom shall be elected directly by the student body. The terms of all shall be one year with election in the spring and taking office in the fall.
5. It is also recommended that the faculty representative on the budget committee be elected by the Senate for a term of five years. Membership on the Senate should not be requisite to selection but he would report to the Senate.

Marilyn Aarsvold
Ralph Brown
Ronald Bzoch
John Penn, Chairman

I. Governing Bodies

A. University Council

1. It is recommended that requirement of two regular meetings per year of the University Council be eliminated.

2. The present provision for the calling of special meetings of the University Council should be retained.

B. University Senate

1. It is recommended that the Senate adopt methods and procedures to strengthen and enhance the legislative process.

- a. The Senate should consider legislation in a time frame which provides careful and deliberate consideration which is not impeded by the necessity to meet immediate deadlines.
- b. All proposed legislation should be immediately referred to the appropriate committee for study, hearings, etc.
- c. If necessary, the Senate should increase the frequency of its meetings. This could be accomplished by adjourning to adjourned meetings.

2. It is recommended that the Senate improve utilization of its committees.

- a. Senate committees should hold meetings on Thursday afternoons of the second, third, fourth weeks of the month.
- b. The Senate should elect all members of its committees.

- c. The Senate should be provided with committee descriptions for all of its committees.
- d. The Senate should consider necessary redefinition of committees and establishment of new committees.
- e. The legislative study committees of the Senate such as the Curriculum Committee, the Academic Policies Committee, the Student Policies Committee and such additional legislative committees which the Senate shall create, should be composed of Senate members.

3. It is recommended that the Senate prepare a manual in loose leaf form which shall be provided to all members.

4. It is recommended that the Senate assume the responsibility for the election of all of its elected student and faculty members.

5. It is recommended that all elected faculty members of the Senate serve terms of two years.

C. Tenured Faculty

1. It is recommended that provision be made for calling meetings of the tenured faculty.

2. The secretary to the faculties should serve as secretary of the tenured faculty.

3. The secretary of the faculties should be responsible for conducting elections which are held by the tenured faculty.

D. College and Departmental Governance

1. It is recommended that the president ask the colleges and departments to review the provisions of the University Constitution

which apply to their units and to their practices. In this connection any documents of governance should be reviewed with regard to the University Constitution.

E. Secretary to the Faculties

1. It is recommended that there be established an office of secretary to the faculties. This would be a part-time position and should:

- a. be responsible for the conduct of all elections of University governing bodies;
- b. be the depository for all constitutions and documents of governance for all segments of the University structure and student governing bodies;
- c. serve as the secretary for all University-wide governing bodies (Council, Senate, tenured faculty, graduate faculty) and serve as the repository of the minutes for these bodies;
- d. be assigned the responsibility for the Faculty Handbook and the annual updating of it;
- e. be assigned such additional responsibilities as seem compatible to its function.

F. Student Government

1. It is recommended that the president appoint a student committee to study student governance. Among the concerns of this committee should be: the kind and extent of participation, an evaluation of representation, methods of election and selection (processes and times), functions and responsibilities, duplication and overlapping, student committees including their turnover in membership and accountability.

2. It is recommended that the committee have made available such administrative and faculty assistance as may be helpful to its task.

II. Committees Advisory to Central Administration

A. Overlap of Advisory, Budget and Deans Committees

1. In view of the overlapping memberships it is recommended that the areas of responsibility and concern be delineated for the Advisory Committee, the Budget Committee and the Deans Council. This delineation should indicate to whom each is responsible. Further, it is recommended that the officer to whom responsible should chair meetings of the committee.

B. Advisory Committee

1. It is recommended that the Advisory Committee, as provided in the University Constitution, be convened by the president as advisory to him.

2. It is recommended that this committee should be consulted in those matters which transcend the limitations of particular segments of the University. Its concerns should include:

- a. campus planning and development;
- b. significant projects of renovation and improvement and the allocation of funds for such;
- c. personnel policies, problems, salary structures, etc.;
- d. student activities, policies, needs and relationships;
- e. relation of the University to the public and the community. Included in this connection would be those University functions and activities which are presented substantially for the public.

- f. consultation regarding fee structures and similar matters;
- g. the functions and operations of the support activities;
- h. the interrelationships of the academic program, the physical plant, the business and financial operation and the student body;
- i. providing assistance to the president in all other matters of general operation of the University.

C. Budget Committee

1. It is recommended that the Budget Committee participate on an advisory basis as the budget is being prepared. The committee should be concerned with the broader aspects of budget policy and not the detail.

2. It is recommended that the Budget Committee carefully consider all segments of the University budget.

3. It is recommended that the time frame for budget preparation provide ample opportunity for careful and unhurried consideration and that it be established on a calendared schedule.

4. It is recommended that a review of the preliminary budget be presented to the Senate prior to its final formulation.

5. It is recommended that a Sub-Committee for Budget Resources be constituted from the membership of the Budget Committee to consider all budget requests in the preparation of the biennial budget and the allocations in the annual budget.

- a. This committee should be composed of individuals who do not represent units which have large budget requests.

- b. The committee should provide ample opportunity for budget requests to be heard.

6. It is recommended that a Contingency Budget Sub-Committee which is constituted from the full Budget Committee, be responsible for consideration of day-to-day budget problems.

7. It is recommended that contingency budget allocations be clearly indicated and that a post-report be made to the Budget Committee on the use of these contingency funds.

8. It is recommended that the shifting of allocated funds be reported to the Budget Committee.

9. It is recommended that the Budget Committee approve the final budget and that an overall budget summary be included in the Senate minutes with the notation of committee approval.

D. Council of Deans

1. It is recommended that the academic deans function as an advisory committee to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Its concerns should include:

- a. allocation of faculty and GTAs positions;
- b. faculty promotions, salaries and the awarding of tenure and sabbatical leaves;
- c. teaching effectiveness, teaching loads, teaching methods, teaching equipment and teaching needs;
- d. class scheduling, examination procedures, and student grading;
- e. research activities, and equipment;

- f. the development of and changes in academic programs;
- g. inter-college relationships, programs and needs;
- h. such other academic matters as may be brought before it.

2. It is recommended that Council decisions should not be reported to and used as argument in the Senate.

3. It is recommended that information from this advisory committee be released by the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

IV. University Committees

A. Advisory Committees to Administrative Units

1. It is recommended that there be implementation of the University Senate action of November 3, 1966 which recommended that: "When a committee exists to advise on the operation of an administrative unit, the administrative officer should serve as a non-voting member of the committee." This clarification should be implemented by the following: Athletic Board of Control, Graduate Committee, ROTC Committee.

B. Student Activities Committee

1. It is recommended that the president appoint an ad hoc committee to study the structure and function of this committee. The study committee should be concerned with:

- a. the composition and method of selection of members;
- b. the relationship to the Budget Committee;
- c. the nature of the activities which are funded by SAC and the relationships of those activities to University departments, boards, committees, etc.;
- d. the methods of SAC in allocating funds;
- e. the availability and use of SAC records in awarding funds;
- f. the responsibility for audit of funds after assignment to activities, and the use of such audits in allocations of the successive years;
- g. the determination of policies for SAC allocations and the input into such policy determination from without SAC;

- h. the reporting by SAC at specified times to appropriate agencies.

C. Graduate Admissions Committee

1. It is recommended that a committee should be established to adjudicate special cases of admission to the Graduate School and that it should have the power of final determination.

2. This committee should be elected by the graduate faculty from among its members. It should be a small committee and its members should serve staggered terms of three years.

D. Press Committee

1. It is recommended that the ad hoc committee on the press has served its function and that it not be continued as a standing committee.

11. Resource Colleague

Awarded to individuals whose primary responsibility is in in-service education and advising to teacher interns regarding the practical aspects of classroom practice. Typically such a person has no responsibility for credit hours instruction.

III. Coaches

Persons appointed to this position prior to September 20, 1972 are and remain on the tenure track as provided in Article I above.

Persons appointed to this position after September 20, 1972 are not on the tenure track as provided in Article I above except for provisions for part-time tenure under article A-5-C of the Tenure statement.¹

[] Indicate deletion of previous Senate action

_____ Indicate additions to previous Senate action

¹A faculty member who completes six years of continuous part-time academic service to the institution (as defined by the institution) shall be considered tenured at any time thereafter to an extent equal to the average of the proportion of full-time appointments (as defined by reference to a full-time teaching load stipulated by the institution for the department involved) held during each of the previous four years of service.

Due Process Statement for Students

(to be considered by University Senate)

Following is a due process statement developed by the Office of Student Development and approved by the Council of Deans and the Student Policy Committee.

"PREAMBLE. Educational institutions have a duty to protect their educational purpose through the setting of standards of scholarship and conduct for the students who attend them. In the exceptional circumstances when the preferred informal means fail to resolve problems of student conduct, proper procedural safeguards will be observed to protect the student from unfair imposition of serious penalties. (Paraphrased from the 'Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students,' June 1967 as found in UND SCOPE Report, March 1973, pp. 51-54).

"The Due Process statement below provides procedural fairness to an aggrieved student in instances where discipline may be administered by a representative of the UND community:

"DUE PROCESS. 1. A student should be informed in writing of the specific reasons for any action taken or proposed against him/her and of the time and place of a hearing, whether for initial decision or appeal and review of a decision already made.

"2. The student should be provided the opportunity to raise questions and give information to any hearing committee in his/her behalf.

"3. The responsibility for establishing validity of allegations lies with the person(s) making the allegation. No implication may be drawn from the absence of a student at a scheduled hearing.

"4. All information relevant to the pending decision shall be made available at the hearing in the presence of the student affected.

"5. Each aggrieved student should be able to designate an advisor of his/her choice to be present at the meeting.

"6. Any hearing may be declared a closed session by either the student or the hearing committee.

"7. A factual, confidential record of all proceedings is to be maintained. Such records may be made public upon completion of the hearing with prior written approval of the aggrieved student and the hearing committee.

"8. Both parties in the disputed matter shall be informed in writing of the hearing committee's final decision and of the appropriate appeal avenues."

PROBLEM:

The University of North Dakota has long been lacking an orderly, established, and published procedure that provides students the opportunity to appeal academic grievances and judgments.

BACKGROUND:

In 1968 the University Senate adopted a Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. The statement was reaffirmed in April 1972 when the same body adopted a Statement on Administrator Responsibilities. A student appeal and grievance procedure was subsequently approved where it related to non-academic matters (see Code of Student Life, pp. 25-26). Although the University has stated its commitment to student academic rights in the following language (ibid., p. 4), a formal appeals procedure has yet to be developed and adopted:

Students should have protection through orderly procedures against prejudiced or capricious academic evaluation. At the same time, they are responsible for maintaining standards of academic performance established for each course in which they are enrolled.

PROPOSAL:

The UND chapter of the AAUP recommends the consideration and adoption of the following student academic appeals procedure. The proposed procedure is based on findings and conclusions reached through its subcommittee survey and examination of the problem with administrators, certain faculty, student body leadership, and prevailing departmental practices.

PROCEDURE:

- 1) Any student with an academic grievance (concerning plagiarism, grading, incompletes, testing, quality of instruction, etc.) should first discuss it with the instructor involved.
- 2) The student has the right to appeal any academic grievance or judgment to the chairperson of the department in question, which has an obligation to develop an established procedure where none operates. Such procedure shall at minimum directly involve the chairperson, appropriate faculty, and the student.
- 3) If the problem is not satisfactorily resolved, the student may carry the case to the Dean of the College and, if the student wishes, he may enlist the aid of the Associate Dean for Student Development.
- 4) The student, if still not satisfied that due process has been observed, may carry the appeal to the Student Relations Committee of the University which should be empowered to review the fairness and adequacy of the procedures employed in resolving grievances and appeal. The Vice President for Academic Affairs or his representative shall sit in on such hearings as an ex-officio member.