

AGENDA FOR FACULTY MEETING

The February faculty meeting was held in the University Union, beginning with a buffet dinner at 5 o'clock p.m. President Peter Armacost called the meeting to order at 5:55 p.m. March 20, 1974, 6:00 P.M. Ed Gerner, who gave a prayer of thanks for the meal. All members were present except for the following: Bill Soucek, Robert Buchanan, Janet Eichner, Merrill Lee, Alice Joy Lewis, Tom Lewis, Fred Zook.

I. Approval of the Minutes of February, 1974 Faculty Meeting

II. Announcements

III. Reports

A. Report from the Committee on Committees - Michael Sancho then Dr. Zook

B. Report from the Religious Life Programs Committee - Chaplain Gibson

C. Report from Winterterm Committee - Dr. Myers

IV. Old Business

V. New Business

A. Motion from the Winterterm Committee - Dr. Myers

B. Other New Business

Note: Faculty minutes for the February meeting already circulated contained incorrect page numbers. Page 4 should be 5, and page 5 should be 4.

Also, please note on page 6, second paragraph please note the following correction: (Correction is underlined)

In response to a question from David Bemmels, Dr. Rich said that the present motion is a development of thought concerning centers as support structures for general education and is thus different from language in the FIPSE proposal; but he said that the motion is not inconsistent with that proposal. In reply to questions from Dr. Armacost, Dr. Rich said that a central contextual intention

FACULTY MINUTES

Ottawa University
February 20, 1974

The February faculty meeting was held in the University Union, beginning with a buffet dinner at 6 o'clock p.m. President Peter Armacost called the meeting to order at 6:55 p.m. He called on Dean Harold Germer, who gave a prayer of thanks for the meal. All members were present except for the following: Bill Boucek, Robert Buchanan, Janet Eichner, Mercile Lee, Alice Joy Lewis, Tom Lewis, Lora Reiter, Barbara Richards, Dale Watts, Connie Zook, and Fred Zook.

The President called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting, January 16, 1974. Ron Averyt asked that the minutes be corrected on page 2, second paragraph of Fred Zook's report from the Committee on Committees, to show that the Election of Elmer Roth to the Faculty Affairs Committee was for the remainder of Joe Hutchinson's two year term. Michael Sancho then moved, second heard, that the minutes be approved as corrected. The motion was carried.

President Armacost then called for announcements, and the following were forthcoming:

- 1) Stanley DeFries announced that the time of the chamber group musical concert this coming Sunday afternoon will be two o'clock p.m., rather than three, as previously announced. He also said that the Music Department has tickets available for performances of the Kansas City Philharmonic, with good seats.
- 2) Tom Maher announced that he had attended a KCRCHE meeting for awarding of faculty development grants, and that two members of our faculty, Jim Hennager and Fred Gibson, will be recipients of these grants for next year. The faculty gave them a round of applause.
- 3) Bill Myers made two announcements. The first concerned Black Heritage Week, February 24 to March 2, 1974. He said that Jerry Streets, a former student at Ottawa University, will give the keynote address this coming Sunday afternoon at three o'clock. There will be events throughout the week, with an all-school dance on Saturday night. The faculty is invited to participate in all of these events, he said. The other announcement was that students in Dr. Myers' class on "Black Community" are investigating the topic of Ottawa University as a community, and will probably be wanting to interview several faculty persons. Faculty were asked to respond to these students, when asked.
- 4) Dean Harold Germer reminded advisors that no students should be allowed to take comprehensive examinations until their contracts have been approved.
- 5) Carl Bobbish announced that Y. G. Srimati will be present on campus beginning on March 4, for three days. She is accomplished in music, drama, literature, and art. Faculty are invited to attend U.P.S. events featuring Ms. Srimati, and to arrange other special events where her talents may be of use to the academic community.

The President then called on Mark Horsman, a student who is president of the University Religious Involvement Committee, for a report from that committee. Mr. Horsman distributed handouts containing a diagram of the Committee's structure and names and addresses of the Committee's officers (see appended handout). Mr. Horsman said that the Committee membership is committed and that the concept of involvement is being stressed this year. He explained some of the ideas for involvement which are being implemented, inviting faculty to participate and to furnish new ideas for involvement. He then introduced two other Committee officers who were present, Susie Clough, a member of the URIC Presidential Advisory Committee, and Ron Gould, chairman of Public Relations. Mr. Gould then spoke briefly, stating that he wishes to see a new attitude stressing more social interaction, e.g. cooperation with Volunteer Services. He said that URIC will be holding weekly meetings on Tuesdays at 6 p.m. in Brown Hall Lounge. In response to a question from Justo Diaz, Mr. Horsman said that about twelve faculty members work with URIC, and that the Committee hopes to involve about one-third of the total university community. In answering a question from Mr. Germer, he said that faculty can become involved through hosting groups in their homes, through advising, through helping with mission team efforts, and through helping with special events such as a retreat this spring. Chaplain Fred Gibson stated that between 75 and 90 students each year sign up for mission team work. President Armacost said that a great religious diversity exists among our students, so that URIC has to have a varied program, and mentioned the Ottawa University commitment to confront students with the Christian faith. Neil Harris observed that the activities mentioned in the report are largely Christian in their nature, so that it might be more appropriate to call URIC a "Christian" involvement committee. The response was that if specific non-Christian religious needs are defined, attempts will be made to respond to them. President Armacost said that we ought to try to help each one to develop in his own religion, and yet keep our commitments to the Christian faith. In response to a question from Wayne Angell, President Armacost said that other reports concerning religious life and programs would be forthcoming.

The President then presented a report concerning the February meeting of the Board of Trustees. He first stated that the Board had taken the following actions regarding personnel: extending tenure to Dr. Charles Rich; promoting to Professor Dr. Charles Anderson, Dr. Leonard Meyers, and Dr. Horton Presley; and promoting to Associate Professor Dr. James Billick. The faculty acknowledged each of these announcements with applause.

Dr. Armacost then reported that an anonymous donor has agreed to underwrite the college budget for next year to the maximum amount of \$130,000. This donation will help to raise salaries and otherwise free us for planning strategies, he said. He gave credit to Vice President for University Advancement, Jack Patty, for doing a superior job in helping to secure this donation. The President said that a proposal to secure funds for instructional equipment and support is being presented to another potential donor, and that a proposal for funds in the amount of \$250,000 for student assistance is being presented to a large foundation. The latter proposal is one which would benefit middle income students, he said.

The President said that the Board meeting had been a very good one. There was excellent give and take and involvement on the part of the Board members. W. J. Coppoc, newly elected Chairman, provided excellent leadership, he said, and there are some other good new people on the Board. Several of the Board's action items were outlined, briefly as follows:

- 1) Approval of two changes in the by-laws, one to formalize the process of selection of faculty and student visitors and to establish their length of term; the other to reflect the reorganization of staff responsibilities, with admissions activities under the Vice President for University Advancement and intercollegiate athletics under the Dean of Students.
- 2) Approval of the budget for 1974-75, which is balanced on a preliminary basis based on a fall enrollment comparable to this year, 654. The donation cited above covers possible errors in budget projections and makes possible faculty salary increases. The budget shows increases for salaries, for general educational expenses (\$44,314 as a result of our funded commitment to the FIPSE), for staff benefits, insurance, interest, institutional memberships and plant operations expenses. The budget shows decreases in fund-raising expenses, in the cross-cultural program (limited probably to the Morelia, Mexico program and to winterterm trips), and in certain faculty and administrative salaries (due to leaves of absence and shared time salaries in the Kansas City Center and Lawrence Project mentioned below).
- 3) Approval of criteria and procedures for selecting members of the network faculty.
- 4) Approval of a proposal for physical plant improvement, focusing on outdoor recreational facilities. The President explained that while this may not be our highest building priority, but that such a project is high in psychological value and funding for such a project is more immediately likely than for some other type. It will not negatively affect the long term master plan for facility improvement, he said.
- 5) Approval of action to authorize the necessary studies and planning of a financial campaign strategy. A major fund-raising campaign may be initiated by the Board at its June meeting, he stated.
- 6) Approval of a pilot project at Kansas University in Lawrence, contingent on favorable market research, indicating the possibilities of recruiting enough Kansas University students to make the program feasible without affecting programs here at Ottawa. Only a project manager will need to be funded by our budget, he said. The project would offer to KU students basic features of the Ottawa plan of education at the same time they are enrolled in courses and receiving student support services at Kansas University. This program would make a lot of sense in terms of our educational and religious goals, and it makes financial sense if the student market is favorable.

President Armacost then discussed items pertaining to an overall corporate strategy for Ottawa University, aided by overhead projector transparencies shown by Jack Patty. The transparencies, and the corporate strategy items presented, were entitled as follows: Trends and Opportunities in higher education in the future; Commitment in Planning for O.U. education in the future; Educational Philosophy and Objectives; Distinctive Aspects of the Program; Overview Diagram of Ottawa University, including programs at places other than this campus; Steps to Strengthen the Program at Ottawa; a Model of the Program at State Universities; Long-term Strategies; and a Merger Concept. The latter strategy concept received considerable explanation, including several questions from faculty members. In response to a question from Wayne Angell regarding whether

corporate strategy proposals may be implemented without faculty discussion, the President said that the whole corporate strategy will be discussed at great length, and appropriate decisions made at appropriate times.

Sherwin Snyder then presented his report concerning the Board of Trustees, speaking as faculty representative to the Board. He said that corporate strategy issues gained momentum during the course of the meetings, and that the Board discussed them with the idea of our being the best kind of college we can be, not just as means of getting business advantages. One trustee had investigated the admissions program and was very complimentary about it, he said. He remarked that in meetings of the Business Affairs Committee there was support for faculty salary increases. The Board has very good people, and it was a fine meeting. The Board expressed its appreciation to Morris Hildreth, ex-chairman of the Board. Two members welcomed were Robert Shaw and James Asher.

Charles Anderson then presented his report on the Board meeting, speaking also as faculty representative. The Academic Affairs Committee of the Board had discussed the development of network faculty, stressing the matters of recognition in an area of competence and good recommendations, and being concerned about quality control. The Lawrence Center was also discussed, as was quality control concerning the work of our students, Dr. Anderson said. Confidence was expressed in the unique elements of the Ottawa educational experience. One of the Board members, Dr. Hodgkinson, introduced the question of doing consumer reports to evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Regarding the Ottawa Investment Corporation, the apartment complex is not doing well and attempts are being made to sell the property, he said. But the office building property is doing well. The English Language Institute was also discussed by the Board. Student potential is increasing, with 17 application from Japanese students being presently in hand, and the distinct possibility of our getting students also from Korea and Germany.

President Armacost then called on Peter Sandstrom for a report from the Office of Educational Facilitation. Dr. Sandstrom discussed items pertaining to a request made at the December faculty meeting that a study be made of opinions and ideas concerning the academic calendar. The OEF conducted an opinion survey, he said, and distributed copies of the questionnaire showing tabulations of responses given. He then proceeded to explain the results, comparing especially student responses with faculty responses. The faculty apparently sees more difficulties with the present calendar than the students do, he noted. The OEF will meet later to discuss the responses and will bring a further report at the next faculty meeting, if the faculty wishes, he stated. (See appended questionnaire).

Dr. Sandstrom then reported to the faculty on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee, of which he is chairman. He stated that the Committee has received repeated requests for an investigation of faculty load. After initial discussion the Committee had decided that proposals presently coming before the faculty, concerning structural changes, etc. appear to render any conclusions about faculty load as premature. He said that a questionnaire or forum may be used in the future concerning this matter, and invited individual ideas from faculty persons. The Committee also reported on a matter of current interest, which is that of disability insurance. John Lehner reported on an investigation which

he had conducted, saying that TIAA policies provide disability insurance at reasonable rates but with a 6 month delay feature built in. Other companies have shorter waiting periods in their policies, but at a higher premium, he said. In reply to a question from Ron Averyt, President Armacost said that the college can work to supply fringe benefits such as disability insurance, but that in the short run it appears to be a question of fringe benefits versus salary increases.

At this point there was a ten-minute recess in the meeting. Following the return to session, the President called for items of old business, but none were forthcoming. He then called for new business. Dr. Charles Rich introduced two motions as follows:

1) (From the Academic Center Task Force)

"It is moved that the faculty approve action toward the implementation of the plan of faculty organization by departments and centers as projected in the reports of December 19, 1973 and February 4, 1974 as follows:

- a. that two of the projected centers be immediately established, specifically the Center for the Study of Organizational and Cultural Issues and the Center for Communication, Expression and Value Clarification;
- b. that a three member planning committee be authorized for each of the other two centers;
- c. that faculty members be identified with centers tentatively for the remainder of the year; (Individual identification with responsibilities to centers will be subject to individual negotiation between the faculty member and the dean in the light of the interests of each faculty member, the need for interdisciplinary representation in each center and the tasks of the centers.)
- d. that the Academic Council be commissioned to evaluate the effectiveness of the centers and the departmental-center system and to make recommendations concerning further action. The Council will be expected to report to the faculty in May and December 1974 and in April 1975."

Discussion then took place on the above motion. Dr. Rich explained that this is not a motion to accept the whole of documents or reports submitted earlier, but it is a revision of earlier "possible" motions which have been previously discussed. Ron Averyt submitted several questions. He asked how center members would be selected, and the answer was given that they would be appointed. He asked about the distinction between departments and centers, and Dr. Rich answered that instructional budgeting would remain with departments and that departments are needed to perform basic educational functions. He asked whether putting in centers would increase the faculty work load, and it was said that if centers implement projected programs it could result in more work. He asked whether it would result in a standardization of the faculty and it was answered that the intention was to achieve the opposite effect. Justo Diaz then commented on ways in which the faculty can relate to both departments and centers, and on the place and function of the centers. Ed Morrissey asked whether, if the motion is approved, we would have both centers and divisional structure until April, 1975. The answer was affirmative, but it was pointed out that we can change this situation at any time. Carl Bobbish asked whether faculty workshops would be used to plan activities of the centers.

He was given an affirmative answer, and it was noted that workshop-related activities involve additional funding. In response to questions by Wayne Angell, it was said that the center directors would be persons with joint faculty and administrative responsibilities, and that the motion itself is neutral about the matter of faculty evaluation.

In response to a question from David Benmels, Dr. Rich said that the present motion is a development of thought concerning centers as support structures for general education and is thus different from language in the RHPSE proposal; but he said that the motion is not inconsistent with that proposal. In reply to questions from Dr. Armacost, Dr. Rich said that a central contextual intention of the present motion is that of taking responsibility for linking the educational program to the career development of the students, and that the centers could serve as program quality control agencies, if so desired. It was agreed that these functions of centers would receive central emphasis. Dean Germer observed that if guidelines from the centers existed it would serve to aid the Committee on Academic Review in supervising graduation requirements. John Lehner said that he feels uncomfortable with the unknown quantities of what approval of this motion might mean, especially concerning where (which center) the faculty might go.

After this discussion, the question was called on the motion cited above from the Center Task Force. The motion was carried by voice vote.
2) (Motions from the Core Subcommittee).

"1. It is moved that the core requirement for the freshman year be reduced from three to two courses.

2. It is moved that a first level freshman core course incorporate advisement and associated contract development within a course registration which may be extended through the whole of the freshman year."

Discussion then followed on this motion. Dr. Averyt asked why there was not a motion on the sophomore and senior cores. Dr. Rich answered that a supplementary motion concerning other core levels may come at a later time. Dr. Anderson asked how registration for the freshman core course will be handled. It was explained that there will not be an overburden in courses for freshman, and that the design of the extended advisement course will have to take care of that. Lloyd Gladman then moved to amend the above motion to provide additional features, those of diagnosis and proficiency development, in the ET freshman core course. This amendment was accepted as a part of the original motion, so that the second part of the motion was made to read as follows:

"2. It is moved that a first level freshman core course incorporate advisement, diagnosis proficiency development, and associated contract development within a course registration which may be extended through the whole of the freshman year."

A vote was taken and the motion from the Core Subcommittee, as amended, was passed by voice vote with no dissent heard. The meeting was then adjourned by consensus at 9:57p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Leonard L. Meyers
Faculty Secretary