Military Education Council Meeting  
December 1, 2011 – 1:00 pm  
Military Science Conference Room, 113 Armory Bldg.

Present: Alexander Scheeline, Chair, Jennifer Bateman, MEC Secretary, LTC Kurt Bauer, Marni Boppart, Susan Brewer, Jack Dempsey, H. George Friedman, Chad Garland, CAPT James Haugen, Kristin Hoganson, Samuel Levon, Jim Maskeri for Nick Larson, Arne Pearlstein, and LTC Christopher Robbins.  
Visiting Observer: Frank Metzger

Call to Order
Prof. Scheeline called the meeting to order at 1:08 pm. He announced that Jim Maskeri was attending the meeting in place of Nick Larson. Prof. Pearlstein moved to approve the Minutes from the September 14, 2011 meeting. Prof. Friedman seconded and the Minutes and were approved.

December Commissioning
LTC Bauer stated that there is no money needed for December Commissioning. One cadet is commissioning; the ceremony will be at 4:00 pm on Saturday, December 17th in Huff Hall.

Veteran’s Day
CAPT Haugen reported that the Veteran’s Day event had good representation from a variety of veterans groups including the VFW, American Legion, Marine Corps League and Military Officers Association of America, and Associate Chancellor DeLorenzo attended. Next year we will look to broaden campus and public awareness and participation. An important aspect of community access will be nearby parking. Prof. Scheeline stated that he contacted the News Gazette after their first announcement of Veteran’s Day activities, which was too late for wide publicity.

LTC Robbins hoped in the future the event would be embraced more by the University and community. University administrators need to be invited early in order for them to be available. Prof. Friedman mentioned a letter to the editor he read about there being no color guard at a volleyball game on the 11th. Visitor Frank Metzger suggested a Veteran’s Day parade, but the council explained the problems with having a parade on a school day.

ROTC Instruction
In order to become more familiar with the ROTC programs, Prof. Scheeline attended three ROTC classes, one from each service. He stated that interactivity in all three was quite good. There was a former enlistee who is now going through the ROTC program in one of the courses who was a great asset to his peers in class.
Prof. Scheeline encouraged the other council members to attend classes. The schedules for courses can be obtained from the departmental secretaries. At the beginning of the spring semester, the schedules will be sent out by the MEC secretary. It was suggested to check with the instructor before attending to ensure that observation will be useful on any particular day.

**Requirements for Teaching Staff**

Prof. Scheeline asked if the council thought it was necessary to change the written list of qualifications for teaching staff. The requirement that an assistant professor be admissible to a graduate program has several interpretations and may need to be clarified. Recently there has been a candidate who would not be admitted to the graduate program in his undergraduate field of study, but perhaps could have been in another field.

The council discussed what was meant by “admissibility.” Mr. Dempsey felt that the requirement was that candidate is admissible to some field or graduate program, not necessarily the same as their undergraduate degree. Prof. Pearlstein stated that an applicant with a 2.6 undergraduate GPA would not be accepted into many of the graduate programs at the University, but perhaps there were some programs that would. Mr. Dempsey mentioned that Business was a program where that would be possible, noting a case where a person was accepted without an undergraduate degree.

Prof. Hoganson stated that when she started on the Faculty Review Committee she was not sure if the approval of the nominations was just a “rubber stamp” or if she should be taking a closer look at the academic credentials. She feels that it is hard to judge the candidates’ academic abilities because she is not familiar with the credentials of many of the candidates’ undergraduate institutions. Prof. Boppart had assumed that the candidates had been pre-screened by the military prior to MEC receiving the nominations.

Mr. Dempsey asked if the military knew the required criteria of an instructor before they sent a recommendation. LTC Robbins explained that the Army takes more care concerning requirements for the Professor of Military Science than for the assistant professors. Since every school has different requirements for their ROTC instructors, the Army does not check these requirements before sending a recommendation to the school. The Army will do an interview before recommending a Professor of Military Science, but not for assistant professors.

LTC Bauer said that Air Force procedures were similar, but that they base recommendations on the career plan of the officer. Candidates must volunteer for positions in ROTC. The Air Force will not recommend someone with certain disciplinary issues in their history or if ROTC does not fit well into their career plan. In all three branches the CO reviews the recommendation before submitting it to the MEC. Then Prof. Scheeline does a screening of the nomination before submitting it to the Faculty Review Committee.

Prof. Scheeline asked if we should set a GPA requirement at 3.0. Prof. Pearlstein did not think it would be a good idea to set a solid number because GPAs have different meanings from different schools. Mr. Garland suggested that the requirements be similar to what is required for an assistantship in a relevant department instead of just admission, since these people will be teaching. Prof. Boppart said that this issue has come into discussion largely because of the
consideration of a minor in the military program. If the council is serious about a minor, we need to have minimum criteria. Prof. Friedman agreed that making the requirements too lenient may hurt ROTC’s reputation with the rest of the University and could make it more difficult to maintain recognition as peer academic units.

Prof. Friedman asked how much military experience the assistant professors usually have. LTC Robbins said that in the Army they typically have seven to eight years of experience since commissioning with usually two or three deployments. The NCO’s usually have fifteen or more years of experience.

Prof. Scheeline stated that when the candidate is ten years out from their undergraduate degree, GPA may be a poor indicator of capability. Prof. Boppart thought that a candidate with a high GPA did not necessarily correlate with quality teaching. Mr. Dempsey said that qualifications should be listed more in terms of experience and require a degree from an accredited school. Prof. Pearlstein stated there was at least one case where a candidate did have a degree from an accredited school but was considered unacceptable by the Faculty Review Committee. He felt they should have more detailed criteria.

Prof. Hoganson said they should base the requirements on what will make the candidate a successful teacher. LTC Robbins explained that the majority of the instructors work is outside of the classroom doing things like PT, training, and leadership evaluations. Prof. Boppart confirmed that in her experience as an Air Force cadet there was constant interaction with the cadre and only a small portion in the classroom.

Mr. Dempsey asked what the impact would be on a candidate who was rejected. LTC Robbins explained that they would just request a different candidate from the Army and the original candidate would get a different assignment. LTC Bauer agreed that in the Air Force it would not cause a great problem to the candidate if they were rejected. They may be assigned to a different ROTC unit or to a totally different assignment. Rejection would not mar the candidate’s record.

Prof. Scheeline suggested that the current document stating the requirements be circulated to the Faculty Review Committee to be edited. They should bring suggested changes to the next MEC meeting. Prof. Pearlstein asked the COs if it would be acceptable to have two sets of criteria: one for an instructor who may teach courses that could be used for general education credit and one for instructor who would not teach courses that could be used for the general education credit. LTC Robbins thought that because the instructors’ responsibilities change frequently, one set of criteria would be best. Prof. Friedman thought it might be a problem to get into the general education credit discussion because the courses have only been used on an exception basis.

**Minor**

Prof. Friedman stated that he did not have additional information on the minor at this point. He had started on putting together a collection of courses that could be used toward the minor. Either he or Prof. Scheeline need to contact the departments offering these courses, explain what they are trying to do, and find out how the departments feel about involvement with the minor.
Mr. Dempsey asked if the ROTC departments had the staff to take on more students with a minor. LTC Robbins said that he didn’t think that staffing would be an issue. Using the upper division courses however could be a problem. He said that currently he has half a dozen students who are not in the ROTC program taking some of the ROTC classes. This is fairly common. However, registration controls are needed so that ROTC students have preference in lower-level classes. Prof. Friedman and Prof. Pearlstein said they would require prerequisites or consent of the instructor for many of the courses.

Prof. Pearlstein mentioned that the Council still hasn’t decided if the minor should be geared toward current ROTC students or non-ROTC students. Prof. Friedman said in the survey of the other Big Ten schools they found that the three schools offering a military minor did this in different ways. LTC Robbins thought that the minor should be geared toward both ROTC and non-ROTC students. Prof. Friedman thought that from an engineering perspective, students in the minor would be taking these 300 level courses and requesting general education credit for them which would likely be approved. Prof. Pearlstein thought this could be one of the selling points since it is much better to be using a 300 level courses for this instead of 100 level ones. Prof. Friedman agreed that gearing it toward both groups would be good, but non-ROTC would be an easier sell to the Senate. Mr. Garland thought that adding the minor may encourage more research in the field here at the University.

The minor is being worked on by the Course and Program Approval Committee which consists of Prof. Freidman, Prof. Scheeline, LTC Robbins, LTC Bauer, and CAPT Haugen. Prof. Scheeline said that he was planning to ask undergraduate student Nick Larson to also be on the committee.

Staff Issue
Prof. Scheeline explained to the council an issue with the former storeroom staff person and the uncertainty of their employment situation. The possibility of an interagency personnel agreement was discussed. He asked the council for a volunteer to attend a human resources meeting regarding this issue on December 7th. LTC Robbins agreed to attend.

Early Registration
Mr. Maskeri who was standing in for Nick Larson at the meeting stated that he and Mr. Larson had been working on the issue of early registration for ROTC students. He provided a packet showing some history on the subject. Currently the James Scholars, Chancellor’s Scholars, University Marching Band, and the University Athletes are allowed to register early. This comes to approximately 5000 students. In April 2010 the Student Senate passed a resolution proclaiming the Student Body’s support of early registration for ROTC students, but little follow up was done to make sure it happened. Mr. Maskeri and Mr. Larson have met with several individuals on campus regarding early registration and have been told that if there were going to be any changes to the early registration policy, it would be reviewed in its entirety and would more than likely have more constraints.

Mr. Maskeri asked if the council or departments had any numbers on the students who have been adversely affected by scheduling difficulties. If there were a significant number they would
pursue the early registration further otherwise they would try to work on a case by case basis. The COs stated that it was difficult to get true numbers on the issues caused by scheduling. LTC Bauer mentioned that they had moved the time of their lab to 5:45 am because of conflicts.

**Navy Briefing**
CAPT Haugen gave a NROTC briefing, a copy of which is on file in the MEC office.

**Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 pm.