

4-11-1974

## Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 11, 1974

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all)

---

### Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 11, 1974" (1974). *Faculty Senate*. 629.

[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/629](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/629)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact [ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu](mailto:ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu).

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty  
FROM: Ms. Arnhold, Secretary,  
Faculty Senate  
RE: Faculty Senate Minutes  
DATE: April 11, 1974

Minutes of the special meeting of Faculty Senate to consider the proposed General Education Program, Thursday, April 11, 1974, at 3:30 P.M. in the Smoky Hill and the Santa Fe Rooms of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call:

Members Absent: Mr. Marc Campbell, Mr. Robert Lowen, Dr. Arris Johnson

Also Present: Alternates: Ms. Emma Littlejohn for Ms. Ilene Allen, Mr. Louis Caplan for Dr. Maurice Witten, Mr. Olli Valanne for Miss Kathleen Kuchar; and visitors: Ms. Vera Thomas, Dr. Ann Liston, Mr. Wayne McConnell, Dr. Russell Bogue, Dr. Adnan Dagistani, Dr. Forrest Price, Dr. John Hocutt, Mr. Mike Schardein, Ms. Cynthia Hartman, Ms. Sue Gillum, Ms. Barb Broeckelman, Mr. Steve Scheibmeir, Mr. Rick Rice, Mr. Jim Munsey, Ms. Kathy McCune, Ms. Lois Jennison, Mr. Robert Schraeder

II. Business:

The special meeting to consider the proposed General Education Program was called to order at 3:30 P.M. by Dr. James Forsythe, Chairman of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Forsythe opened the meeting by reading a statement which he stated reflected the impressions and feelings of Dr. John Gustad on the proposed issue.

Dr. Forsythe made the following remarks prior to reading the statement: The chair has a statement which will be entered in the minutes. It is the reconstruction of several meetings with the President. I believe that they are as accurate as they can be and reflect my understanding and interpretation of the conversations between the President and myself, and on one occasion with Dean Thompson present. If there are inaccuracies, they will be part of the minutes and thus subject to correction. Dean Thompson has heard the statement and said that it is accurate as to the meeting when he was present and that the rest, the meetings between the President and myself, accurately reflect his understanding of what President Gustad wants and will approve.

The statement was read as follows:

I. I visited with President Gustad at 9:30 a.m., Tuesday morning. Dean Thompson was present.

a. I asked the President when the General Education Program would become effective. He wanted it for this fall. The program would be for incoming freshmen and junior college transfers, not for students now on campus. I suggested a lead time of about 17 months and that the program become effective August, 1975. I mentioned that the current catalog was effective until that time. He said that the catalog was not binding and that you can change it by distributing a list of changes. He wanted it effective this fall. He suggested that an alternative would be to distribute the change to all faculty and that all faculty advisers show the new program to incoming freshmen. The faculty advisers would explain that the new 12 hour per area general education program was educationally superior but that the fall 1974 freshmen could option to take the existing program but that he hoped not.

I told the President that much of the concern that initially developed about the existing general education program came because it was not fully explained to junior colleges and to high school principals and counselors. My own opinion was that we had better get to every high school counselor and explain the program. President Gustad told Dean Thompson and myself that Fort Hays State had better plan a long session with the counselors at Student-Counselor Day in the fall. Dean Thompson said that the college would get out a booklet describing the program.

b. I told the President that it seemed that some of the Senate members were unsure of whether or not they could get their courses approved by the General Education Committee. He said that departments must offer some real general education courses, not just their freshmen survey classes. The President said that the General Education Committee will carefully review each proposal. I would like to add parenthetically that it appears within this context that if a department prefers technical writing rather than Composition II, a junior level course, or perhaps oral communication then that department will ask the General Education Committee to allow the substitution. Dean Thompson said that this was the way the program was designed to operate. I asked Dean Thompson this question this morning.

The President also said that he, President Gustad, will be carefully watching the General Education Committee. He wants some general education courses and he wants quality in the department programs.

c. The President said that there were three kinds of education. He said that General Education is learning how to think about the liberal arts areas. The student learns the methods of how those in liberal arts think, how they research, how they apply their research. There is Liberal Education which takes the student who has now learned how to think in the General Education program and teaches him how to think deeply. Then there is Professional Education, such as Business, Industrial Arts, Education, and similar professional areas. These professional areas take the student who has learned to think in the General Education Program and now gives that student professional training. The curriculum of the professional areas should be built upon a liberal arts background. Fort Hays State is a liberal arts college and that is what gives value to the professional programs of the college and thus differentiates Fort Hays State from a proprietary school.

d. I also told the President that some departments, some of the professional departments, indicated that they should be considered and should be allowed to offer General Education courses. The President said no, they could not. The curriculum of the professional departments is built upon the General Education courses of the liberal arts areas. The President and the Dean discussed this briefly and the President said that if the professional departments have enough staff to offer both their professional courses and to offer General Education courses, then those departments are overstaffed. Instead of them needing more staff as they have indicated, he now finds that they have too many staff. He said that they would be interesting if and when further faculty reductions have to be made or positions reallocated. The answer was no, the professional areas cannot offer general education courses.

e. The General Education Program as proposed by the General Education Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee and the alternative proposal by Mr. Glenn Ginther were handed to the President. He looked them over. He sort of shook his head and remarked that he had seen both types of programs before

and had been associated with schools with variations of the programs. He said no to the additional items in the Ginther proposal, that is, Section A, item II. D. and Section B, item II. He again said that the professional areas were not going to offer General Education courses.

I told him that some of the Senators thought that the 12 hour requirement in each of the three area studies was a bit stiff and that 9 hours in each area might be better. Some suggested maybe 9 hours of communication to include speech.

President Gustad then laid the two proposals on the table and said that he preferred the 12 hour proposal of the General Education Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee.

II. I must also report to you that in one of the earlier meetings with President Gustad that one of the rumors around at that particular time was that some departments might try to get revenge on other departments by excluding them by requiring certain courses in only certain departments and thus not allowing any flexibility for the students. Word was floating around that there might even be attempts to teach courses from other departments within given departments.

The President responded rather sharply to these rumors as he had heard of them from several sources. He said that departments could not just go about changing their curriculum; they could not change requirements or electives to penalize other departments. If departments start changing their departmental programs without sound rationale or if they start expanding the number of hours for a major, then he will have the department chairmen outside his door waiting to come in to discuss the developments with him. If necessary, he will start looking at how many hours departments are requiring for a major. This will not be tolerated.

The President also said at this earlier meeting that the liberal arts departments must develop general education courses. If they could not, he would have to talk to those department chairmen as well. He also said that there were no departments within departments on the campus.

III. At yet another meeting with the President, and this was after the General Education Program was distributed to the faculty, I discussed the proposal with the President. He did not go into any details, but he said there were some features that were not quite to his liking and that most were to his liking. He did not elaborate, and I did not ask him to. He said that the proposal was acceptable and that he could live with it without any difficulty as proposed by the General Education Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee.

IV. The Chair would also like to summarize the points made during the last Senate meeting so as to refresh our memories.

a. The General Education Committee with three Faculty Senators on it and the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate approved the 12 hour area requirement document without verbal dissent in the last sessions of those meetings. We cannot question the integrity or the motives of those Faculty Senators, so that means that those Senators supported presenting the proposal to the Senate for action.

The two committees have presented to the Senate the broad outlines of policy. As we all know, this is the way any organization functions. The

details or day to day considerations that must be determined by the General Education Committee are in reality responses to exceptional cases. It is the job of the Senate to establish the broad policy.

b. A number of the Senators and guests voiced concern over aspects of the proposal. Usually each example was an unusual, a unique, or an exceptional situation relating to a given department, not the entire college. In essence, the speakers asked if the proposal will help or hurt Fort Hays State; are there enough safeguards to allow the departments to maintain quality programs and meet the proposal General Education requirements; and will incoming freshmen and junior college transfers be adversely affected by the new program.

V. The Chair would also like to remind the Senators that the proposal is one that is subject to constant review, and if necessary, later change. This is the Faculty Senate's project. The program was drawn up primarily by Senate members and with the aid of two students. For the first time at Fort Hays State, it is ours. If the Faculty Senate does a good job with the General Education Program and establishes the broad policy guidelines, and if the General Education Committee, which will be composed nearly entirely of Senators and/or faculty, fills in the details to make the program fully workable, then we will be able to keep control of the General Education Program in the Faculty Senate. If we cannot exercise this faculty responsibility, it will devolve to the administration and the Faculty Senate will have little voice in determining the details of curriculum.

VI. As you may or may not know, the college is under pressure to improve its General Education Program as well as the quality of the total program, and if the Faculty Senate does not do it today, we will have to meet until we do or we will abdicate faculty responsibility and have something imposed upon us. The North Central criticized our existing General Education Program, and others have raised questions about quality, and I stress that the President wants quality, and as some perhaps have found out, he plans to get quality. I want to remind you then that a college must maintain an awareness of its image as relates to the quality of its instruction and programs and it must maintain an awareness of its accreditation standing in the many different areas.

These Faculty Senators on the two committees have presented what they consider to be a quality program and the President has indicated that he will accept it. We are deciding on what is good for Fort Hays State, not what is good for any individual department or any individual faculty member.

After concluding the statement, Dr. Forsythe reminded members of the Faculty Senate that "Civilized people do not kill the messenger who brings the news." Dr. Forsythe indicated that the issue was of sufficient importance that Immediate Senate action was imperative.

Dr. Jack McCullick said that in view of the remarks made and in view of the discussion on the issue at the previous Faculty Senate meeting he moved the previous question.

Dr. Parish seconded the motion.

Dr. Forsythe explained that the action if taken would eliminate further debate on the motion before the Senate and that a two-thirds majority vote was now required to pass the motion to limit debate.

Dr. Frerer asked what the action meant and on what the Faculty Senate was now voting.

Dr. Forsythe explained that if Dr. McCullick's motion was approved of by two-thirds of the Senate body the Senate would then vote on the proposal before the house that was recommended by the two committees.

Dr. Frerer questioned whether or not the proposal included the friendly amendment which was attached to it in the last Senate meeting.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the affirmative.

Dr. Wall requested that the friendly amendment be reread.

Dr. Drinan reread the friendly amendment. It read as follows:

Section B: General, part 1 be changed from "Each of the departments listed under area studies will be asked to submit a maximum of three courses for inclusion in the General Education offerings." to read "Each of the departments listed under area studies will be asked to submit a limited number of courses for inclusion in the General Education offerings."

Ms. Veed sought clarification on the action and asked whether or not, if the motion made by Dr. McCullick received a two-thirds vote of approval, the Senate would then vote on the original proposal.

Dr. Frerer stated that while he was aware of the fact that he was sticking his neck out he nevertheless felt it necessary to note that a friendly atmosphere prevailed at the last meeting but he interpreted the action by Dr. McCullick as an attempt to keep amendments from happening. He asked why there was such an attempt to use strict parliamentary procedure at this time when such had not been the case before.

Dr. Forsythe explained that the action being suggested was in reality a democratic feature designed to protect the rights of the minority and that if eleven members voted no that it would not pass. It protects the desire of those desiring further debate and further amendments to the motion on the floor. If you want further debate and/or amendment, vote no; If you want debate to stop, vote yes.

Dr. Frerer suggested that the threat of another meeting was sufficient to prompt Senate members to vote yes. Dr. Forsythe explained that there was no threat, only the reality that we need to pass a new General Education Program.

The vote was called for by Dr. Forsythe. Fourteen members voted in the affirmative; fourteen members voted no. The motion failed.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the floor was then open for debate on the motion before the Senate that was made by Dr. McCullick to approve the 12 hour area program.

Dr. Frerer distributed to all Senate members and visitors present an alternate General Education Program for their consideration. Dr. Frerer made a point of stating that Dr. Gustad had seen the proposed program and was aware that Dr. Frerer intended to suggest it to the Senate.

The Program read as follows:

#### General Education Program

1. Communications (Departments of English and Speech)

- A. English Composition I
- B. A second course chosen from the following areas: English Composition, Technical Writing, Creative Writing in prose, Fundamentals of Speech, Argumentation and Debate, or Business and Professional Speaking.

## II. Area Studies

- A. Humanities 9 hours/3 departments

Foreign Languages, Philosophy, Music, Theatre - Radio/T.V. - Motion Pictures

- B. Natural Sciences 9 hours/3 departments

Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, Earth Sciences

- C. Social Sciences 9 hours/3 departments

Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, History, Political Science, Economics

- D. Elective Courses: 9 hours/3 departments

Students must take 9 more hours of approved general education courses. They may choose from the offerings of any department.

Dr. Frerer noted that features of his proposal allowed the student more latitude than does the original proposal introduced by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Ms. Pfeifer noted that at the last Faculty Senate meeting the point had been made that Student Senate opposed the proposed change in the General Education Program. Ms. Pfeifer questioned whether or not student opinion was in line with Student Senate. She reminded Senate members that there was student opinion other than the line expressed by Student Senate. She stated that she had polled members of her classes and found only one student who was of the opinion that he did not need advice or guidance in establishing his program. She indicated that all others suggested they did need more direction and structure imposed on them.

Dr. Forsythe stated that if Senate did not settle the issue at this meeting the inaction would necessitate another meeting next week. Dr. Forsythe pointed out to the Senate members that the decision on the General Education Program must be made before many other pressing issues could be resolved.

Mr. Schardein stated that the members of Student Senate are not opposed to more structure than the present General Education Program provides but that the Student Senate questions the necessity of the 12 hour proposal. He noted that he, too, had discussed the matter with the President Gustad at 11:30 a.m. that day. He suggested that the 12 hour proposal was a political move and not, in his opinion nor in the Senate's opinion, best for the student. He indicated that the 9 hour proposal was more attractive to Student Senate because while it provided more structure than the present program it was not as rigid as the 12 hour proposal under consideration.

Dr. Frerer stated that when he announced earlier that President Gustad had seen his proposal, he did not intend to convey that President Gustad had approved of it. Dr. Frerer explained that President Gustad was aware of the proposal he introduced and had not "reacted with horror" to it.

Dr. Frerer explained features of his proposal which he felt provided the student with more latitude in terms of General Education requirements. He noted that some of the changes proposed stemmed from the observation that speech is an "umbrella" department consisting of several departments.

Dr. Miller asked how Dr. Frerer could justify the statement that speech is not listed when in fact it is listed under Part II, Section A.

Dr. McCullick noted that everything listed on the proposal that Dr. Frerer had distributed pertained to departments except Theatre, Radio/T.V. and Motion Pictures.

Dr. Fleharty reminded Dr. Frerer that speech is not the only department that is an "umbrella" department.

Dr. Parish, in reference to the program distributed by Dr. Frerer, objected that the inclusion of creative writing in Part I, Section B was inappropriate.

Ms. Pfelfer noted that under the proposal in question speech is given preference and that by the same logic a similar case could be made for Foreign Language.

Dr. Adams asked whether or not Dr. Frerer was presenting these suggestions in the form of a motion.

Dr. Frerer responded that he was viewing the proposal only as a basis for discussion.

Dr. Drinan suggested that a vote on the General Education Committee and the Academic Affairs Committee proposal be taken to determine the degree of support. He suggested that Senate needed to move on and could later deal with amendments as new motions.

Mr. Crissman replied that the Senate must, in his opinion, discuss other motions prior to voting on the 12 hour proposal.

Dr. Wall asked why the Senate does not give serious consideration to retaining approximately the same forty hour requirement. He suggested that the 9 hour proposal be given consideration at this time noting that the college maintained its 4 hour Physical Education requirement. Dr. Wall suggested that a later Faculty Senate could reconsider increasing the required hours to more closely approximate the provisions of the 12 hour proposal.

Ms. Baxter asked what the status of English Composition II was in the proposal.

Dr. Forsythe stated that the Proposal read that in Communications there would be the three hour requirement of English Composition I and an additional requirement of English Composition II. Dr. Forsythe indicated that as he understood the procedures, if a department wished its students to take Technical and Report Writing in lieu of the Composition II requirement the department would have to petition the General Education Committee.

Ms. Baxter noted that the proposal did not specifically state that a student could not select General Education courses from his/her major. She questioned whether or not such was an intent of the committee.

Dr. McCullick answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Schardein asked whether or not Fort Hays Kansas State College would, if the 12 hour proposal passes, have the most stringent General Education requirements in the State of Kansas.



Dr. Forsythe replied that he was unable to answer that question.

Dr. Drinan suggested that the adoption of the 12 hour proposal would have the effect of making Fort Hays Kansas State College's program more encompassing than that of Pittsburg or Emporia but less than that of Kansas University or Kansas State University.

Ms. Hartman noted that Emporia State has a 9 hour program.

Mr. Crissman asked whether or not Emporia State has a total of 42 hours General Education requirement.

Dr. Forsythe replied that he was unable to answer that question.

Dr. Wall pointed out that when Dr. Thompson was contrasting the communication requirements of Fort Hays State to that of other institutions he was including both written and oral communication so it was hard to draw a good comparison.

Ms. Veed moved to amend the original proposal to read that three hours of Composition I be required and that an additional 3 hours of either English Composition II or Technical and Report Writing be required.

Dr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Dr. Frerer moved to amend the amendment to read that three hours of Composition I be required and an additional three hours of either Composition II or Fundamentals of Speech, Argumentation and Debate, or Business and Professional Speaking be required.

Dr. Staven seconded the motion.

Dr. Drinan stated that he felt the proposal was consistent with both the General Education Committee and the English Department because flexibility is granted to departments under the existing proposal. He emphasized the point that the proposal reads "If this should constitute an undue hardship, the department may show cause and the General Education Committee may take appropriate action."

Dr. Miller moved the question. The motion was defeated.

The attention of the Senate focused on Ms. Veed's amendment. Ms. Veed's amendment to have the proposal read English Composition II or Technical and Report Writing was voted upon. The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Ms. Gillum suggested that more investigation was needed into the entire subject of a General Education Program before a final decision was made. She cautioned that voting on the measure at this time defeats its purpose.

Mr. Schmeller noted that he was of the opinion that sufficient time had been spent on the issue. He noted that he had served on the General Education Committee and on the Academic Affairs Committee and since September had spent on the average of one to two hours in weekly meetings on the question of General Education. He pointed out that the work input in both committees was extensive and the measure being considered was a compromise measure which in itself is indicative of much time, much thought and much discussion by all concerned. He said that department chairmen were aware of the program and that two students served on the General Education Committee. With that many people participating in and knowing of the program and with the length of time already spent on the program, it seemed that it was now time to act on the proposal.

Dr. Frerer moved to amend the proposal to read 9 hours with 2 departments represented instead of the proposed 12 hours with 3 departments represented.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Dr. McCullick called for the question.

Dr. Forsythe stated that the chair sensed that the Senate members were ready to vote and then continued by clarifying the two changes incorporated into the original proposal. In Section A, Part I instead of English Composition I and English Composition II being the communications requirement it will read English Composition I and English Composition II or Technical and Report Writing. In Section B, Part I instead of it reading "Each of the departments listed under area studies will be asked to submit a maximum of three courses for inclusion in the General Education offerings" it will read "Each of the departments listed under area studies will be asked to submit a limited number of courses for inclusion in the General Education offerings."

Dr. Wall moved that a roll call vote be taken on the issue.

Dr. McCullick seconded the motion.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Dr. Forsythe instructed the secretary to read the names of the voting members and the names of the duly elected alternates. Members were instructed to vote yes if they approved of the proposal, no if they were in opposition to the proposal, and present if they did not want to vote. The results of the voting are as follows:

Mr. Heather .....	Present	Dr. Miller.....	Yes
Ms. Littlejohn...	Present	Dr. Hamilton.....	Yes
Mr. Ginther.....	Present	Dr. Fleharty.....	Yes
Dr. Robinson.....	No	Dr. Harris.....	Yes
Dr. Frerer.....	No	Dr. Marshall.....	Yes
Mr. Crissman.....	No	Ms. Baxter.....	Yes
Dr. Wall.....	No	Dr. Zakrzewski.....	Yes
Dr. Parish.....	Yes	Dr. Pruitt.....	Yes
Ms. Veed.....	Yes	Mr. Rupp.....	Yes
Dr. McCullick....	Yes	Mr. Schmeller.....	Yes
Dr. Dobbs.....	Yes	Dr. Drinan.....	Yes
Mr. Caplan.....	Yes	Dr. Adams.....	Yes
Dr. Smith.....	Yes	Dr. Staven.....	Yes
Dr. Valanne.....	Yes	Ms. Popp.....	Yes
Ms. McFarland....	Yes	Mr. Lojka.....	Yes
Ms. Pfeifer.....	Yes	Ms. Hoffman.....	Yes
Dr. Brown.....	Yes	Ms. Powell.....	Yes

The motion carried.

Ms. Veed commented that she hoped the General Education Committee would act in accordance with the expressed oral understandings during the Senate's consideration of this matter.

Dr. Staven moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Popp. The motion passed with no one in opposition. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.