

6-24-1974

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, June 24, 1974

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, June 24, 1974" (1974). *Faculty Senate*. 631.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/631

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.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Ms. Rose Arnhold, Secretary,
Faculty Senate
RE: Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
DATE: June 24, 1974

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Monday, June 24, 1974, at 3:30 P.M. in the Frontier Room of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call

Members Absent: Mr. Jack Heather, Dr. Edith Dobbs, Mr. Marc Campbell, Mr. Glen Lojka, Ms. Kathleen Kuchar, Dr. Wallace Harris, Ms. Vivian Baxter, Ms. Alice McFarland, Mr. Robert Lowen, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Dr. Samuel Hamilton, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Ms. Maxine Hoffman, and Mr. Glenn Ginther

Also Present: Mr. Mike Schardein, Dr. Alan Busch for Mr. Helmut Schmeller, Ms. Sally Ward, Mr. Ralph Huffman, and Dr. Forrest Price

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous regular meeting were approved.

III. Announcements

Dr. Forsythe requested that prior to the announcement Mr. Ralph Huffman be permitted to discuss the plans being formulated for Parents' Day to be held on September 28, 1974.

Mr. Huffman reported on the June 14 meeting of the Parents' Day planning committee. He noted that the idea of Tigers Parents' Club will continue and, hopefully, be dovetailed with Parents' Day. Mr. Huffman suggested that it was felt by members of the June 14 meeting that a departmental open house extending from 9:30-11:45 A.M. might be appropriate. He said that departmental open house would be voluntary on the part of each department.

Ms. Sally Ward thanked all those who participated in the Parent Spring Safari and stated that while the turnout was low those who did attend enjoyed it. She commended the faculty members who contributed much hard work and support.

Mr. Huffman explained that he was bringing the idea of a departmental open house before the Faculty Senate because he did not believe it should be instituted by administrative edict and should not be forced on departments and faculty.

Dr. Staven asked how many parents attended the last Parents' Day. Mr. Huffman replied that approximately 1000 were in attendance. Dr. Staven asked whether that number constituted individuals or couples. Mr. Huffman answered that he was referring to approximately 1000 couples.

Mr. Huffman requested that the Faculty Senate consider the idea and apprise him of the Senate's sentiments as soon as possible. Mr. Huffman again stated that if it were to be instituted by administrative edict that "blazes might be seen emanating out of some offices." Dr. McCullick responded by asking why Mr. Huffman looked at him when he said that.

Ms. Ward stated that Safari weekend was not intended to be interpreted as an edict.

Dr. Forsythe clarified the remarks of Mr. Huffman by asking whether or not the Faculty Senate was being asked to consider a recommendation for voluntary departmental participation and voluntary faculty participation.

Mr. Huffman replied in the affirmative.

Dr. Forsythe thanked Mr. Huffman and Ms. Ward for their attendance.

Dr. Forsythe reported on the Council of Deans meeting on June 17, 1974. He noted that for the 1974-75 academic year Fort Hays State would have \$500 more for Out-of-State travel than it had in 1973-74.

Dr. Forsythe stated that President Gustad was supposed to take the proposed fee change to the Board of Regents on June 25, 1974. He explained that in the Council of Deans meeting on June 17, 1974, the fee structure proposal had been discussed. He stated that he collected statistics dealing with the question and used them at the C.O.D. meeting. Dr. Forsythe distributed a copy of the statistical information to all Senate members. It read as follows:

TABLE I

HOURS GENERATED ABOVE 15 HOURS IN THE FALL OF 1973

No. of Hours Taken	No. of Students	Hours Over Fifteen	Hours Generated Over 15 Per Student
16	664	x 1	664
17	496	x 2	992
18	417	x 3	1251
19	221	x 4	884
20	114	x 5	570
21	60	x 6	360
22	37	x 7	259
23	17	x 8	136
24	17	x 9	153
25	6	x 10	60
26	3	x 11	33
27	3	x 12	36
28	6	x 13	78
29	2	x 14	28
30	1	x 15	15
33	1	x 18	18
55	<u>1</u>	x 40	<u>40</u>
	2066		5577

TABLE II

NORMAL LOAD 15-18 HOURS WITH PERMISSION FOR 19 OR MORE HOURS

No. of Hours Taken	No. of Students		Hours Over Eighteen	Hours Generated Over 18 Per Student
19	221	x	1	221
20	114	x	2	228
21	60	x	3	180
22	37	x	4	148
23	17	x	5	85
24	17	x	6	102
25	6	x	7	42
26	3	x	8	24
27	3	x	9	27
28	6	x	10	60
29	2	x	11	22
30	1	x	12	12
33	1	x	15	15
55	<u>1</u>	x	37	<u>37</u>
	489			1203

Fort Hays Kansas State College
Graduate Division

Fall 1973 Headcount - 576

<u>Hours taken</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>
1	16
2	34
3	174
4	9
5	27
6	83
7	9
8	11
9	66
10	14
11	20
12	50
13	16
14	13
15	21
16	3
17	2
18	3
19	0
20	3
21	1
22	<u>1</u>
	576

TABLE III
HOURS ENROLLED/PASSED FALL 1973*

Hours Taken	No. of Students	Percent	% by Group (3)	Hours Passed	No. of Students	Percent	% by Group (3)
0**	60	.014		0	344	.081	
1	60	.014		1	43	.010	
2	45	.011		2	90	.021	
3	205	.048	.087	3	237	.056	.169
4	23	.005		4	45	.011	
5	30	.007		5	33	.008	
6	169	.040	.052	6	201	.048	.066
7	6	.001		7	44	.010	
8	11	.003		8	43	.010	
9	82	.019	.023	9	191	.045	.066
10	51	.012		10	107	.025	
11	56	.013		11	131	.031	
12	251	.059	.084	12	397	.094	.150
13	226	.053		13	329	.078	
14	310	.072		14	307	.073	
15	626	.146	.272	15	578	.137	.287
16	664	.155		16	481	.114	
17	496	.116		17	301	.071	
18	417	.097	.369	18	163	.039	.224
19	221	.052		19	73	.017	
20	114	.027		20	45	.011	
21	60	.014	.092	21	26	.006	.034
22	37	.009		22	4	.001	
23	17	.004		23	4	.001	
24	17	.004	.017	24	2	.000	.002
25	6	.001		25	3	.001	
26	3	.001		26	0	.000	
27	3	.001	.003	27	1	.000	.001
28	6	.001		28	0	.000	
29	2	.000		29	0	.000	
30	1	.000	.002	30	0	.000	.000
33	1	.000	.000	33	0	.000	.000
55	1	.000	.000	55	0	.000	.000
	<u>4227</u>				<u>4223</u>		

*Compiled from information provided by data processing through Dr. Michael Stewart. There is a shortage of 4 students in the number of hours passed, but this is the information provided. Total students is 326 less than the 20th day headcount.

**Students who withdrew.

TABLE IV
HOURS TAKEN/PASSED

Hours Taken	No. of Students	% by Group	Hours Passed	No. of Students	% by Group
1-14	1585	.371	1-14	2542	.602
15-18	2203	.515	15-18	1523	.361
19+	489	.114	19+	158	.037

Dr. Forsythe reminded Senate members that in May the Faculty Senate adopted a fee structure plan similar to that of Wichita State. He further noted, however, that Wichita State at the May Regents' meeting changed its fee structure much to the surprise of all involved.

Dr. Forsythe apologized for the inaccuracy in some totals and the incompleteness of the statistical tables he distributed but they were the best available at the time he needed them for the C.O.D. meeting.

Dr. Staven stated he felt Mr. Kellerman should be present to defend himself on the subject of lacking data. He said that he felt Dr. Forsythe was making a harsh statement regarding the unavailability of good statistical data on campus.

Dr. McCullick expressed the opinion that Dr. Forsythe was not making a harsh statement but rather a very accurate statement.

Dr. Marshall pointed out that it would be unlikely Mr. Kellerman would defend the existence of good data because Mr. Kellerman had experienced the same difficulty in securing accurate data as had Dr. Forsythe.

Dr. McCullick agreed that if anything, Mr. Kellerman would defend Dr. Forsythe's remarks.

Dr. Forsythe told Dr. Staven that he had not stated nor implied that anyone was responsible for incomplete statistics, nor had he mentioned any names. None of the statistics which were distributed came from Mr. Kellerman. Dr. Forsythe said that he did not know how Mr. Kellerman's name became involved in the discussion as he had not mentioned anyone by name.

Dr. Forsythe then read from memos from Dr. Stewart dated May 20 and May 24, which Dr. Forsythe said supported what he had said when the discussion began. Both memos state that the enrollment statistics which were distributed to some faculty in May were not accurate. These enrollment statistics were the basis for the handouts that Dr. Forsythe distributed. Dr. Stewart's memo stated that most of the missing students could be accounted for. Dr. Forsythe read from the memo of May 20 which said that the list of students enrolled was 326 less than the 20th day headcount. The May 28 memo stated "The headcount on this list is 326 students less than our official headcount." Dr. Forsythe also said that the fall semester printout of the students enrolled in 18 or more hours had 916 students marked on it but the latest list shows 906. Dr. Forsythe said that he was sorry that his statement was misunderstood but there is inconsistency.

Dr. Forsythe also stated that he had distributed a list of hours taken by graduate students in the fall semester. The faculty could determine if additional hours could be generated from this level. He said that he wanted to thank Dr. Jimmy Rice, Graduate Dean, and his staff for collecting the statistics as he understood that they collected them by hand and did it quickly.

(NOTE: For the information of the Senate, the following paragraphs from Dr. Stewart's memos are inserted in the minutes.

"May 20, 1974. Friday, I sent you a copy of the data processing analysis of hours taken by students during Fall 1973.

Several questions have arisen, and I am not sure how to answer them. Data processing cannot provide an answer either.

The total number of students on the print-out is 326 less than the 20th day headcount report. I am asking data processing to re-run the report. Secondly, the 60 students who took "0" hours are students who withdrew. Whether they are counted in the 20th day report depends upon when they withdrew.

I will share with you the new report when I receive it.

May 28, 1974. Last week I sent you a copy of the breakdown of hours attempted by our students for Fall 1973. The headcount on this list was 326 students less than our official headcount. Of those, 69 students took only mini-courses, presumably for P/NC and would not be reflected in the load report. The same is true of the 184 continuing education students who were legitimately included in our official headcount figures. This leaves 69 students who are "unaccounted" for by data processing. Attached is the student load data for hours passed. Withdrawals, I's, P/NC, cancellation for non-payment of fees "grades" are not included in either of the two load reports. In addition "U's" are also excluded in the hours passed load report." JLF)

Dr. Forsythe reported that the reaction of Faculty Senate was sought in the June 14 meeting of C.O.D. on Mr. Keating's proposal that up to 15 hours a flat hourly fee be charged with change occurring after 15.

When Dr. Forsythe's opinion was solicited on this he reported that he explained to members of C.O.D. that the two issues which had prompted the May Faculty Senate action were (1) concern with excessive numbers of hours being taken and (2) equity. He reported that he was then asked how Faculty Senate would respond to the hourly fee up to 15 hours with a discontinuing of flat fee for hours above 15. Dr. Forsythe explained that he stated to C.O.D. members that based on the information which he had on enrollment that he supported the modification and thus had represented the Faculty Senate in that manner. He personally supported the per credit hour fee, but under the conditions, the 15 hour limit might be best for the moment.

Mr. Crissman questioned whether or not such a fee structure would encourage students to take either 14 or 18 hours.

Dr. Wall stated he felt such action would encourage students to take either 14 or 18 hours.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that Mr. Keating had estimated a loss of \$15,000 to \$16,000 income if Fort Hays accepts the proposal that limits fees at the 15 hour level. Dr. Forsythe noted that if the number of students remains approximately the same in the fall of 1974 but would not take over 15 hours and not increase the loads at the lower levels, a loss of 18½ faculty positions could be faced. If students take 18 hours and none over 18 and do not increase loads at lower levels, the estimate scales down to 4.2 faculty positions that could be lost.

Dr. McCullick pointed out that the assumptions being drawn were not taking into consideration any change at the other end of the continuum. Because of the per credit hour fee, there may be heavier loads at levels below 15 hours and thus increase credit hour production.

Dr. Forsythe remarked that he personally still supported the flat fee charge as it was the most equitable.

Dr. Robinson asked why the May Faculty Senate deliberations were not accepted.

Dr. Forsythe stated that concern with the number of positions that might be lost forced reconsideration of the issue.

Dr. Staven stated that the proposal requiring permission of the College to exceed 18 hours would have the effect of discriminating against the better, more capable students.

Mr. Schardein asked how difficult the procedure would be if a student preferred to take in excess of 18 hours. He was advised that a student would have to get permission from the appropriate dean.

Dr. Pruitt asked how many additional credit hours might be generated when the discrepancy in cost between a six hour load and a seven hour load is erased. He noted that in the May Faculty Senate meeting he had suggested a compromise. His proposal included a flat fee to 15 hours and then a lesser charge for those desirous of taking 16 to 18 hours and then returning to a flat hourly fee for 19 or more hours. Dr. Pruitt added that this would eliminate the necessity of seeking permission to enroll in hours exceeding 18 and if a student felt he could handle the load and was willing to pay for it he should be allowed to do so.

Dr. Forsythe stated that he did not know for sure what President Gustad intended to take before the Regents as the President had been on vacation. Dr. Forsythe said that he assumed that the C.O.D. approved fee schedule would be the one.

Dr. Drinan said he felt that the idea of securing the Dean's approval to take over 18 hours was not intended to be arbitrary but rather was a statement of sentiment that Faculty Senate opposes the situation in which a student can enroll in 30 hours and complete none.

Dr. Forsythe said that there was no rule regarding permission to take over 18 hours. C.O.D. supported the idea, but the Senate has not considered such a rule.

Ms. Popp asked whether or not the add/withdrawal feature of the proposal was acceptable to the Council of Deans.

Dr. Forsythe replied that it was. C.O.D. accepted the entire document passed by the Senate with the exception of the fee structure which was modified.

Dr. McCullick questioned whether or not the entire debate of fee structure was a waste of time at this point if President Gustad was right now at the Board of Regents presenting a proposal.

Dr. Forsythe stated that the matter was explained only to apprise Faculty Senate members of his action at the Council of Dean's meeting.

Ms. Veed asked whether or not the members of the Council of Deans were aware of the fact that 15-18 hours would be extremely expensive. (NOTE: If the Chairman of the Faculty Senate had a quizzical look on his face during the

discussion of the much greater cost for the 15th hour under the C.O.D. proposal, it was because the fees some Senators referred to were from the June 17 C.O.D. minutes and the June 19 corrections, and both were in error. The C.O.D. minutes state a 15 hour and above cost of \$276.50. The correct fee discussed in C.O.D. was \$247.50, or \$16.50 per hour through 15 hours. The correct fee is \$247.50 for 15 hours and an additional fee of \$3.50 per credit hour PE building fee for hours over 15. When the Chairman of the Faculty Senate was advised of the fee listed in the C.O.D. minutes, he called Vice-President Tomanek. Dr. Tomanek sent a correction to C.O.D. and all Faculty Senate members that \$247.50 was the maximum tuition fee for 15 hours. JLF)

Dr. Wall commented that Dr. Price had an interesting idea concerning the flat fee structure.

Dr. Price stated that the extension fee would be cheaper than the on campus flat rate schedule. However, if departments do not receive credit for extension Fort Hays stands to lose faculty positions.

Dr. Staven pointed out that if Faculty are not paid above regular salaries then head count in extension courses could be counted by the department.

Dr. Forsythe stated that the matter had been brought up in the last Council of Deans' meeting and the way it now stands if a faculty member teaches 9 hours on campus and 3 hours off campus he would receive mileage. However, if a faculty member taught 12 hours on campus in addition to three extension hours he would receive mileage and inconvenience pay.

There was discussion of whether hours taught by extension could count for headcount. Dr. Forsythe said that the situation was as he stated it as that was what was discussed an hour earlier at C.O.D.

Dr. Forsythe distributed current pre-enrollment figures. They are as follows:

	<u>Freshmen</u>	<u>Transfers</u>	<u>Total</u>
March 21, 1971	657	75	732
March 21, 1972	628	85	713
March 21, 1973	568	79	647
March 21, 1974	641	116	757
April 6, 1971	727	130	857
April 3, 1972	665	100	765
April 3, 1973	621	113	734
April 3, 1974	698	160	858
April 17, 1971	757	156	913
April 17, 1972	748	181	929
April 17, 1973	669	161	830
April 15, 1974	752	214	966
April 27, 1971	795	190	985
April 28, 1972	796	205	1,001
April 30, 1973	696	191	887
April 26, 1974	801	237	1,038

Pre-enrollment figures (Continued)

May 6, 1971	883	192	1,025
May 6, 1972	831	209	1,040
May 11, 1973	745	203	948
May 9, 1974	868	252	1,120
May 26, 1971	885	200	1,085
May 31, 1972	903	226	1,129
May 31, 1973	806	227	1,033
May 31, 1974	937	270	1,207
June 23, 1971	975	229	1,204
June 22, 1972	987	293	1,280
June 22, 1973	880	290	1,170
June 21, 1974	1,000	316	1,316

Mrs. Kay Gilmore, Office of the Registrar

Dr. Forsythe reported that he had discussed with Dr. Tomanek the minutes that had been circulated by the Nursing Department. According to Dr. Tomanek the Dean of Nursing was not in attendance at the particular meeting in March when the recommended salary increases were adjusted. According to Dr. Tomanek an oversight was committed when Dr. Machan was not apprised of the reductions in the proposed salary increases. Dr. Tomanek stated that the minutes circulated were out of context and, while there was a staff member which the administration understood was agitating students, the term "troublemaker" was not used. One could deduce "troublemaker" from the general discussion, but the term was not used.

Mr. Crissman asked what the agitation involved.

Dr. Forsythe replied that it involved, according to Dr. Tomanek, students coming to the administration to voice dissatisfaction or to ask questions.

Ms. Allen replied that as a member of the department she was unaware that agitation of or by students was occurring. She added that in matters as important as this one she felt that communications channels should have existed.

Dr. Forsythe stated that Dr. Tomanek admitted that this was a problem and that it was inadvertent that Dr. Machan was not advised at the time. Ms. Allen continued by stating that she cringed every time she hears that Dr. Machan was not in attendance at certain meetings because the entire staff's time was being spent on seeking accreditation.

Dr. Forsythe said that he had discussed the issue with Dr. Tomanek because a number of people asked about the situation. Dr. Forsythe said that individuals did not ask about the reductions. They seemed interested in why Dr. Machan was not told of the reductions. Individuals were especially interested to learn if faculty would be punished by reductions in proposed salary increases because they had expressed their views or had discussed issues with students. Dr. Forsythe said that it seemed that individuals were asking if collegiality was still recognized.

Dr. Forsythe reported that a list had been circulated in the Council of Deans meeting showing which departments had students adding a course the last day. He noted that he understood that nearly every case could be accounted for in terms of getting students in the correct sections or some similar problem. The adds that were made the last day to make a change were: Agriculture (1), Art (1),

Biology (1), Business (2), Chemistry (1), Economics (1), Education (11), Geology (1), HPER (11), History (1), Mathematics (3), Music (3), Philosophy (1), Psychology (2), Sociology (2), Speech (5). There were 3 reinstatements in Business, one in Art, and one in Biology.

Dr. Forsythe reported that the following points had been discussed in the June 24 C.O.D. meeting.

The Regents Calendar was noted. JUCO pre-enrollment dates were established: March 18-19, 1975, March 16-17, 1976, March 15-16, 1977, and March 14-15, 1978. This means that fall schedules will be needed earlier in the year. There needs to be at least six weeks lead time to print schedules, so departments will need to get their full 1975 schedules in by January 1-10, 1975 for the fall semester of 1975.

Open enrollment was briefly discussed and the Senate will be asked about it later. The question is if classes will be left open so that every student can have exactly the class they want. The Deans will discuss this with department chairpersons. A proposal may be sent to the Academic Affairs Committee. Instead of closing classes, perhaps classes with one or two students can be cancelled and professors reallocated so as to offer additional sections of popular classes. So if a class does not make, new sections of popular classes can be opened.

Honors at Graduation was mentioned but not discussed at C.O.D. The Senate is working on this.

Academic Freedom was briefly discussed.

The possibility of FHS celebrating its 75th anniversary was discussed briefly by C.O.D. A memo from Dr. Luehrs was circulated at an earlier C.O.D. meeting and was the basis of the discussion. C.O.D. indicated that the President should consider appointing a committee. The memo follows:

To: John D. Garwood, Dean of Instruction
From: Robert Luehrs

Date: March 13, 1974
Subject: Fort Hays' 75th Anniversary

You indicated during our conversation of last week that my suggestion for a year-long celebration of the college's seventy-fifth anniversary in 1977 ought to be put in the form of a proposal. Hopefully, this memorandum will serve that purpose.

I was struck, while reading Lyman Wooster's history of Fort Hays Kansas State College, how few customs and traditions have really taken root at our school. To be certain, Homecoming remains as do a number of the activities originated by the Department of Music, and The Leader still appears only once a week as it did in 1922. But other activities, from boating on Big Creek to Governor's Day and the literary societies, have vanished; it would seem that the college has grown enormously in size and quality since 1902 but without holding to the sense of continuity and history which preserves identity. Perhaps, then, a Diamond Jubilee would present opportunity for recovering the more valuable elements of the past and marking a course for the future. My thought is that the College should plan on commemorating its seventy-fifth anniversary with a program of events through-out the 1976-77 academic year, culminating in a "Founders' week" in the Spring. Such a nine-month celebration would permit Fort Hays to participate in a form of the currently popular cult of nostalgia (although, admittedly, such interest may be

played out by them), to revive temporarily old traditions and perhaps establish new ones, to bring to the college a series of outstanding speakers and entertainers, to muster all campus resources in the service of a single purpose, and even to join in the last phases of the national bicentennial.

In 1952 the fiftieth anniversary celebration occupied the entire calendar year and presented a number of speakers, entertainers, and exhibits as well being festooned with anniversary stationery, insignias, mementos, and souvenirs. However, the main thrust of this celebration appeared to be only three major events: Dr. Wooster's address at Founders' Day in March, an alumni lunch in June, and a combination of open house, dinner, and pageant at Homecoming in the fall. The Diamond Jubilee certainly should have more major events and take an example from the thirtieth anniversary celebration, which featured the Vice-President of the United States honoring Fort Hays' first teacher.

Perhaps, then, the Diamond Jubilee could sponsor one major event each month of the 1976-77 academic year. A logical kick-off affair would be a picnic and square dance along Big Creek, recalling the western heritage of the area. The Homecoming-Oktoberfest activities could also be incorporated into the anniversary. For December, a colossal Edwardian Christmas party, replete with food and drink, lavishly decorated, and saturated in turn-of-the-century good will. Perhaps the Music Department could be convinced to cooperate in a revival of the week-long Western Kansas Music Festival, at which would perform not only all campus ensembles but a number of nationally-known groups and individuals, representing all styles of music. It might be noted that in the 1920's this Festival presented ballet, opera, oratorios, the New York Philharmonic Orchestra and once packed the Coliseum for Madame Schumann-Heink. Certainly Governor's Day and President's Day could be revived for the anniversary also. A spring "Founders' week" could be a melange of various events (Such as a carnival and a varsity show as well as presentations and activities sponsored by the fraternities and sororities), perhaps ending in an elaborate formal party and dance for the campus community.

Each of these major events should be carefully planned to appeal to both alumni and the student body; each should smoothly blend elements of the past and the present to create an atmosphere appropriate for the activity. Where the nature of the events warrant (for example, a resurrected Western Kansas Music Festival), a concerted effort should be made to bring to campus high school students and the public at large. Ideally, the events should all be free. If admission prices are necessary, they must be low enough to attract students. I doubt that many people would have the patience for a genuine pageant now; the amateurism of these epics is sometimes overwhelming. Still, the major events could constitute a more refined version of the pageant, with each one evolving from a theme suggested by the College's past.

The Diamond Jubilee could also sponsor lecture series--possibilities which come readily to mind are talks by prominent alumni; presentations by faculty members concerning the history and development of Fort Hays; several days to visit classes, take meals with students, participate in forums and so on. Several years ago I was taken with a lecture series presented under the auspices of the Queens College Honors Program, "The Last Lecture Series," in which notable individuals indicated what they would say if that was to be their last opportunity to speak to any audience; perhaps Fort Hays would like to experiment with this exercise in ultimate wisdom and final ideas.

The Seventy-fifth anniversary would be an appropriate time for Departments to bring a number of scholarly meetings of state and regional academic organizations to campus. For the year Fort Hays could then become a major convention center and a primary focus for the intellectual and cultural activity of this area.

Following the model of the fiftieth anniversary celebration, the commemoration ought to be publicized through special stationery used by all campus agencies, by special publications, and by a variety of souvenirs (for example, postcards reproducing photographs from the earlier days of the college). Perhaps, too, special tours of college facilities could be arranged for visiting groups of all sorts; the student guides would be carefully selected and trained as well as being uniformed in modified Edwardian dress. Of course, the anniversary would supply the themes to be used for the pageantry associated with athletics. The double heritage of the Old West and the "Good Old Days" before World War I is rich in all kinds of possibilities.

If a Diamond Jubilee is to be planned in the scope outlined above, it would be necessary for a Jubilee committee to begin functioning as soon as possible, preferably by the fall of 1974. Two years is not too long a time for creating a festival of this magnitude. To be most effective, such a committee ought to be made up of a handful of the most imaginative individuals on campus; provided with a budget adequate to cover the expenses of stationery, postage, and telephone as well as some secretarial assistance; and permitted to supervise and coordinate the actual events in 1976-77, so that problems can be dealt with in the context of the entire celebration. It seems to me that the committee would also be well-advised to secure significant cooperation from the student body at the outset. Not only should the students be represented on the committee, but they should also be expected to stage anniversary events of their own invention. One of the results of a celebration of this size could well be a renewed sense of purpose in all sectors of the college and a deeper appreciation of what a liberal arts college is all about.

Robert

Continuing education offered by Santa Clara was discussed.

The fact that Fort Hays State will not appear in Peterson's Guide to Graduate Schools was brought up.

An exchange program for an urban semester was brought up by Dr. Harbin. This had been mentioned once before by President Gustad he said. Students and/or faculty could be exchanged with other schools. Students could do student teaching through another school. Perhaps we could exchange with Denver or a similar school.

C.O.D. also discussed changes occurring above departmental level regarding salary and rank. These changes will be brought to the attention of the department chairman of the affected faculty member.

Inconvenience pay for off campus courses to count as FTE was discussed. The administration will need to know which courses are to be offered. Courses can count for EFT if the faculty member does not get regular extension pay.

IV. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

No reports of Ad Hoc Committees were presented.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

Dr. Wall, in the absence of Dr. Frerer, indicated that the committee had nothing to report.

B. Student Affairs Committee

Dr. Marshall indicated that the committee had nothing to report.

C. College Affairs Committee

Ms. Veed distributed a statement regarding procedures for hearings and appeals to all Faculty Senate members present. It read as follows:

PRELIMINARY PROPOSAL
PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS AND APPEALS

In accordance with the principles of administration and due process and in order to insure prompt determination of contested decisions and fair play to all concerned, the following options to disaffected faculty members (faculty defined as all individuals holding academic rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor) are available. Any faculty member directly concerned and affected by a college decision related to academic freedom, condition of employment, termination of employment, termination related to financial exigency, and other grievances shall have these recourse procedures.

1. There is an established tradition of informal appeal at Fort Hays Kansas State College, and this informal procedure shall be maintained. The aggrieved faculty member has the right of an informal effort at mediation with his or her departmental chairperson, and if unsuccessful at this level, the faculty member has the right of an informal effort at mediation with the Dean of his or her respective faculty.

Since an open-door policy has been maintained at all administrative levels, the aggrieved faculty member also has the right of informal appeal to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the President. This right shall not be infringed upon, but the usual procedure for pursuing mediation if informal mediation is not successful at the level of the respective Dean will be to initiate a request for a formal hearing or appeal.

2. A request for a formal hearing based on an appeal in writing will initiate the proceedings. The written request shall state the issue and the reasons for appealing. It shall be dated and signed by the appealing faculty member and addressed to the appropriate department chairperson with a copy to the appropriate Dean. Within five working days from the receipt of the written request for such hearing, the department chairperson shall set a time and place agreeable to both parties for such hearing by a departmental committee and notify the person in writing. A decision shall be made within five days following the departmental hearing and the decision reduced to writing and delivered to the appealing faculty member with a copy to the department chairperson and the appropriate Dean. A record of the departmental meeting will be kept.

3. If the departmental hearing committee does not support the faculty member, or if it does support the faculty member and the Dean does not concur in the committee's decision, a formal appeal may be made directly to the Appeals Committee of the College Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

4. The faculty member may notify the Chairperson of the College Affairs Committee that he or she has a formal appeal, formally state in written form the reasons for the appeal, and ask that an Appeals Committee be established by the College Affairs Committee. The Appeals Committee shall select its own chairperson. The Appeals Committee shall, within one week, set up its own procedures and conduct its own meetings in accordance with the Faculty Senate by-laws and regular rules of review.

Procedures for Hearings & Appeals (continued)

When the Appeals Committee considers appeals of the nature of severe sanction or the dismissal of a tenured professor, it shall establish detailed and explicit procedural safeguards in conformity with Section 5 "Dismissal Procedures" of the American Association of University Professors' 1972 Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AAUP Bulletin, LVIII (Winter, 1972), 428-433), and as outlined in section b. 4 of the April 18, 1947, Board of Regents minutes.

The decision of the Appeals Committee in the form of a written recommendation to the President of the College shall be transmitted to the appealing faculty member and to the President within 48 hours after the hearing.

5. The President shall take action on the Appeals Committee recommendation within one week unless prevented from so doing by absence from the campus. If the President does not concur with the Appeals Committee findings, the President shall submit a detailed statement of the compelling reasons for nonconcurrence. The Appeals Committee shall reply to the counterarguments presented by the President, and the President will then make a final decision.

6. In the event the final decision is adverse to the interests of the affected faculty member, and if the appeals is of the nature of severe sanctions or dismissal, the faculty member shall have the right to ask the Board of Regents to review all documentary evidence and testimony.

Ms. Veed asked the Senate members to discuss the preliminary report with their respective departments and to bring points of discussion or questions to her attention. Ms. Veed stated that input was being sought and would be appreciated.

Dr. Robinson asked whether or not only an informal agreement was in effect at the present time.

Ms. Veed answered in the affirmative.

Dr. Miller asked whether or not FHS subscribes to AAUP standards.

Ms. Veed answered that it does.

Dr. Miller questioned the necessity of the proposed statement.

Ms. Veed stated that the Affirmative Action Program requires the adoption of some such statement.

Dr. Staven said he felt specific guidelines were needed because if one does not have a procedure, one is in trouble.

Dr. Forsythe said that each department had its own expectations of what faculty will do, such as work load, and that departmental autonomy in this will be protected. Department chairpersons should tell their faculties what are expected so that theoretically there would be no grievances.

Ms. Allen pointed out that if such guidelines had been provided that the difficulty in nursing could have been avoided.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that informal agreements exist but not everyone knows that they do. Individuals who know of the informal procedures use them, so all faculty should know that there are informal procedures for discussing grievances.

Dr. Marshall asked whether the proposal under consideration would provide for counsel.

Dr. Forsythe stated that both Dr. Slechta and Dr. Tomanek have seen the preliminary report and agree that counsel would be provided in the formal procedures where sanctions or dismissal were at issue.

D. Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. McCullick stated that while his committee did have something to report, it could be distributed and action delayed until the July Faculty Senate meeting. The proposal which will receive consideration at that time reads as follows:

June 12, 1974

TO: Dr. Jack McCullick, Chairman, Academic Affairs Committee
FROM: Dr. James Forsythe, Chairman, Faculty Senate

A. Since FHS has abandoned the Honors Program, the statement on "Honors at Graduation" on page 52 in the catalogue must be changed. I believe that we should change this title to "Academic Recognition at Graduation." There are many types of honors, such as for athletics, outstanding student teacher, etc., which might be awarded. Let's stick to "Academic Recognition."

I propose the following to your committee for consideration for this new program. This will give your committee something to evaluate, change, etc., and hopefully save you time.

Academic Recognition at Graduation--There will be three levels of academic honor at graduation: cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude.

Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.4 to 3.59 and 3.4 to 3.59 while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Magna Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.6 to 3.79 and 3.6 to 3.79 while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Summa Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.8 or above and 3.8 or above while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Each student graduating with academic recognition must have attended Fort Hays State for one of the last two years, and at least 62 hours must be earned in an institution offering regular upper division credit.

Students may also earn distinction in their department. Any student earning a 3.6 in the department of the major may also graduate "With Distinction" in that department. Any student earning 3.8 or higher in the department of the major may also graduate "With High Distinction" in that department.

While honors will be listed in the commencement program for those who may reasonably anticipate honors, the listing of honors on the program is not a guarantee of receiving honors. Honors will be awarded only on the basis of the student's grade point for his or her entire undergraduate program, including the final semester or summer session. The honor awarded will be noted on the student's diploma and transcript.

B. Your committee should also review the "Proposal for Articulation Agreement Regarding General Education Requirements for Transfer Students Between the Public Community Junior Colleges and the Regent's Institutions of Kansas." The document is on page 4 and 5 of the December, 1973 Senate minutes.

As you may recall, you and I had to make a quick decision on the document in December, and the approval was only tentative. The Academic Affairs Committee and the Senate were not given an opportunity to consider this document. I personally believe that the Senate should take a position on the document and that the position taken should be to oppose the document. I can see a number of problems arising from this.

A Proposal for Articulation Agreement Regarding General Education Requirements for Transfer Students Between the Public Community Junior Colleges and the Regents' Institutions of Kansas

"A student who completes an Associate of Arts or an Associate of Science degree based on baccalaureate-oriented sequences at a state and regionally accredited Kansas public community junior college will be accepted with junior standing and will have satisfied the lower division general education requirements of all public four-year institutions of the state."

Points of Clarification

1. General Education to be defined as follows: General education provides students with facility in the use of the English language and a broad intellectual experience in the major fields of knowledge. It ensures that each graduate will have experienced some of the content, method and systems of values of the various disciplines which enable man to understand himself and his environment, as dealt with at a level of abstraction beyond that usually found in secondary school studies.
2. This agreement applies only to A.A. and A.S. degree transfers from state and regionally accredited public community colleges in Kansas. The agreement would not include transfers from non-accredited community colleges or any other colleges.
3. Transfer students with the A.A. or A.S. degree would automatically be given junior standing.
4. Each institution will define its own graduation requirements. The receiving institution may build on the program completed by including educational experiences designed to satisfy the students' objectives as well as meeting the degree requirements in a minimum amount of time. Foreign language requirements are viewed as graduation requirements and not as general education requirements for purposes of this agreement.
5. A transfer student may be required to take freshman or sophomore courses to meet particular requirements of a given major or minor.
6. Transfer students could be required to take general education courses normally required of junior and senior students the last two years of their senior college experience.
7. Transfer students preparing for teacher certification must meet the general education requirements as outlined by the State Board of Education. Teacher certification requirements have been incorporated in the degree requirements of most senior colleges. The spirit of the proposed agreement would indicate that transfer students are to be judged in the same way as non-transfer students.

VI. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

VII. New Business

Dr. Marshall moved that the Faculty Senate endorse the idea of voluntary participation of departments and voluntary participation by faculty on Parents' Day.

Mr. Rupp seconded the motion.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Dr. Marshall moved that the Faculty Senate minutes be filed in Forsyth Library for permanent record.

Mr. Rupp seconded the motion.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

VIII. Adjournment

Dr. Staven moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. McCullick seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 P.M.