

9-9-1991

## Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 9, 1991

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, September 9, 1991" (1991).  
*Faculty Senate*. 833.  
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/833](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/833)

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).

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES  
September 9, 1991

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Black and Gold Ballroom of the Memorial Union on September 9, 1991 at 3:30 pm by President Willis Watt.

The following members were present: Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Michael Madden, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Dale McKemey, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Serjit Kasior, Dr. Steve Shapiro, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. Gary Millhollen, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Pam Shaffer, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Helmut Schmeller, Ms. Mary Pickard (for Mr. Glen McNeil), Mr. Herbert Zook, Ms. Anita Gordon-Gilmore (for Mr. Jerry Wilson), Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Ms. Cynthia Streck (for Dr. Mary Hasset), Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Kenneth Olson, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Michael Rettig.

The following members were absent: Dr. Bill Daley, Mr. Michael Jilg, Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Mohammad Riazzi, and Dr. Richard Hughen.

Others present included President Edward Hammond, Dr. James Hohman, and Grant Bannister and Lane Victorson of the Student Government.

President Watt asked that approval of the previous meeting minutes be postponed to allow for election of Vice President/President-Elect and Secretary of the Senate. The Nominating Committee had selected Dr. Richard Hughen and Dr. Ralph Gamble as nominees for Vice President, and President Watt asked if there were any other nominations from the floor. Dr. Heil moved, and Ms. Rumpel seconded, that the nominations cease, and this motion carried. Ballots were passed out and collected on this election.

The Nominating Committee had selected Ms. Martha Holmes and Ms. Dianna Koerner as nominees for Secretary, and President Watt asked if there were any other nominations from the floor. Dr. Heil again moved that nominations cease, and this motion carried. Ballots were passed out and collected on this election, and members of the Nominating Committee retired to tally the votes.

The minutes of the July 2, 1991 meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Board of Regents is in the process of reviewing the mission statements of the entire Regents' system and the individual institutions, and is particularly looking at possible program duplication in ten program areas: Business, Education, Health and Life Sciences, Agriculture, Engineering, Architecture, Arts and Sciences, Journalism/Mass Communication, Home Economics, and Library Science. Committees are meeting across the state to assess whether or not duplication exists, whether or not the duplication is justified, and how much cost savings might be

realized if duplicative programs were eliminated.

2. President Hammond opened a discussion of the recently released document from the Board of Regents' staff titled "From Aspiration to Achievement: Mission Development in the Kansas Regents System, 1992-2000". He said that this document is part of a process begun last spring when the Board decided to review the mission, role, and scope of the six schools in the Kansas Regents' System, with the intention of completing this review by early 1992. The Council of Presidents asked that the campuses play a significant role particularly in decisions regarding program review and program duplication, and met with the Executive Director of the Regents' staff to establish committees to look at these issues (as mentioned above) and report at the October Regents meeting. President Hammond said that there were a lot of assumptions in the Board's review process that may or may not be true, such as the assumption that departments having the same name are necessarily duplicative in their programs.

President Hammond stated that the Presidents were aware of the plan to have the Regents' staff prepare a mission statement for the entire system to be presented at the September Regents meeting, but did not see the document until it was released. He pointed out that the document was only a rough draft, and that the Regents also had not seen it before its release and would not act on it until constituencies had a chance to comment on it. He also commented that some of the items in the document are good from our point of view - for example, the strong emphasis on teaching - while there are other items that might be workable but were not desirable from his viewpoint. As a consequence he recommended that the Senate not condemn the whole document but rather go through the document item by item commenting on both the good and the bad points. He said that the students had looked at the document and were very concerned about the proposed requirement that students not be admitted to a degree program until they have completed 30 hours of general education courses with at least a C average. He stated that he didn't feel that the Board should be setting our general education requirements, and that the sooner we admit students to degree programs the more likely we are to retain them.

Dr. Markley asked if the strategic themes mentioned in the document had not already been approved by the Board, but President Hammond responded that he felt the Board was open to any suggestions on any item. He said that the document approved at the Board's June meeting was much shorter and was couched in rather innocuous and general terms that he had no objection to. Ms. Koerner asked how soon the Senate should respond to the document, and President Hammond replied that President Watt should have a position on the document by the time of the next meeting of the Faculty Senate Presidents. President Watt stated that it was his intention to make copies of the document available to all faculty to get their comments, and that the

Executive Committee had already met and responded to the document. He then read the text of the letter that he had sent on behalf of the Executive Committee to Regent Jack Sampson outlining ten specific responses to problems perceived in the document. President Hammond suggested that the Senate take a

position in support of the Executive Committee's response but ask the Board to delay action at least on the initiatives in the document until it can be thoroughly reviewed. Dr. Miller asked if the letter that President Watt had read was a draft, and President Watt replied that it had already been sent to Regent Sampson. President Hammond stated that he felt the Board would want to act on a system-wide mission statement at their September meeting, and that he had drafted an alternative proposed mission statement for the Regents system for the Regents to consider. However, he said that there was nothing in their time-line requiring action on the initiatives this month.

Ms. Koerner moved, and Dr. Heil seconded, that the Senate take a position affirming the Executive Committee's response and strongly urging that the Board delay action on the initiatives until a further examination of the document and the initiatives can be made. This motion carried unanimously. President Watt read the letter that the KU University Council had sent in response to the document, for the information of the Senate.

3. President Watt noted the Art Show being presented that night (Sept. 9) from 7 to 9 pm by Mr. Michael Jilg at the Moss-Thorns Gallery.

4. Faculty Senate Liaisons have not yet been established but are forthcoming.

5. Mr. Jack Logan of the Department of Computer Information Systems/Quantitative Methods plans to retire in January, 1992. His replacement as Faculty Senator from that department will be Dr. John Durham, with Mr. Arup K. Mukherjee as alternate.

6. Senators are reminded that permission needs to be obtained before photocopying copyrighted materials.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. Presented by Dr. Britten.

M-1. Four new courses or course changes from the Department of Nursing were presented for the approval of the Senate: NURS 540 (3 hr.), 542 (3 hr.), 543 (1 hr.), and 544 (1 hr.). The three courses numbered 540, 543, and 544 are proposed to take the place of the three one-hour courses given under the old heading NURS 544. The Department of Nursing asks that these four courses be approved as a package, and the committee approved them 10-0-0.

Dr. Rumpel noted that NURS 540 is being proposed as 3 credit hours, and 543 and 544 are for 1 credit hour each, while the old NURS 544 was only 1 credit hour. Dr. Britten said that that was right, and that more information is being added to these courses, but said that the total number of hours needed by these students would not be changing significantly. Dr. Votaw pointed out that the Hegis system number should be changed on NURS 542, and Dr. Markley noted that all the other courses need Hegis system numbers.

Motion to approve these four courses as a group, given that

corrections are needed on the Hegis numbers, carried.

Dr. Britten noted that he had been re-elected as chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, with Ms. Rumpel continuing on as secretary.

2. University Affairs. No report.
3. Student Affairs. Presented by Dr. Stephenson.

A revised Academic Clemency Policy was presented by the Ad Hoc Committee in charge of modifying the previously proposed policy in consultation with members of the Student Senate, and copies were handed out. This new policy would permit students who are granted academic clemency to have one or two entire semesters' worth of credit hours along with the grades removed from the transcript. The previous policy would have allowed students to "pick and choose" up to 15 credit hours from any semester(s) for removal from calculation of the grade point average, and would have left the grades on the transcripts. In cases where the student wishes to have two semester blocks removed, the new policy would require that the blocks be consecutive. Finally, the new policy would allow the student to appeal for academic clemency only once; the previous policy would have placed no limit on the number of times a student could appeal. Mr. Bannister noted that the Student Senate had not yet met to vote on the new policy.

Dr. Rumpel asked for clarification of the meaning of consecutive semester blocks; for example, would the spring and fall semesters be considered consecutive if the student did not enroll for the intervening summer? Dr. Stephenson replied that the committee's viewpoint was that these would not be considered consecutive, since a sudden problem that interfered with a student's studies in the spring might "carry over" into the summer but would not be expected to last into the fall. Dr. Rumpel asked that the committee clarify the wording on this point. Dr. Heil noted that the new policy makes no mention of the student's major, and Dr. Stephenson said that the committee's position was that anything hindering a student's performance would probably affect all of his or her classes. He said that

the previous policy's dis-allowing of clemency for classes required for a student's major was essentially a "pick and choose" option. Dr. Britten commented that the new policy is actually more restrictive than the previous proposal, and Dr. Stephenson agreed and stated that the more severe restrictions were in response to students' suggestions. Ms. Holmes noted however that the new policy does allow more credit hours to be removed from the transcript.

Dr. Gamble suggested that the committee contact the Financial Aids office to see if a policy such as this could affect a student's eligibility for a grant or loan. Dr. Stephenson stated that he had in fact brought this point up before the committee but no resolution was reached. President Watt noted that since the appeal could only be made after 24 credit hours following re enrollment had been completed enough time should have elapsed for the financial aids status to be clarified. Ms. Koerner asked if

there had been any input from the various colleges or departments, since in some instances a certain number of failures eliminates a student from a degree program. Dr. Stephenson said no, there had not been such input. Dr. Rumpel asked if this proposal had been shown to the Board of Regents' attorney for an opinion as to whether it is legal to falsify an official document. President Watt stated that this would not be falsification of a document, and noted that many schools have an academic clemency policy similar to this proposal. Dr. Rumpel noted however that the previous policy specified additions to the transcript but not deletions, while this proposal would actually allow deletions. President Watt commented that he was concerned about debating the question of whether we should have an academic clemency at all, when in fact that question was decided last spring.

Mr. Ison asked why the time-line for the semester blocks to be removed could not read "within one calendar year, starting at any point"? He also noted that the summer session is not a semester, and suggested that there was potential for abuse if this policy is implemented. Dr. Votaw agreed and asked if some students who have a problem in the spring, don't enroll in the summer, and still have the problem in the fall might not need clemency for both spring and fall. Dr. Stephenson said that such a principle could be applied to even longer gaps just as well, but Dr. Votaw said that the semesters in these cases would not be considered part of the same year. Dr. Heil moved, and Ms. Koerner seconded, that the Senate table these deliberations until the October meeting to give the Student Senate a chance to vote on this proposal.

The motion to table the new Academic Clemency proposal until the October meeting carried with one "No" vote.

4. Bylaws and Standing Rules. Presented by President Watt.

The results of the Faculty Senate elections are that Dr. Hughen will be the Vice President/President-elect and Ms. Holmes will be the Secretary for 1991-92.

5. External Affairs. Presented by Dr. Heil.

Dr. Kasior has been elected chair and Dr. Heil will be the committee secretary for the upcoming year. The committee is reviewing the Regents' report and solicits input from all Senators.

6. Executive Committee. Presented by President Watt.

Handouts listing committee memberships, liaisons, addresses for each of the Regents, and other useful information were passed out.

The committee is looking into ways to improve meaningful communication and faculty participation in decision-making at the university level and beyond, and solicits suggestions from Senators on this issue.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Britten moved, and Dr. Witten seconded, that discussion of the revisions to Appendix O be suspended. This motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

LIAISON REPORTS

None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Holmes, Secretary  
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate