

1-28-1992

## Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, January 28, 1992

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, January 28, 1992" (1992).  
*Faculty Senate*. 838.  
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/838](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/838)

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).

Minutes of the  
Special Meeting of the  
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate

January 28, 1992

President Willis Watt called the meeting to order on January 28, 1992, at 3:40 p.m. in the Black and Gold Room of the Memorial Union.

The following members were present: Dr. Dale McKemey, Mrs. Joan Rumpel, Dr. John Durham, Dr. Carl Parker (for Dr. Ralph Gamble), Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Dr. Gary Millhollen, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Mr. Michael Madden, Dr. Tom Kerns, Mr. Herb Zook, Dr. Richard Hughen, Dr. Helmet Schmeller, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Zoran Stevanov (for Mr. Michael Jilg), Dr. Stephen Shapiro, Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Mohammad Riazi, Mrs. Sharon Barton, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Robert Jennings, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Mr. Glen McNeil, Ms. Martha Holmes, Mr. Lance Lippert (for Dr. Serjit Kaur-Kasior), Dr. Phyllis Tiffany (for Dr. Kenneth Olson), and Dr. Robert Markley.

The following members were absent: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Lewis Miller, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. Kenneth Olson, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Mike Rettig.

Also present were Dr. James Murphy, Dr. Larry Gould, Grant Bannister and Lane Victorson from the Student Government Association, a representative of the Leader, and many faculty members of Fort Hays State University.

President Watt emphasized that the special meeting was called to allow discussion of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee report on general education and to allow input from all faculty members of FHSU. The Senate has set a two-hour block aside for discussion of the CRC report. President Watt noted that faculty have received another proposal, "Review" of Undergraduate Graduation Requirements" developed by Dr. Murphy. President Watt requested that Dr. Murphy's document be sent to all faculty since Dr. Murphy was planning to send it to all chairs. President Watt stressed that the special meeting would discuss only the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee report (hence referred to as the CRC report) in order that the Faculty Senate may make final decisions on the report at the regular Faculty Senate meeting on February 4, 1992.

President Watt outlined the procedures for the meeting; he asked for a motion from the Senate to fix a time limit on "open" discussion. Ms. Koerner made the motion to set the time limit at 30 minutes with 2 minutes maximum allotted to each speaker. The motion was seconded and carried with 15 "yeas" and 9 "nays." Dr. Richard Heil, Parliamentarian, was asked to time the speakers.

President Watt opened the floor for discussion from senators and invited guests. Dr. Lloyd Frerer asked if there was a limit on the number of courses a department could offer for general education. Dr. Ron Sandstrom replied that the limit was three with consideration

993-09-16

given to an additional, exceptional course if a department could demonstrate significant reasons for offering one. Dr. Frerer objected to this limit since he said that six, the present number allowed, was severely restrictive for the Communications Department. Disciplines are different, and one course might be adequate for one discipline while six might not be enough for another discipline.

Dr. Evelyn Toft pointed to the emphasis given to internationalization on campus and asked how this emphasis could be fulfilled without foreign language courses and without foreign civilization courses. The Regents have required us to expose students to alternate ways of thinking and living; Dr. Toft did not see how this requirement could be accomplished by the proposed program. Dr. Ruth Firestone supported Dr. Toft and asked if all departments will be allowed to present three courses for general education; she wanted to know what criteria had been used for choosing the courses. Dr. Sandstrom replied that the areas listed on the CRC report -- such as art, music, economics, etc. -- were just that, areas not departments; he suggested that the Foreign Language Department might propose a literature course for the literature area of Liberal Arts. If that particular course were approved by the general education committee, then it would be in the general education program. Dr. Firestone asked why foreign language had been omitted; Dr. Sandstrom stated that it had been discussed extensively by the CRC. Dr. Jean Salien objected to the CRC procedures; he believed that faculty of the Foreign Language Department should have been invited to discuss the foreign language area with the committee in a closed session instead in open session with the rest of the faculty. He reminded faculty that in two previous reviews of general education, foreign language had been retained in the program. He asked the Faculty Senate to reconvene the Ad Hoc Committee for the purpose of discussing this issue with the Foreign Language Department. Dr. Salien stated that foreign language looks at culture from within, the only department of the university to look at culture from this perspective; all the rest look at culture from an American perspective. Mrs. Leona Pfeifer pointed out that at least one course in a foreign language was better than none, would open a door for some students, and might encourage students to take more courses. Dr. Firestone said that one course in a foreign language changes the way students look at English since it gives them a critical approach towards English and shows them that English is just one language among many. Dr. Salien also objected to the deletion of the course, Principles of Multiculturalism, which he stated was the only course at the university to look at racism, stereotyping and labeling.

Dr. Richard Leeson pointed out that with both proposals students could graduate from FHSU without taking a survey of world history, foreign language, college algebra, literature, or philosophy; the students may touch on them in the umbrella courses, but he wants a full-bodied education for the students. He said to do otherwise was to pay lip service only to a liberal arts education; he believed that a core curriculum was the best way to insure culturally literate FHSU graduates. Dr. Steve Tramel said that faculty have missed the fact that the CRC wanted to require five hours of world history; it is found on page 6 of the CRC report. Many people missed it because it was separated from the distribution areas. The CRC wanted to require it for all students. History is not in the distribution.

Dr. Albert Geritz supported the core idea; he stated that a "pick-and-choose" program, a little dab here and there, continues what FHSU has now and continues to pit one department against another. He believed that FHSU must get away from this type of program if the faculty wish to give students a good education. He said that FHSU should stand up and say that general education should be at least 50% of a student's program even if this means that the professional schools must tell their students that their degrees will take five years to complete. Dr. Frerer pointed out that in a "fixed" general education program the students would take only about 13 courses; he asked if anyone would want their department dropped from general education under this limited program. Dr. Geritz noted that the faculty would not find an ideal program, but could find something better than FHSU offers now. He believed that these offerings should be based upon how different one thing is from another; for instance, in social science he listed history and three courses from other areas -- sociology, psychology, economics, and political science. He stated that the program does not have to do everything, but we should try to expose students to as much as we can. He concluded by saying that it comes down to how many hours the university is willing to give to general education; in other words, what is the university's commitment to general education?

Dr. Cliff Edwards repeated that there was no ideal program. He commended the CRC for its work, but added that the CRC had made a mistake when they gave their report to the administration for a response, which took all Fall semester. He questioned the three-week deadline which had been established for completion of the deliberations; he stated that the university is now at the stage of the process where negotiation and fine tuning should take place and not where final decisions should be made. He noted that three years is an average in universities for revision of general education programs unlike the year and a half for this review. He recommended that the Faculty Senate observe its procedures and due process and allow as much debate, whether it takes weeks or months, before it makes its final decisions. In considering the CRC program specifically, he pointed out that the University of Kansas and Emporia State University, whose programs have been identified as ideal core curriculum by the American Association of Colleges, require a literature course for all students. He stated that there are some good things about the CRC program which need to be debated, particularly the upper division integrative courses which are part of an important national trend today; but he remarked that the elimination of multiculturalism goes against national trends in core curriculum.

Dr. Ellen Veed supported the CRC program, saying that it was a reasonable compromise; she believed that we could live with it. She stated that she could create a two-hour computer course in replacement of the present three-hour course.

Dr. Robert Stephenson asked why a separate course on critical thinking had been recommended by the CRC; he believed that critical thinking could be spread across the curriculum. Dr. Sandstrom pointed out that all Basic Skills courses were supposed to permeate courses across the curriculum. The question is dealt with in the rationale for this course on pages 8-9; Dr. Tramel pointed out that there is a strong analogy between that question and the question of why not drop English



Composition and stress writing across curriculum. Dr. Toft said that internationalization across the curriculum is similar to what you oppose about the critical thinking across the curriculum; she believed that faculty would have to be trained in internationalization before they could incorporate this across the curriculum. She wondered if the university had the funds for the training or the interested personnel.

Dr. Max Rumpel asked if courses in the major area could be taken by students in that major. Dr. Sandstrom answered that department majors could take general education courses offered by the department.

The observation was made that hours of a major compete with general education hours; students will not attend FHSU if they have to go for five years in order to complete a major. There needs to be a balance between scholarly learning and the practitioner side.

Dr. Fred Britten moved that we extend the "open" discussion for ten more minutes to allow non-senators to speak. The motion was seconded. Ms. Koerner asked for discussion on this; she wanted to know how many non-senators still wanted to speak. No one indicated that they wanted to speak. The motion was withdrawn. Dr. Leeson asked if the audience could discuss Dr. Murphy's proposal and if his proposal was equal in weight to the CRC report. He also asked if other persons could submit proposals for the Faculty Senate to consider. President Watt said that the only document being considered by the Faculty Senate is the CRC report and that discussion will only pertain to that document. He explained that Dr. Murphy had asked to see the CRC report in December and had written his document after reviewing the CRC report. President Watt could not answer the question about weight; as far as he was concerned, the CRC report was the Senate report, and the Senate had not yet taken action on it. If possible, the Senate will continue discussion at the February meeting, and if a recommendation or motion comes forward at that meeting, the Senate will vote on it. If not, the Senate will continue discussion. The reason for the special meeting is to provide the Senate with additional time for discussion so that perhaps the Senate can finish at the next meeting. This gives the Senate an opportunity to cooperate with the Provost in terms of the pressures which have been brought to bear on this from external agencies. If the Senate does not reach a decision, then the Senate will extend the discussion until it can. Dr. Murphy responded that his document was for administrative purposes only and was not meant to influence faculty in any way.

Dr. Britten said this may be a "point of order"; he believed that Dr. Murphy had presented alternatives at the last Faculty Senate meeting and wondered if the Faculty Senate should not question Dr. Murphy about them. President Watt said that this would be out of order because the Senate had been called for a special meeting to look at the CRC report only.

At this point, Dr. Heil reminded the Senate that the "open" discussion had ended. President Watt suggested that the senators consider the CRC report by starting at page 1 of the report. The question was asked if then should not be a motion to accept it. President Watt stated that the Senate was in a "committee of the whole": we are discussing it only, not amending it nor voting on it today.

Dr. Paul Gatschet asked Dr. Sandstrom to respond to some of the concerns expressed by the audience during the "open" discussion. Dr. Sandstrom pointed out that foreign language had been proposed by some members of the committee and, although not listed as a separate area in Liberal Arts, could be included under the literature area. The committee had stressed writing, critical thinking, oral communications, etc., across the curriculum but believed that a separate course of critical thinking was important. Multiculturalism could fit in one of the areas already specified in the CRC report. Dr. Sandstrom went on to say that the number of total hours in the program caused choices to be made by the committee and so foreign language had been voted out. Dr. Gatschet asked Dr. Sandstrom how he would respond to the criticism, that the document was "fluff." Dr. Sandstrom stated that some of the committee had wanted a core, some had wanted no changes to the present program; the CRC report was very much a compromise document. He stated once again that the content areas listed in Liberal Arts were areas, not specific departments. He pointed out that the criteria established on page 4, goal A of the CRC report were criteria already established for the present program and that each instructor and department teaching those courses, not a general education committee, would establish specific criteria for the courses: For a new course, the instructor and department will develop specific criteria and will present the course to the general education committee, which will assure itself that the criteria accord with the general criteria under goal A and will then approve the course. All present courses will be resubmitted for approval.

Dr. Michael Madden said that he thought the Senate had only half the program and that the other half would be the specific courses decided by the general education committee. He wanted to know what the courses would be before he approved the CRC report. Dr. Stephenson asked who would be the members of the general education committee. Dr. Robert Markley pointed out that the CRC report on page 26 set forth the approval process. President Watt stated that a draft proposal for the new general education committee had been written by Dr. Larry Gould, Dean of Arts & Sciences, who had been appointed as chair of the committee by Dr. Murphy. Dr. Gould explained the draft proposal; he stated that he had tried to use the CRC report to guide him in creating the draft. The committee will be composed of representatives from across campus: two from Humanities, two from Mathematics and Natural/Physical Sciences, two from Social & Behavioral Sciences, one from each professional school -- College of Education, College of Business, College of Health & Life Sciences -- the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate, and one undergraduate student. Dr. Gould pointed out that this committee will make recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee; he viewed the committee's primary role as advisor to the Academic Affairs Committee and secondarily as advocate of the liberal arts, facilitator, reformer, and ombudsman.

Mr. Madden asked if the general education committee would create specific courses. Dr. Gould replied that the general education committee would work with the required courses in the Basic Skills areas, but that other courses would be generated by departments and presented to the committee. Dr. Sandstrom reminded senators that the Faculty Senate has final approval of the courses.

Dr. Helmet Schmeller asked when departments should be prepared to submit courses for approval. President Watt replied that the time will be when the Senate has made a final recommendation on the CRC report. Dr. Murphy said that the time would be next December 1992, the last date for submitting courses for the Fall 1993 schedule. Ms. Koerner asked if all courses -- 50 or 60 -- would go through the approval process; could they possibly be ready for the Fall 1993 schedule? President Watt said that current courses are already generated and will just have to be approved again. If there are clear criteria and department have considered these criteria, then the process should be fairly quick. Ms. Koerner asked what criteria President Watt meant; he replied that, right now, the criteria are those from 1985. Ms. Koerner mentioned that there was a lot of confusion about the criteria, the time lines and the approval process and personnel. Dr. Britten asked if the deans would input before the Academic Affairs Committee acts on the proposals; Dr. Sandstrom said that was correct.

Dr. John Durham expressed his concern that the faculty are focusing excessively on curriculum and not on what goes on in the general education courses; he believed that at most universities general education is taught casually and with some indifference to the needs of the students. He does not think that, as long as the faculty address curriculum and confine themselves to counting hours, the faculty will ever change general education at this university. He does not see anything in any of the proposals to increase the commitment of faculty in both liberal arts and in the professional schools; he does not think that the general education proposal with any foreseeable amendments will have any material effect on the type of student FHSU graduates.

Other areas of concerns mentioned: It was asked how FHSU can internationalize the students if the students are not encouraged to go to a foreign country to be in another culture. Dr. Witten stated that the United States has resolved to be first in science and mathematics by 2000; he commented that the proposed program was weak in the sciences. He believed that science should be required as World Civilization and World Geography are. In the CRC proposal the student could take as little as seven hours in science; in the current program the student can elect to take twelve hours in science. He also did not like students in other areas using general education courses as cognates for their majors; this practice is not in keeping with what general education should be. Dr. Stephenson asked what the problem with this use of cognates was; he disagreed with Dr. Witten's position. Dr. Carl Parker reminded the Senate that the university is a multifaceted institution; some areas such as nursing, business, and agriculture are driven by the market. If students are not allowed to count some of the courses as cognates, then students will have to take more courses and may decide to go elsewhere for an education. This may place FHSU at a disadvantage.

Dr. Markley remarked that students need room for electives, which are not necessarily in the general education program. He gave his own experience as an example; he had taken more courses in foreign language because one course had developed his interest and because his program had room for electives. He believed that there should be pressure on the majors to make their major requirements reasonable



within a framework where students can become liberally educated. With respect to the professional schools becoming so stressed by the general education program, he commented that the program will not put our students at a disadvantage. If the professional schools have quality programs, the students will enroll even in a five-year program. Dr. Hassett pointed out that nursing has parameters to meet and national certification requirements so that they do not have much room to allow for electives in their program as it is now. Furthermore, she believed that the program would lose majors if it were a five-year program; in these economic times, people cannot afford to extend another year if there are other options available. Other faculty from professional areas supported her position. Ms. Koerner mentioned that enrollment in nursing at the University of Kansas had dropped when they changed to a five-year program.

In response to Dr. Witten's concern about science requirements, Dr. Sandstrom pointed out that the CRC was actually improving on the science requirement because the proposed program required a minimum of two science courses with one lab instead of only one without a lab as students could presently take. As for cognates, if there were a core curriculum, every course would be a cognate, by definition. Ms. Koerner stated that these two proposals, the CRC and Dr. Murphy's, will necessitate the nursing department's close look at their program; only cognates will help to alleviate the excessively high number of hours (145) that nursing students will have to take.

Dr. Britten asked how the proposed program would affect teacher's education. Dr. Jennings said that in elementary education the faculty have put together areas of concentration and Dr. Hoy would like the general education program to constitute the areas of concentration; they are concerned with depth in each area, which would give the students something to take out and use in teaching.

At this time, President Watt suggested that the senators go over the model outline and see if there were any concerns, to facilitate the Senate in its considerations at its regular meeting. Ms. Koerner said that some students had opposed the one-hour labs with no credit given; they felt that they should receive credit for work done, and they asked why should they do the work in a lab if they received no credit for it. Grant Bannister agreed with the general sentiment of Ms. Koerner's remarks; he said that the students liked the structure of the courses, but not the credit hours. Dr. Durham stated that the computer course has more content than a two-hour course; he could not imagine teaching it in this way, and it was his opinion that the computer labs on campus could not handle the courses. Dr. Rumpel offered a traditional rationale for such courses; he said that the assumption is that for a regular lecture-style course a student would generally spend about two hours studying outside of class for each hour spent in class. For lab classes the ratio differs; there is an understanding that there should be less time spent outside of class, outside of the scheduled meeting time for the labs. Dr. Markley added that the CRC report is talking about a hegis-1-type course, a lab course, where a student spends time in class, as opposed to outside of class, working on the material. He noted that there are both thinking and mechanics involved in these sorts of courses; they are more than just 50 minutes of lecture twice a week in which the student sits there.



Dr. Stephenson reiterated that the Agriculture Department thinks the critical thinking course is just a Logic course which already exists, and that is a stumbling block for them; critical thinking should be instilled in the students through courses taught across campus. Dr. Hassett affirmed the Nursing Department's opposition also. President Watt observed that, based on his experiences in debate, most students do not necessarily learn critical thinking in any given course; it seems to take a variety of ways. He did believe that it could be taught in one course. Dr. Britten pointed out that the document did not say that the Philosophy Department had to teach it; any department could propose to teach it. Critical thinking could also be a part of the capstone course also. Dr. Jennings stated that he had observed serious shortcomings in the preparation of students, many from Arts & Sciences, to do critical thinking; there is a need to teach students something about thinking in their own subject areas. The faculty are not teaching critical thinking skills presently to a significant number of students; the faculty needs to improve this in their area courses or else through a different avenue such as the proposed course. Probably through area courses is the best approach. Ms. Koerner has encountered difficulties trying to introduce critical thinking in her courses, but believes it needs to be done.

Mr. Madden asked why World Civilization and World Geography had been included as required courses; he wanted to know what the rationale was and asked why biology had not been required since he believed biology was as important a requirement as the chosen courses. Dr. sandstrom referred him to the rationale for these courses on pages 13-14 of the CRC report. President Watt reiterated that these courses were part of the internationalization component and pointed out that the proposed program was the result of many compromises. If we included everything everyone thought should be required, the program would be too large. Dr. Charles Votaw pointed out that a student cannot study international politics or similar courses if the student has no idea where countries are in the world or what their histories are. Dr. Schmeller pointed out that the Regents have required the universities to provide the historical and cultural foundations of our world civilization. Grant Bannister stated that the students want both World Civilization and World Geography required, but want Geography to be a three-hour course. Several faculty senators agree with the three-hour course.

Dr. Britten pointed out that the students have not had much time to consider the CRC report.

The suggestion was made to end discussion. Senators concurred.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.