

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

7-7-1965

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, July 7, 1965

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, July 7, 1965" (1965). *Faculty Senate*. 487.

[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/487](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/487)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate, Wednesday, July 7, 1965 at 3:30 p.m. in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Members present: Dr. Edwards, Mr. Cleland, Mr. Dalton, Miss Felten, Mr. Forsythe, Mrs. Hellem, Dr. Nelson, Dr. Pierson, Dr. Rice and Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Members absent: Mrs. Brown, Mr. Osborne, Dr. Staven.

Also present: Dr. Youmans.

The meeting was called to order by the chairman, Dr. Garwood, who said that the Committee for the investigation of Probation and Suspension would present its report. Copies of the report which follows were sent to the members of the Faculty Senate previously:

Report of the Faculty Senate Committee  
for the Investigation of Academic  
Probation and Suspension Policy at  
Fort Hays Kansas State College

July 7, 1965

Introduction

Last fall (1964), the question of Academic Probation and Suspension was presented to the Faculty Senate for discussion. After some consideration a few minor changes were made in the rules and regulations, but the basic structure remained intact. Some Senate members and other faculty members still felt, however, that the present Probation and Suspension policy was not entirely satisfactory and deserved further study.

This spring, Dean Garwood appointed a committee of Faculty Senate members whose duty was to be that of analyzing and evaluating the present Probation and Suspension policy at Fort Hays State, and reporting its findings and recommendations to the Senate. Dr. Rice was named chairman of the committee. Mr. Cleland and Miss Felten were also appointed to the committee. The committee's report follows.

Procedure

The committee felt that before it began a study of this nature an attempt should be made to list the most desirable characteristics of a system of scholastic probation and suspension. The committee also felt that it was necessary to formulate a statement of the purpose of probation and suspension at Fort Hays State. This list of desirable characteristics and the statement of purpose then served to guide the committee in its study.

A satisfactory system of probation and suspension should be simple, should be easy to administer, and should fit the needs of the particular institution for which it is designed. During the study, the committee kept these guidelines in sight along with a few major weaknesses of the present policy.

Members of the Administration, the Council of Division Chairmen, the Faculty Senate, and the Faculty seem to agree that we need to tighten our probation rules considerably. As a publicly supported college of the state of Kansas, Fort Hays State does not practice a severely selective student admission policy. The institution recognizes, however, that many students are incapable of and/or unmotivated for the intellectual enterprise, and therefore it feels justified in following a policy of selective retention. As the committee proposal will indicate, the decision of determining the degree of selectivity will be in the hands of the Faculty Senate.

What purpose should a system of scholastic probation and suspension serve? The committee feels that it should afford the deserving student a second chance to succeed, it should serve to warn and motivate the capable but unmotivated student, and it should serve to weed out the incapable student.

The committee continued its work with a survey of current literature and an examination of existing policies at other colleges and universities. The primary source of information was a large number of catalogs and bulletins of institutions which were similar in size and orientation--state-supported colleges and universities of medium size. As a result of this survey and a certain amount of correspondence the committee presents the following proposal.

### The Proposal

As the proposal indicates, changes in the present policy are being suggested. It is to be emphasized that these changes are not suggested just for the sake of changing, but they appear to be necessary if inherent weaknesses in the present policy are to be corrected. The committee feels that the basic structure of the proposed policy will accomplish this. The proposal is presented in such a manner, however, as to allow the members of the Faculty Senate to make the policy as strict or as lenient as they desire.

The committee recommends that the following statement, with any necessary editorial changes for clarification, be substituted for the academic probation statement which appears in the present catalog. It is further recommended that it be applied to total grades and credits earned by students at the end of the Fall semester of 1965 and thereafter until changed by the Faculty Senate.

### SCHOLARSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Every student is expected to demonstrate his ability to progress toward a degree by achieving at least a minimum quality of work each semester. Since a "C" average is required on total hours for graduation, a student's record should reflect progress toward that level of achievement.

A. Academic Probation. A student places himself on probation when his accumulated hours and grade points show that he is deficient from a "C" average

(five) or more grade points on hours attempted but less than (twenty) grade points on hours attempted. Probation is designed to alert the student that he may encounter difficulty in meeting graduation requirements and that he should take steps immediately to improve his academic status.

B. Suspension. A student whose accumulated hours and grade points show that he is deficient from a "C" average (twenty) or more grade points on hours attempted will be suspended for poor scholarship. However, no student will be suspended at the close of a semester during which he achieves a "C" average or better.

C. Reinstatement. A student suspended from college for poor scholarship will be provided a period of at least one semester during which he may reconsider and re-evaluate his academic plans. He may then file a completed Application for Reinstatement form in the office of the Dean of the Faculty. Each application will be considered on its own merits. Reinstatement is not automatic.

D. Appeal. Any student affected by these regulations who has shown marked improvement or who believes he has been affected unfairly may appeal to the Committee on Reinstatement. To make an appeal, the student should discuss his case with his adviser, then submit a written statement signed by him and his adviser to the Dean of the Faculty. He may ask to appear in person before the committee.

#### Conclusion

Although none of the institutions surveyed stated the purpose of its system of probation, the Faculty Senate may want to formulate a statement of purpose to appear in our next catalog.

There is no doubt that discussion and debate among Faculty Senate members will bring about suggestions for change in the above proposal, but the committee believes that the proposed policy has certain advantages which should be preserved if at all possible. These advantages are listed below.

1. No student will be dismissed who has an overall "C" average.
2. A student's total record rather than just one semester's work will be the governing factor for probation or suspension.
3. The grade point requirements may be adjusted easily without affecting the overall structure of the policy.
4. The student is required to continue to make progress toward meeting graduation requirements.
5. The student is not allowed to place himself in a position in which he has little chance of graduation.
6. The policy would be easy to administer.
7. The policy is more lenient with the lower division student than with the upper division student.

This is a hypothetical student who just remains in College during his four years under a 20 point dismissal plan. These averages represent the worst grades

July 7, 1965

-4-

he could possibly have to remain in school. You will notice that such a student is still making progress toward graduation.

Hours	Shortage	Grade Points	Average
15	19	-4	-.266
30	19	11	.367
45	19	26	.578
60	19	41	.683
75	19	56	.747
90	19	71	.789
105	19	86	.819
120	19	101	.842

This is a hypothetical student who remains on probation during his four years using a 5 point grade point shortage for probation. These averages represent the best grades he could possibly have to remain on probation.

Hours	Shortage	Grade Points	Average
15	5	10	.667
30	5	25	.833
45	5	40	.888
60	5	55	.917
75	5	70	.933
90	5	85	.944
105	5	100	.952
120	5	115	.958

CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS  
 ON PROBATION  
 Spring Semester 1964-65

Present Policy		Proposed Policy			
		(5&20)	(5&18)	(6&22)	(4&18)
Fresh.	178	280	248	287	273
Soph.	83	134	117	144	129
Junior	76	81	71	87	75
Senior	31	39	36	39	42
Grad.	7	5	5	5	5
Uncl.	2	3	3	3	3
	<u>377</u>	<u>542</u>	<u>480</u>	<u>565</u>	<u>527</u>

CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS  
 ON SUSPENSION  
 Spring Semester 1964-65

Present Policy		Proposed Policy			
		(5&20)	(5&18)	(6&22)	(4&18)
Fresh.	219	178	210	158	210
Soph.	93	113	130	95	130
Junior	82	61	71	48	71
Senior	43	30	33	28	33
Grad.	3	0	0	0	0
Uncl.	3	1	1	1	1
	<u>443</u>	<u>383</u>	<u>445</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>445</u>
Totals	820	925	925	895	972

CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS  
 ON PROBATION  
 Fall Semester 1964-65

Present Policy		Proposed Policy			
		(5&20)	(5&18)	(6&22)	(4&18)
Fresh.	385	299	280	287	317
Soph.	199	154	137	154	155
Junior	171	71	63	71	68
Senior	90	41	39	42	43
Grad.	11	5	5	7	6
Uncl.	8	6	6	6	6
	<u>864</u>	<u>576</u>	<u>530</u>	<u>567</u>	<u>595</u>

CLASSIFICATION OF STUDENTS WITH  
 TWO CONSECUTIVE SEMESTERS ON PROBATION  
 Fall Semester 1964-65

Present Policy		Proposed Policy			
		(5&20)	(5&18)	(6&22)	(4&18)
Fresh.	55	68	87	49	87
Soph.	79	90	107	77	107
Junior	49	41	49	36	49
Senior	33	26	28	21	28
Grad.	1	3	3	1	3
Uncl.	3	2	2	1	1
	<u>220</u>	<u>230</u>	<u>276</u>	<u>185</u>	<u>275</u>
Totals	1084	806	806	752	870

Dr. Rice presented the report and reviewed each part briefly.

The report was discussed. The Scholarship Requirements area was discussed at length.

Some of the considerations, suggestions, etc. were:

If this plan were used would it not permit students to enroll year after year before finally being suspended?

Is it not better to suspend these students earlier?

One of the reasons for using the cumulative is that students do not ordinarily make a sudden jump to a good grade but increases a little each semester.

One suggestion was that perhaps the students need a jolt to bring them to the realization that they must make a satisfactory record and that this is important.

Some cases were worked out using the table in an effort to see how it would operate.

The discussion is to be continued at the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

Standlee V. Dalton, Secretary

Florence Bodmer, Recorder