

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

5-2-1967

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, May 2, 1967

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, May 2, 1967" (1967). *Faculty Senate*. 526.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/526

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.

Clark Chipman, newly elected Student Body President, met with Faculty Senate. His purpose was to explain why students felt they should be represented at Faculty Senate Meetings.

"A Study of Alternative Course Numbering Systems" by a sub-committee of Faculty Senate members composed of Dr. McMechan, Dr. Fleharty and Mr. Tomlinson was presented by Dr. McMechan. Study is enclosed.

Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, May 2, 1967, at 3:30 p.m. in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Members present: Mr. Dalton, Miss Cotham, Mr. Crites, Mr. Schmidt, Dr. Fleharty, Mr. S. Johnson, Mr. Tomlinson, Mr. McGinnis, Dr. McMechan, Dr. Wilkins and Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Members absent: Miss Gangwer, Dr. Coder and Dr. Youmans.

Also present: Mr. Maxwell and Clark Chipman.

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Dr. Garwood introduced Mr. Clark Chipman, newly elected Student Body President. Mr. Chipman said he was speaking for the students as their president and gave various reasons why students felt they should have some representation in Faculty Senate meetings. He stated students were not administrators but do want to understand administrative policies. They do not want student representatives to vote but they do want to understand Faculty Senate policy and thereby improve the relationship between the student body and Faculty Senate. Mr. Chipman suggested the Faculty Senate consider having a full time student representative at Faculty Senate Meetings - this would have to be a responsible person to sit in at meetings - or elect a student representative who could report to the student body. Another alternative was to have a part time student representative at the Faculty Senate Meetings. The agenda might be arranged so student affairs could be discussed at the first or last part of the meeting then the remainder of the meeting would be closed to the student body. He suggested as another alternative that the students might elect a faculty member to represent them so this faculty member

Faculty Senate Minutes
May 2, 1967

could report back to the students. Mr. Chipman concluded that the rationale was simply to give the student body a clear idea of Faculty Senate policy making and improve the relationship between the student body and the Faculty Senate. Mr. Chipman believes that it would be a valuable asset to the Faculty Senate to have students' opinions at the meetings.

The meeting was then open for discussion. It was stated that the Senate in no way will have any ideas other than for the good of the student and they will do nothing contrary to the best interest of the student body. Mr. Chipman agreed with this, thanked the Faculty Senate for whatever consideration they would give his suggestions and departed. Dr. Garwood explained that Mr. Chipman called for an appointment to visit with the Faculty Senate and that Mr. Chipman welcomed the opportunity to visit with the Senate members.

Dr. Garwood commented that Dr. Clifford Edwards of the Language, Literature and Speech Division was making a study of the numbering of courses.

The meeting was then turned over to Dr. McMechan, Chairman of the Senate Committee, which had made a study of alternative course numbering systems. * Dr. McMechan stated his report is an explanation of the current system; the systems presently used around the country; the alternatives available if a change is desired and the kind of numbering systems which occur at other institutions. He further stated it was his understanding not to undertake a change in categorization so far as courses are concerned.

*The sub-committee's study is enclosed.

Faculty Senate Minutes

May 2, 1967

Dr. McMechan cited examples of different types of numbering systems used by state institutions. He noted that Pittsburg's system was the same as that used by Emporia whereas Kansas State University's system compared with that used at Fort Hays. So far as numbering itself is concerned, it is a matter of allowing or assigning a wider breadth of numbering to each category. If more numbers were needed for re-assignment, we could lump together or make three main categories - draw a line between Upper and Lower Divisions; Seniors and Graduates. Comments were made about using a code system to indicate course, level, content, department, instructor, section and credit. It was stated that many errors occur when using the digit system. If more numbers were to be made available for courses, Dr. McMechan's report listed an expanded numbering system that would appear to be of value. A system had been proposed that no drastic alterations of course numbers be made. Memos had been sent out by Dr. McMechan's committee; 25% responded; 75% were not concerned or failed to reply. Most of those who replied preferred a system such as the one proposed.

One suggestion made to the committee was that after a course number the figure "1" would denote if the course were offered in the Fall; "2" would indicate Spring and "3" indicated Summer. There was the possibility of doing away with abbreviations for departments and indicate Math as "MA" and Chemistry as "CH".

The question was raised as to why so many numbers were needed for Freshmen-Sophomore courses. If the Lower Division courses were expanded from

Faculty Senate Minutes
May 2, 1967

1-199, there would be no need to worry about another change in the next ten years. It was mentioned that instead of creating new courses, we have more sections; more opportunity for students to be offered courses in the Upper Division for which lower courses are a pre-requisite. Several courses had few variations in the lower fields (same today as 50 years ago) whereas other fields were becoming so wide, many have to expand into more courses to prepare students going into specialists' areas. Some departments use most of the numbers which they have been assigned. Considerable discussion followed about Freshman-Sophomore levels; Junior-Senior levels and the use of the category "Basic Studies". It was suggested to keep the terminology simplified. The feeling was with the increased enrollment there would be a need for an increase in numbers.

If a change is in order, then it may be necessary to have^a new numbering system or reassign old numbers to bring us more in line with other colleges in Kansas; establish a system where we are not back to back with numbers. If some courses are dropped from the curriculum and the years when offered or if last offered 10 years ago and the numbers are no longer listed in the college catalog, may we reuse this number?

It was suggested that if we decide to go to a new system of numbering courses, to have each Division set down on paper their findings to see how it will work out over a period of time; Give some thought to it. It is good to have continuity of numbers. We need to be very thorough in setting up numbers in Divisions in such a way that many of these standard courses would never again change their numbers.

Faculty Senate Minutes
May 2, 1967

If we decide this is the time to make the change - make it before we run out of positions - let's give enough thorough study to it so it can be continuous over a period of time.

Dr. Garwood suggested each member take Dr. McMechan's report with him; visit with his Division Chairman; see how it fits into their programs and let the people in the Division look over the material for suggestions. The change would have to be effective September, ^{1969.} ~~1968~~. Possibly some of Dr. Edwards' work could be included with Dr. McMechan's report. Dr. Garwood thanked Dr. McMechan for his report.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p. m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

Lucille Drees, Recorder