

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

6-20-1967

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, June 20, 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, June 20, 1967" (1967). *Faculty Senate*. 530.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/530

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.

Sent to Pres. Office 6-28-67

Dr. Wood's Summary "Institutional Survey of Communication Proficiency Requirements for Teacher Education" attached.
Further discussion of English Proficiency Tests.
RECOMMENDATION: That English Proficiency Test be abolished as of the first of Sept. 1967. Motion seconded and carried.
Dr. Garwood commented on Suspension and Honor Roll Lists for Spring, 1967.
Letters of congratulation sent to all with 2.50 grade and above.
Pass/Fail System discussed.

Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, June 20, 1967, at 3:30 p.m. in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Members present: Miss Cotham, Mr. S. Johnson, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Crites, Mr. Dalton, Miss Gangwer, Dr. Youmans, Mr. Schroder, Dr. Smith, Miss Veed, and Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Members absent: Mr. McGinnis and Dr. Wilkins.

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

Dr. Garwood presented a Summary which Dr. Youmans brought to the Faculty Senate Meeting. The Summary, an "Institutional Survey of Communication Proficiency Requirements for Teacher Education" was prepared by Dr. Wood. A copy of the Summary is attached.

English Proficiency Test. Dr. Garwood reviewed last week's meeting in which Dr. W. R. Thompson expressed his views on the English Proficiency Test. Dr. Thompson suggested we no longer require the English Proficiency Test. The rationale for dropping the test is the fact we have strengthened our English Composition offerings through the revamping of English Composition I and II; most colleges do not administer English Proficiency Tests and we do not have sufficient staff to administer the test.

Kansas University once had English Proficiency tests where English Department people graded the test. As of last Spring, they are no longer administering the English Proficiency Test. K-State administers the test and has for some time. The Registrar at the University of Wichita stated they have no English Proficiency Test. The Registrar at Pittsburg stated they do not have an English Proficiency examination.

There were no particular comments on Dr. Wood's Summary. It was pointed out the Summary was a written communication; there was no oral communication. One must have an average of "C".

Discussion of English Proficiency Tests. One Senate member stated his division members thought the English Proficiency Test ought to be dropped but that a minimum of "C" grade should be required in English Composition II 51. If the student gets a "D", he should be required to take the course over.

Another member indicated her division members stated there should be a minimum of "C" in all three courses - English Composition I, English Composition II and Speech 29.

Another representative stated his Division members suggested the test be dropped. Most of his people want a "C" grade in English Composition I and II. It would be satisfactory if a student got a "C" in English Composition II. But all of his Division members want some requirement for graduation.

The next member felt the need for English Proficiency but could understand the English area's problem. Her Division indicated a minimum of "C" in English Composition II. This would eliminate the need for the test but they recommend a good stiff course in English Composition II with a minimum of a "C", as indicating English Proficiency.

Someone stated that if there were no English Proficiency test, they saw no reason why a "D" in English Composition II 51 would not satisfy like a "D" in Modern Civilization. It would appear if a "D" were good enough for other courses, it should be good enough for English.

The question was raised about transfer students. If they have English Composition I and II, would we accept them as proficient or would they have to take the 51 course? It was stated we could have these people take these courses over again but it seemed superfluous since they have already taken these courses. It was noted there was no problem as yet. Transfer students with a minimum of "C" in English Composition II would be regarded as proficient in English.

Another member stated the test should be dropped. It is not doing what we think it ought to be doing. Requiring a "C" grade may or may not be the answer but it is an approach.

It was noted in English Composition II 51 the same teachers would grade who also have to grade the Proficiency Test. Previously it required a "B" in English Composition I and English Composition II to be considered proficient now a "C" in 51 is the key. The test is for the student who does not make a "C" in the course. A "D" student has the option of retaking the course or he can take the test. Some favored "C" in both courses rather than an average of "C". It was the consensus that English Proficiency does not give much proof of a person's ability.

Dr. Garwood quoted the ruling on "Proficiency in English" from the class schedule:

"A student achieving a minimum grade of "C" in English Composition II 51 will be regarded as having met the English Proficiency requirement. Students who do not achieve a minimum grade of "C" in English Composition II 51 will be required to take the English Proficiency test. The requirement of English Proficiency must be met prior to admission to the teaching block in the division of education and psychology. It is also a requirement for graduation."

RECOMMENDATION: It was recommended that the English Proficiency Test be abolished as of the first of September, 1967. The motion was seconded and carried.

Suspension List, Spring, 1967. As a matter of information, Dr. Garwood stated that 239 out of 1377 Freshmen at the end of the Spring semester were placed on suspension or 17% of the class. There were 59 sophomores; 42 juniors and only 7 seniors. The figures were taken from the Suspension List received from Data Processing. Dr. Garwood stated the figures were not quite accurate because a few students

retook a course and have been removed from the suspension list. Sometimes a student gets an "Incomplete" and when he completes the work, his grade is sufficient to remove him from suspension.

Honor Roll - Spring, 1967. On the Honor Roll, Dr. Garwood stated 3 freshmen out of 1377 received "A's"; 46 had grade points between 2.50-2.99. There were 9 sophomores who received all "A's" while 39 had grade points between 2.50-2.99. There were 12 juniors with all "A's" while there were 48 between 2.50-2.99. There were 18 seniors with all "A's" while 92 were in the 2.50-2.99 range. (The 92 seniors represented 11% of their class.) Dr. Garwood stated the grades reflect the fact the students do better as they become upper classmen.

Dr. Garwood stated letters of congratulation were sent out to all who made 2.50 and above. The News Service gets the names and addresses so they can notify home town papers of those students who are on the Honor Roll. Problems arise because a student may list his address as "Hays" rather than his home town.

The question was raised if maintaining Honor Rolls was justified. It was believed these students who achieve outstanding grades should receive the same recognition that athletes and others do. Again it was stated some students may not receive this recognition in the newspapers because they have stated their home address incorrectly.

Pass/Fail System. The Pass/Fail system was discussed briefly. A student may wish to take a certain course but because he feels he is not very good in a particular field will not attempt the course because it will lower his grade point. Some schools are experimenting with the idea of taking a course but receiving no grade for it. You either pass or fail the course. When the student enrolls, he must state if he is taking it for Pass/Fail; if not, he takes the course as any other student. Dr. Garwood stated that before this discussion comes up at a later meeting, we will send

Faculty Senate Minutes

June 20, 1967

-5-

out Pass/Fail literature again.

The time of Faculty Senate Meetings was again discussed and 3:30 on Tuesdays seemed to be most satisfactory. This will be the schedule for the summer months. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, June 27.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

Lucille Drees, Recorder