

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

11-12-1968

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, November 12, 1968

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, November 12, 1968" (1968). *Faculty Senate*. 561.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/561

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.

COURSES APPROVED: Agriculture 25, 40, 60, 122 and 119.

Discussion: Recommendations of the Committee for the Selection of Students for Who's Who. Discussion will be continued at next Senate meeting.

Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, November 12, 1968, at 3:30 p. m., in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty.

Members Present: Mr. Ginther, Mr. Schroder, Dr. Thomas, Dr. Hamilton, Mrs. Popp, Dr. Sackett, Miss Christopher, Dr. Miller, Mrs. Theis, Dr. Witten, Dr. Oliva, Dr. Rice, Mr. Dalton, Mr. Finnin and Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Members Absent: None.

Also Present: Mr. Kellerman, Mr. Ruff Gentry and Mr. Thaine Clark.

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

NEW COURSE PROPOSALS. Dr. Garwood stated Dr. Tomanek had been invited to the Senate meeting but due to a previous commitment, Dr. Tomanek would be unable to attend. Dr. Garwood read a letter from Dr. Tomanek in which Dr. Tomanek recommended new Agriculture courses to revise and strengthen our present Agriculture program. Dr. Garwood stated Mr. Clark and Mr. Gentry were present to represent the Agriculture area.

Mr. Gentry discussed the following new course proposals:

25. Grain Grading and Seed Analysis. 2 cr. hrs. Application of the Federal standards for grading farm crops and judging of grains and other crop products. Four hours of lab per week. Prerequisite Farm Crops 5.

Mr. Gentry stated this course would entail grading of crops and seeds by Federal standards. It is an elective course in the field of Agronomy and is a course which would help our students compete with other agriculture graduates. This course is somewhat similar to Agriculture 35, Techniques of Livestock Evaluation.

November 12, 1968

40. Pastures and Forage Crops. 3 cr. hrs. Forage crops for meadows, pasture, soiling, and silo with reference to establishment, adaptation, production, management and improvement. Recitation 3 hours per week. Prerequisite Farm Crops 5.

Mr. Gentry stated this course would deal with cultivated grasses for pasturage, silage, soilage and cultivative crops for hay are included in this course. In Agricultural colleges, this is a required course. This course would be taken by sophomores, juniors and seniors.

60. Weed Science. 3 cr. hrs. Principles and practices of weed control including identification of weed seeds and plants. Two hours lecture and 2 hours lab per week. Prerequisite Farm Crops 5 and Chemistry 26.

Mr. Gentry stated farmers spend more than 50% of their production dollar controlling weeds. In the present curriculum, one chapter is devoted to the control of weeds. The Division is late in offering this course. The staff members have had a full teaching load. Mr. Gentry stated they hope to alternate courses with other courses they have at the present which are elective courses. There are three full time staff members with 225 majors and they will have 18 agriculture graduates in January, 1969.

122. Soil Fertility & Fertilizers. 3 cr. hrs. Fundamentals of soil fertility and the manufacturing and use of chemical fertilizers as they relate to crop production and quality. Three hours lecture per week. Prerequisite Soils 51.

Mr. Gentry stated we hear so much about population explosion - people lacking food, clothing, etc. Soil fertility is a big problem in Agriculture. Soil fertility increases quality and needs of our crops. Mr. Gentry stated for two years students

Faculty Senate Minutes

- Page 3 -

November 12, 1968

have been asking for such a course. This course deals with maintaining or improving the quality of the soil. Junior and senior students could use this course as their major and possibly graduate students in Botany might use this as a minor course. This course would be offered in Fall, 1970, or Spring, 1971, and will have to be alternated with courses we are teaching at the present time if Mr. Gentry is to teach all of them.

119. Development & Classification of Soils. 3 cr. hrs. Influence of soil-forming factors on soil development and methods of classifying and mapping soils. Two hours lecture and two hours of lab. a week, plus field trips. prerequisite Geology 10 and Soils 51.

Mr. Gentry stated juniors and seniors in Agriculture could use this course for their major. The course deals with factors of soil development, topography, organic matter, climate, classification of soils, etc. The Range Management people are anxious to have this course added to the Agriculture curriculum. Mr. Gentry said any of these courses would help the student to be in a better bargaining position when he looks for a job. Mr. Gentry said the Division wants to bring its offerings up to the level offered by other colleges.

Mr. Clark corroborated Mr. Gentry's statements.

RECOMMENDATION: It was moved by Dr. Sackett that course 25 Grain Grading and Seed Analysis, 2 cr. hrs., 40 Pastures and Forage Crops, 3 cr. hrs., 60 Weed Science, 3 cr. hrs., 122 Soil Fertility & Fertilizers, 3 cr. hrs., and 119 Development & Classification of Soils, 3 cr. hrs., as described above, be approved. Motion seconded by Dr. Thomas. Motion carried.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE SELECTION OF STUDENTS

FOR WHO'S WHO. Dr. Lewis Miller, Chairman of the Committee for recommending a procedure for the selection of students for Who's Who, reported to the Senate.

The other members of the Committee are Mr. Glenn Ginther and Mrs. Ruth Theis.

A summary of the findings was distributed to the Senate. The Who's Who Committee reviewed the methods of selection used by colleges and universities across the country. This information had been made available to the College from Who's Who Among Students in American Colleges and Universities.

Most colleges and universities limit the eligibility to Who's Who to seniors who will graduate by August of the following year although a few schools selected some juniors. Ordinarily a list of seniors is prepared who have a grade point above a certain minimum figure. At Fort Hays this past year, all seniors were included who had a grade point of 2.00 or better.

The initial recommendations may come from several sources. The following methods have been used by colleges and universities:

1. Academic Dean (or other administrator(s))
2. Dean + ad hoc Faculty Committee
3. Faculty Committee
4. Separate caucuses of Faculty and Student Committees
5. Combined Faculty and Student Committee
6. Departmental Chairmen
7. Yearbook and Newspaper Editors (with or without faculty advisers)
8. Student Senate Committee
9. The whole Student Body through ballots (with or without Freshmen)
10. The whole Faculty through ballots or questionnaires
11. In several cases, all Seniors with the appropriate GPA are invited to submit applications to one or more of the above committees.

Faculty Senate Minutes

- Page 5 -

November 12, 1968

After the initial recommendations have been made, the next problem is one of screening the candidates. Various colleges and universities have used the following methods of screening:

1. Faculty Committee (with or without Administrators)
2. Combined Faculty and Student Committee
3. The whole Faculty (by departments or otherwise)
4. The whole Student Body (with or without Freshmen)
5. Student Senate
6. A computerized point system based on GPA + activities of candidates

Lastly, after the number of students has been narrowed considerably, the final decision as to the choices may be made in several ways. The methods used by various colleges were noted as follows:

1. Faculty Ballot
2. Student Ballot
3. Student Senate Ballot
4. Faculty-Student Ballot

Dr. Miller said that the Committee had occasion to read the hundreds of different methods used to select the students. One of the problems has been that of involving the students in the selection processes. Where students are not involved in selecting the Who's Who candidates, it appears that the selections may be made by the faculty members on grade point average more than on the activities in which the students are engaged. With this thinking in mind, the Committee recommended that Fort Hays adopt a program as follows:

1. That a list of senior students with the appropriate grade point average be compiled. The grade point might be any designated figure, i. e., seniors with a grade point average of "B" or better might be utilized.
2. A Committee be established of representatives from the Honor Societies on campus as well as various campus service organizations,

November 12, 1968

representatives of the Reveille and Leader, ASC, and other student organizations. It was recommended that a second Committee be established composed of Division Chairmen or representatives of the Division. Each of these Committees would meet individually and act as a screening mechanism to select not more than 35% of the candidates on the original list. (Fort Hays has been permitted to submit the names of 34 students for the last few years to Who's Who. This year approximately 225 senior students had grade point averages of "B" or better.)

3. After the two Committees had agreed on the 35% of the seniors involved - this might be 75 or 80 people - each one of these students would be sent a data sheet on which he could indicate his pertinent activities at the College. These sheets would be returned to these Committees which would then further screen the candidates. At this time the list of candidates would be narrowed to possibly 50. At the present time pertinent activities are considered in selecting of the candidates. The Registrar's Office receives a list of students from each activity group. Some groups, however, are not very careful in listing their activities. If students were asked to list all their activities, there is the possibility there might be some exaggeration but it was suggested that this would be a more accurate list than the one now utilized.

One of the problems with these procedures is that they are time-consuming and the deadline for material is around the middle of October. The question was raised as to whether it would be possible to assemble the list of candidates in the spring of the year. The chief problem here is that the list would be very incomplete in that some students will not be returning to college in the fall. We have students who have been away from the campus a period of time so that another list would need to be assembled in the fall as the list assembled in the spring would have to be corrected substantially.

4. A ballot would now be prepared of these 50 candidates and would be made available to all full time sophomores, juniors and seniors for voting purposes. Mr. Finnin said that the Student Council could handle this part of the procedure and conduct the election each year of the recommended senior candidates.

If these names are submitted to the vote of sophomores, juniors and seniors, would this result in a popularity contest? Mr. Finnin said that Who's Who on campus would involve some of the elements of a popularity contest. However, the individuals involved would be

Faculty Senate Minutes

- Page 7 -

November 12, 1968

screened carefully and if a person is well known on campus and has an adequate grade point, it appeared to him that this was the type of student we should elect to Who's Who. Would this type of election mean that the Greeks would ban together to elect their members? Would this permit an organized minority on campus to exert their will? Is there so much student apathy that a relatively small number would vote? Mr. Finnin said that possibly 500 voted in the last student election and he felt this was a very representative figure.

Would this require a separate election by the students or could this election be conducted along with another student election? There is the time factor involved so that the election of students to Who's Who could not be delayed.

The Committee felt that such a procedure involving both students and faculty would insure that academic excellence, citizenship, service to the institution and regard of peer groups would be factors in the selection of students to Who's Who.

The discussion will be continued at the next Senate meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p. m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

Lucille Drees, Recorder