

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

12-10-1968

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 10, 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, December 10, 1968" (1968). *Faculty Senate*. 563.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/563

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 12-30-68

Discussion: CHANGES IN CALENDAR DATES...Commencement, Final exams and summer school.
Discussion: CHEATING. Discussion continued of study made by AAUP, rules in Fac.Handbook, etc.
RECOMMENDATION: It was moved by Dr. Hamilton that a Senate committee on cheating be appointed to meet with that of the Student Council. Motion seconded by Dr. Thomas. Motion carried.
Committee on Cheating: Mr. Ginther, Chairman, Mrs. Popp, Dr. Sackett & Dr. Thomas.
Discussion: PROPOSAL FOR A TEMPORARY MECHANISM FOR THE ADJUDICATION OF STUDENT-FACULTY DISPUTES. (Received from Div. of Lang. Lit. and Speech - See Minutes for details. Possibly a committee might be established from Fac.Sen. members to deliberate on this question.

Minutes of the meeting of the Faculty Senate, Tuesday, December 10, 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, Miss Christopher, Dr. Miller, Mrs. Theis, Dr. Witten, Dr. Oliva, Mr. Dalton, Mr. Finnin, and Dr. Garwood, Chairman.

Member Absent: Dr. Sackett.

Also Present: Mr. Kellerman.

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

CHANGES IN CALENDAR DATES. Dean Garwood announced that the date of Commencement had been changed from Friday, June 6, to Monday, June 2. The dates of the final examinations have been changed to May 26, 27, 28, 29 and June 2. Summer school will start Monday, June 9. Our previous schedule was not allowing sufficient time between spring and summer schedules. The interval of six days will permit the Registrar's Office to process the grades and prepare for the summer registration. In addition, the interval of time will permit the custodial services to prepare the residence halls and classrooms for the summer session. The change in our schedule will bring us in line with the other state schools in Kansas.

CHEATING. All members of the Senate have received copies of the study on cheating which was made by the AAUP. Mr. Forsythe, Secretary-Treasurer of the Fort Hays Chapter of the AAUP, had requested that the Faculty Senate appoint a committee from the Student Council to draw up a cheating code.

On Page 8 of the Faculty Handbook, the subject of cheating is discussed as follows:

"It is the responsibility of each faculty member to exercise every possible precaution in the preparation and care of all quizzes and examinations, and in administering them. The faculty member

can reduce to a minimum the cheating in his class by diligent proctoring and by being vigilant at all times.

"Administering the same test or examination semester after semester is encouragement for students to cheat.

"In case of cheating, the faculty member should report the case to the Chairman of the Division and to the Dean of the Faculty. Necessary action will then be taken. Appeals may be made to the Student-Faculty Discipline Review Board."

A number of the Senate members commented that the report of the AAUP revealed nothing which was not already known. It was the consensus of the Senate that the instructor of the class has the major responsibility for the prevention of cheating. Dr. Oliva, who worked with Dr. Sackett in compiling the report, stated that the non cheating student needed to be protected against the student who does cheat. One of the most frequent causes of cheating is the use of the same test again and again. Another member commented that inadequate proctoring during the test leads to cheating by students. Some instructors do not keep their tests under careful surveillance and hence it is possible for students to secure a copy of the test from the instructor's office.

It was moved by Dr. Hamilton that a Senate committee on cheating be appointed to meet with that of the Student Council. Motion seconded by Dr. Thomas. Motion carried. The Senate committee will be composed of the following people: Mr. Ginther, Chairman, Mrs. Popp, Dr. Sackett and Dr. Thomas.

PROPOSAL FOR A TEMPORARY MECHANISM FOR THE ADJUDICATION OF STUDENT-FACULTY DISPUTES.

The following proposal was received from the Division of Language, Literature and Speech.

"A better, indeed the ideal, way for disputes between the students and the faculty to be resolved would be through committees of the Faculty Association, which is the professional organization of the faculty; these committees, one on Professional Rights and Responsibilities and the other on

Ethics, would be charged with the administration of the code of ethics of the education profession. In the meantime, in response to a student request for a mechanism by which disputes between students and faculty can be adjudicated, the Division of Language, Literature, and Speech proposes the following system:

1. All disputes between students and faculty members should, whenever possible, be resolved by the parties themselves.
2. In the event, however, that such disputes cannot be resolved by the parties to them, an appeal may be made to an Investigation Committee, which will be composed of three students appointed by the Associated Student Body President and three faculty members appointed by the President of the College, of whom one student and one faculty member will serve jointly as co-chairmen.
3. If three or more members of the Investigation Committee consider the dispute sufficiently serious to warrant investigation, it will seek to ascertain the facts of the case in private hearings, to which it may invite witnesses to testify, and at which either party or his representative will have the right to cross-examine the witnesses presented by the other.
4. When the Investigation Committee has established the facts in the case, it will lay these facts before an Adjudication Committee, which will be composed of three tenured faculty members appointed by the President of the College, one of whom will serve as chairman.
5. The Adjudication Committee will have the power to make whatever recommendations it considers necessary to resolve the dispute--whether to the parties concerned or to any appropriate agency of the college."

It was pointed out that the proposal was broader in scope than the original proposal drawn up by the Student Council. The purpose of the proposal is to protect students from capricious actions of faculty members. For example, it has been alleged that faculty members may penalize a student by lowering a grade if he differs with a faculty member or protests some action of the faculty member. Mr. Finnin said that students were simply concerned that their voices could be heard without fear of penalty.

The question was raised as to whether a majority or a unanimous vote would be required by the Adjudication Committee or the Investigation Committee. Would

the Investigation Committee challenge the competence of teachers? Mr. Finnin cited a case where the instructor reads for an hour out of a book to his class. He indicated something like this should be challenged. He felt that the students desire better teaching techniques than this.

Dr. Oliva, representing the Social Science Division, stated that the members in his Division were opposed to the proposal because of the broad implications of it. The members of his Division asked the question as to whether problems were now being handled through the channels, i.e., from instructor, to Division Chairman, to the Dean of the Faculty? Is this not a satisfactory way to handle these questions? If these channels are not being utilized, possibly the thing to do is to use them. Would the Investigation Committee involve itself in areas in which it has no legitimate concern?

One member of the Senate noted that this could create a very embarrassing situation for a faculty member if he were being investigated on some question by the committee. Would it not be possible for the student to go to the instructor or his Division Chairman and seek to clear up a difficulty rather than having a committee investigate the problem?

It was asked if there were situations which had been channelled through the faculty member, Division Chairman and Dean of the Faculty. Mr. Finnin said he knew of no case which had been brought before the Dean of the Faculty. Dr. Garwood stated that occasionally students come directly to his office with a problem. For problems of this nature, he will work with the Division Chairman in securing information. In all cases he said he attempted to protect the student from any undue wrath on the part of the faculty member in such a situation yet by the same token he did not want to impugn the honesty of any faculty member without careful study of the problem.

A member of the Senate stated the students' original proposal was a much better proposal and a "milder" proposal than the one we have before us. It was his opinion that the students wanted simple justice and the students were asking for a mechanism to accomplish this purpose. The original proposal asked for representation in making the final decision yet the Senate members turned this proposal down.

One Senate member cited a case where a student failed to take the final examination because he made a mistake in reading the examination schedule as to the time. The instructor refused to give him another final examination and the Division Chairman would not overrule his instructor. The student was given a "U" in the final examination and he was forced to retake the whole course. It was pointed out that mistakes like this do happen and some recognition should be given to the fact there is a possibility of human error. Occasionally a mistake will be made by faculty members - also through human error.

It was suggested that even where such a committee structure is set up, it would be used very infrequently. One Senate member commented that in his judgment 18 and 19 year old students are as competent to make some judgments as are our faculty members. He again pointed out that what the student wants is simple justice and the possibility of having his case reviewed by an impartial group. The students feel that when a problem arises, Division Chairmen tend to side with their faculty members rather than siding with the student. Students come and leave the campus whereas faculty members remain and the problem is one of not arousing animosity within the Division so the students' opinion is that Division Chairmen tend to side with the establishment.

It was suggested that possibly a committee might be established from the Faculty Senate members to deliberate on this question. Other Senate members

Faculty Senate Minutes
December 10, 1968
Page--6

felt that the discussion should be within the Senate itself. Although the importance of grades may be downgraded by some, nevertheless it was pointed out by a member of the Senate^{that} grades are a mark of achievement. A minimum level is a requirement for graduation and they figure into the student's background when he is looking for entrance into professional schools or when seeking a job. Students are concerned that they be graded fairly.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

John D. Garwood, Chairman

Lucille Drees, Recorder