

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

12-10-1973

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 10, 1973

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, 1973" (1973). *Faculty Senate*. 624.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/624

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.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty

FROM: Mrs. Rose Arnhold,
Secretary, Faculty Senate

RE: Faculty Senate Minutes

DATE: December 10, 1973

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Monday, December 10, 1973, at 3:30 P.M. in the Smoky Hill Room of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call:

Members Absent: Mrs. Ilene Allen, Mrs. Vivian Baxter, Dr. Edith Dobbs, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Samuel Hamilton, Dr. Wallace Harris, Miss Kathleen Kuchar

Also present: Ms. Sue Gillum, Mr. Mike Schardein, Mr. Greg Zimmerman, Dr. Price for Dr. Wall, Dr. Sidney Johnson for Mr. Jack Heather, Dr. Norma Herman for Dr. Fleharty, Mr. Scott Brooks

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Dr. Drinan moved that the minutes of the previous meeting be approved. Mr. Rupp seconded the motion. The motion passed with no one in opposition.

III. Announcements:

Dr. Forsythe announced that the major points of business in the meeting of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with Dr. Gustad and Dr. Tomanek on November 16, 1973 were as follows:

The internalization of curriculum matters by the Faculty Senate was discussed. A proposal dealing with this subject would be introduced in today's meeting.

President Gustad and Vice-President Tomanek indicated that release time for the Chairman of Faculty Senate was a possibility and that it would be considered.

The Faculty Senate meeting minutes were being forwarded to President Gustad with a summarization of specific items needing immediate action. This was the procedure developed to expedite Administrative action on Senate recommendations.

Dr. Forsythe requested that the Chairpersons of Faculty Senate Standing Committees not schedule meetings in the next two weeks to allow faculty members ample time to make up exams, grade term papers, etc.

Dr. Forsythe announced that Dr. Tomanek had advised him that a Faculty Senate representative could attend the Council of Deans meetings. Dr. Forsythe requested Dr. Drinan to serve in this capacity. Dr. Drinan accepted.

Dr. Forsythe announced the following committee appointments and explained the purpose of each committee.

1. Faculty Environmental Advisory Committee

I hereby appoint you to the Faculty Environmental Advisory Committee. This committee is to make recommendations to the Long Range Planning Committee. I believe that this is a very important committee. It must plan to meet quickly and make recommendations. If you are unable to serve on this committee, please notify me immediately.

Chairperson: Ms. Leona Pfiefer, Assistant Professor of German
Dr. Gary Hulett, Professor of Biology
Dr. Stanley Robertson, Associate Professor of Physics
Dr. Kenneth R. Baker, Associate Professor of Education
Ms. Phyllis G. Tiffany, Assistant Professor of Psychology
Ex Officio: Dr. Jerry Tomanek, Professor of Biology, Vice-President
for Academic Affairs
Ex Officio: Mr. Walter Keating, Professor of Business, Vice-President
for Administration and Finance

Each of you will bring your expertise to the deliberations. Mr. Keating will be your liaison with the Long Range Planning Committee. Dr. Tomanek represents the academic community. Ms. Pfiefer will be your liaison with the College Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate as that committee deals with long range planning.

2. Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Pre-Enrollment

I hereby appoint you to the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Pre-Enrollment. If you cannot serve, please let me know.

Chairman: Mr. Glen G. Ginther, Assistant Professor of Industrial Arts
Mr. James V. Kellerman, Registrar, Assistant Professor of
Business
Dr. Ervin M. Eltze, Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Mr. David A. Lefurgey, Instructor of Speech
Mrs. Joan Slechta, Instructor of Psychology
Dr. Allan Miller, Assistant Professor of Education
Mr. Jack N. Logan, Instructor of Business
Student to be appointed by Mike Schardein of the Student Senate

The Committee is to evaluate the current pre-enrollment program that is used each semester and to make recommendations concerning the maintenance of the program and any changes that the committee believes should be made or to make recommendations to abolish pre-enrollment and the reasons for the recommendations.

A method of improving pre-enrollment might be to ask faculty to post a list of the hours that they would be available for advising. The list of hours might be scattered over the two week period before actual pre-enrollment. The advisees would sign the list and appear at the designated time. The student would pre-enroll at the time scheduled by the Registrar and obtain class cards.

The Committee should consider all aspects of pre-enrollment. I encourage you to inquire of your colleagues as to difficulties with pre-enrollment and any hardships but also to inquire as to the beneficial aspects of the program.

Your recommendations will go to the College Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate. Mr. Ginther, the chairman of this ad hoc committee, will act as your liaison with the College Affairs Committee.

Please advise Mr. Ginther of your schedule. He will call the first meeting in January.

3. Ad Hoc Committee on Student Advising

I hereby appoint you to the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Advising. If you cannot serve, please let me know.

Dr. William Robinson, Chairman, Professor of Education
Dr. Bill Jellison, Dean of Students, Professor of Education
Dr. James H. McMechan, Associate Professor of Chemistry
Mrs. Katherine I. Bogart, Associate Professor of English
Dr. Ann Liston, Assistant Professor of History

The Committee is to develop a system for advising students who come to Fort Hays State but who have not decided upon a major. The number varies from perhaps 200 to 450 per year. Perhaps seventy-five percent of these advisees will have chosen a major by the end of the year.

I suggest that a core group of general advisors be established to advise these people. Each department should have the opportunity to have a person in the core group. You would have twenty or so advisors with ten to fifteen advisees. This core group should meet occasionally to discuss their work so as to improve their advising. If such a system is developed, the college should send out brochures advising principals and counselors that Fort Hays State has such an advising system and that they should feel at ease about sending one of their students to Fort Hays who has not decided upon a major.

The Committee is also asked to evaluate the current advising process and make suggestions for improvement. Perhaps there should be an occasional meeting of advisors to notify them of changing requirements for teacher certification, college requirements for graduation, employment opportunities, and other information which our departmental advisors should know. They might consider whether or not just anyone could be an advisor. Perhaps departments should evaluate their own advisors, since a poor advisor or one who does not like to advise should not advise. The recommendations are up to the committee, but I strongly believe that our advising should be improved.

The Committee is to report to the Academic Affairs Committee. Dr. Robinson, who will chair the Committee, will also act as liaison with the Academic Affairs Committee.

Please advise Dr. Robinson of your schedule. He will call the first meeting in January.

Dr. Forsythe explained that he, on behalf of Faculty Senate, had attended the Principal-Counselor-Student Conference held on December 4, 1973. His purpose in attending was to welcome the participants and to indicate to them the genuine interest and appreciation Faculty members had for their services.

Dr. Forsythe reported that they had attended the Administrative Council Meeting. The items receiving attention at that meeting were the Board of Regents salary recommendations, the remodeling of Picken Hall, and the energy crisis as it could possibly affect Fort Hays State College.

Dr. Forsythe suggested that the problem of assigning Incompletes possibly deserved the attention of Faculty Senate. He referred to and read the instructions regarding Incompletes as it appears in the Faculty Handbook.

An "I" is given to a student only when the work in a course has not been completed for unavoidable reasons beyond his or her control. When an "I" is given, the instructor must write an explanation of the work yet to be completed on the grade sheet which is filed in the office of the Department Chairman and on the roster filed in the Registrar's Office. At the time the student completes his or her work, the instructor fills out the "removal of incomplete" card in the Registrar's Office.

Dr. Forsythe indicated that the problem of incompletes, the problem of excessive absences, and the excessive number of hours taken by students during a given Semester were all topics deserving of future Faculty Senate attention. He questioned whether or not it was good to allow a student to take 35 to 42 hours per semester.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee approved the proposal for Articulation Agreement Regarding General Education Requirements for transfer students between the Public Community Junior Colleges and the Regents' Institutions of Kansas. Dr. Forsythe explained that the Executive Committee approved the proposal with the understanding that further consideration will be given to the matter by the Academic Affairs Committee. Dr. Forsythe explained that a deadline necessitated the immediate action by the Executive Committee but that any Senate member who had questions regarding the proposal should contact Dr. McCullick.

A Proposal for Articulation Agreement Regarding General Education
Requirements for Transfer Students Between the Public Community
Junior Colleges and the Regents' Institutions of Kansas

"A student who completes an Associate of Arts or an Associate of Science degree based on baccalaureate-oriented sequences at a state and regionally accredited Kansas public community junior college will be accepted with junior standing and will have satisfied the lower division general education requirements of all public four-year institutions of the state."

Points of Clarification

1. General Education to be defined as follows:

General education provides students with facility in the use of the English language and a broad intellectual experience in the major fields of knowledge.

It ensures that each graduate will have experienced some of the content, method and systems of values of the various disciplines which enable man to understand himself and his environment, as dealt with at a level of abstraction beyond that usually found in secondary school studies.

2. This agreement applies only to A.A. and A.S. degree transfers from state and regionally accredited public community colleges in Kansas. The agreement would not include transfers from non-accredited community colleges or any other colleges.

3. Transfer students with the A.A. or A.S. degree would automatically be given junior standing.

4. Each institution will define its own graduation requirements. The receiving institution may build on the program completed by including educational experiences designed to satisfy the students' objectives as well as meeting the degree requirements in a minimum amount of time. Foreign language requirements are viewed as graduation requirements and not as general education requirements for purposes of this agreement.

5. A transfer student may be required to take freshman or sophomore courses to meet particular requirements of a given major or minor.

6. Transfer students could be required to take general education courses normally required of junior and senior students the last two years of their senior college experience.

7. Transfer students preparing for teacher certification must meet the general education requirements as outlined by the State Board of Education. Teacher certification requirements have been incorporated in the degree requirements of most senior colleges. The spirit of the proposed agreement would indicate that transfer students are to be judged in the same way as non-transfer students.

✓ IV. Reports of Standing Committees:

A. Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

Dr. Frerer was absent. The committee had nothing to report at this time.

B. Student Affairs Committee

The Student Affairs Committee report concerned Student Senate Bill 1973-023. (The bill is included in the minutes for the information of the Senate.)

Whereas: the honors at graduation should reflect a student's entire career, and

Whereas: the present system of bestowing honors at graduation may be discriminatory against students in some demanding programs, and

Whereas: some students with lower academic averages can receive maximum honors at graduation, therefore

Be it resolved: that honors at graduation be based strictly on cumulative, over-all grade point averages; exclusive of P.S. service courses taken prior to the pass/no credit ruling

Be it further resolved: that a grade point average of 3.5 qualify for Cum Laude graduation, 3.65 qualify for Magna cum laude graduation, 3.80 qualify for Summa cum laude graduation

Be it further resolved: that upon passage, this bill be sent to the Student Affairs Committee of Faculty Senate for further study

Dr. Marshall reported that his committee had studied the matter of graduating with honors but did not choose to recommend a change of policy.

Dr. Marshall did indicate that his committee wished to see all eligible students notified of their eligibility to do an independent honors project and receive highest possible honors upon graduation.

Dr. Marshall presented for inclusion in the Faculty Senate minutes a summary of the committee deliberations on the Student Senate bill. Dr. Marshall visited with the Registrar and other concerned individuals for comment on Honors graduation policy. The following comments are submitted for the information of the Faculty Senate and without any recommendation. The Chairman of the Faculty Senate asked the Secretary to include them in the minutes for information purposes.

Comments on graduation with honors:

- a) Information concerning the policy should be more widely disseminated.
- b) Perhaps the Registrar could include such information in material sent to students.
- c) Could letters be sent to students with high academic standing, encouraging them to consider possible honors?
- d) Could lists of students having high academic standing be made available to faculty, so that they will be reminded to encourage students and inform them of possible graduation with honors?
- e) At what point in the student program should this encouragement begin?
- f) What is the role of the advisor in this program?
- g) At what level should the Independent Study Project be completed?

C. College Affairs Committee

Miss Veed stated that the College Affairs Committee had nothing to report but that she, as chairperson of the Committee, wished to offer the following resolutions in the form of motions with the understanding that Dr. Forsythe would write an accompanying letter and send to
Governor Docking
Each member of the Board of Regents
Leaders in both Houses of the State Legislature

Resolution 1:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Fort Hays Kansas State College acknowledges the efforts of President John W. Gustad and the Administration of

Fort Hays Kansas State College in their efforts to upgrade faculty salaries and the collegiate program. The Faculty Senate fully supports President Gustad in his appeal to Mr. James W. Bibb, Director, Division of the Budget, to restore the budget increases recommended by the Board of Regents.

Resolution 2:

Be it resolved that the Faculty Senate of Fort Hays Kansas State College acknowledges the efforts of the Board of Regents to upgrade faculty salaries at the state colleges and universities and to maintain quality education. The Board is to be commended for its continued contact with state legislators as the Board endeavors to acquaint legislators with and impress upon them the needs of the state colleges and universities. Faculty salaries are a critical factor in maintaining quality as well as attracting the best qualified faculty for educating the youth of Kansas. The faculty Senate is prepared to work with the Board in any way that it can to aid the Board's efforts.

Mr. Dan Rupp seconded the motion. There was no discussion and the motion passed with no one in opposition.

D. Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. McCullick reported that the Academic Affairs Committee had two proposals to submit for Faculty Senate action. He distributed copies of each.

The first proposal reads:

One of the fundamental concerns of any faculty is curriculum policy. In an attempt to provide the faculty of Fort Hays State with a greater voice in curriculum development and policy the following recommendation is made:

Beginning in the fall semester of 1974 all matters relating to curriculum (New course proposals, change of course title or hours of credit, etc.) will be approved by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate. The Academic Affairs Committee will then present to the Senate for its action all curriculum matters favorably voted upon.

Procedure for handling curriculum matters within the Academic Affairs Committee will be as follows:

- (a) A permanent subcommittee, composed of five members, will initially deal with all curriculum matters. The composition of this committee will be as follows: Three members chosen from the Academic Affairs Committee chosen by the Chairman of the Faculty Senate and the remaining two members to be appointed by the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. These two members may be selected from outside the Senate.
- (b) The appointments are expected to balance the various academic interests of the college.
- (c) The subcommittee will select its own chairperson and secretary.

- (d) The subcommittee will submit to the full committee all curriculum matters favorably acted upon. The full committee will in turn submit to the Faculty Senate all curriculum matters favorably acted upon.
- (e) The Faculty Senate, having received a report on all curriculum matters one week prior to meeting, will then vote to accept, reject, or amend the report of the Academic Affairs Committee.
- (f) The Senate will then submit all approved curriculum matters to the President for his action.

Dr. McCullick moved the proposal be accepted. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Dr. Staven indicated he felt that the term chairperson was unnecessary as a female could be a chairman.

Dr. McCullick stated that the specific terminology in that case was a rather unimportant detail and members could interpret it as they chose.

Dr. Staven questioned how much exposure the proposal had been given.

Dr. McCullick indicated that the departmental representatives to the Academic Affairs Committee had the task of keeping their respective departments informed.

Dr. Robinson explained that he had been absent the meeting at which the matter had been discussed.

Dr. Adams asked whether or not a department would have resource to appeal new course proposals not favorably acted upon.

Dr. McCullick indicated that it would.

Dr. Forsythe said that the affected department could attend the Senate meeting and be recognized by the Chair. This was provided in the By-Laws. You could appeal to the full Senate.

Mr. Campbell asked how curriculum matters were handled at the present.

Dr. McCullick explained that a committee of eight appointed by President Gustad under the chairmanship of Dr. Garwood dealt with curriculum matters. Dr. McCullick indicated that the concern of the Academic Affairs Committee was to make curriculum matters internal to Faculty Senate as they are on the majority of campuses.

Mrs. Hoffman noted that Faculty Senate in the past handled curriculum matters and questioned why this was changed.

Dr. Forsythe indicated that when the New Bylaws were written that Faculty Senate did not include this as a Senate responsibility.

Dr. Marshall reported that Faculty Senate wanted to dispense of this job because it was time-consuming and routine.

Dr. McCullick indicated that while curriculum matters may be both time-consuming and routine they nevertheless should be a primary concern of Faculty Senate.

Mr. Ginther suggested that all new course proposals come before the Faculty Senate proper and the mechanics of this procedure did require much time of Senate members.

Dr. Forsythe reemphasized the fact that Fort Hays Kansas State College was the only school in the state that did not have curriculum matters internal to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Staven suggested he would like to see the issue tabled until the next meeting to allow time for representatives to seek opinion of the various departments.

Dr. McCullick noted that the administration was aware of the Senate's interest in internalizing curriculum matters.

Dr. Drinan asked how the procedure was to be operationalized.

Dr. McCullick noted that the committee would welcome suggestions for change if the proposed procedure was not satisfactory and reiterated that it was the primary concern of this committee to internalize curriculum matters.

Dr. Marshall asked whether or not departments would be notified when courses were being considered for approval.

Dr. McCullick assured him departments would be informed.

Dr. Parish asked whether new courses would be approved by the department chairman and the Dean before coming to Faculty Senate.

Dr. McCullick indicated they would.

Mr. Schardein asked why students were not involved in curriculum matters.

Dr. McCullick indicated he had no personal objection to inclusion of students.

Dr. Staven repeated his desire to have action on the motion delayed until the next meeting.

Mr. Schmeller moved to table the motion.

Dr. Staven seconded the motion to table.

The motion to table passed with one person in opposition.

Dr. Forsythe indicated the matter would be brought to the floor of Faculty Senate under unfinished business at the next regular Senate meeting.

Dr. Adams suggested consideration be given to amending the motion to include student representation.

The second proposal of the Academic Affairs Committee read:

Withdrawal from a Course

Students may withdraw from a course only with the consent of their adviser and instructor. During the full refund period, first full week, students may withdraw without penalty. Between that time and through

half fee-refund period, any time after the 20th, students who obtain permission to withdraw from course work will have those courses marked "W" on their transcript record. After the half fee-refund period, withdrawal will be permitted with a "W" recorded on the transcript record up until two weeks before the end of the term only under one of the following circumstances:

1. When the student's work in the course is of passing grade.
2. When the student is a first semester freshman or undergraduate transfer student.
3. When the student must completely withdraw from school due to extenuating circumstances. (The Registrar's Office will denote on the form total withdrawal.)

Withdrawal is accomplished by filling out a withdrawal form obtained in the Registrar's Office. If a student discontinues attendance in a course without being officially withdrawn, a grade of "U" will be recorded for the course on the transcript record.

Dr. McCullick moved the proposal be accepted.

Dr. Pruitt seconded the motion.

Dr. Drinan asked why the proposal was so complicated.

Dr. Miller suggested that all that the proposal accomplished was a date change.

Dr. Pruitt explained that the deadlines specified in the proposal were consistent with the deadlines in schedules. He pointed out that students according to the proposal could not withdraw from a course unless one of the three conditions were met. Dr. Pruitt explained that there was a division of opinion among faculty members regarding withdrawal and the purpose of the proposal was to give a degree of support to those faculty members wishing to possess a greater degree of control. Faculty members who were not in agreement could sign a withdrawal form any time they wished.

Dr. Adams requested an explanation of the reasoning behind the proposal. He asked if the measure was intended to facilitate bookkeeping, punish students, or what.

Dr. McCullick explained that the proposal reflected a split in philosophy of faculty members regarding withdrawal. Those faculty members who wished to hold the student more accountable could use such a measure while those who felt otherwise could liberally interpret the same.

Dr. Staven remarked that the very fact a student would have to see his advisor would be worth while.

Dr. Pruitt pointed out that there were students who dropped regular courses to pick up mini-courses. With this policy in effect such actions could be averted.

Mr. Schardein asked whether or not the policy would benefit the student.

Dr. McCullick stated he did not personally feel that it would but that some faculty members perceived the policy as designed specifically to help students. He noted the proposal would have the effect of allowing faculty members more latitude.

Dr. Staven remarked that students have in the past desired more advisor exposure and the proposal might bring about that end.

Mrs. Pfeifer suggested that she felt more work could be elicited from students if such a policy were in effect.

Mr. Schardein noted that the advisor should sign the withdrawal and he had no objection to that requirement. However, in his opinion students should have the chance to get out of classes.

Mr. Rupp suggested that perhaps the problem of students enrolling in an excessive number of hours is encouraged by the present withdrawal policy.

Dr. Robinson noted that while the proposed change might be advantageous to the students in certain respects it could also be used against them.

Dr. Marshall suggested that he felt faculty were doing students a disservice by allowing them to withdraw from a class simply because they were not getting an A.

Miss Gillum asked if the present policy posed a strain on faculty members.

Dr. Adams noted that with a tighter withdrawal policy students might very well avoid enrolling in classes they felt they might fail.

Mrs. Pfeifer suggested that the pass/no credit system recently adopted was to alleviate this possibility. She stated that she felt tightening up the withdrawal policy would encourage the student to develop self-discipline.

Dr. Staven stated that the positive side of the question needed examination. Increased student advisor interaction would be beneficial.

Mrs. Popp noted that she advised approximately forth-five students and needed more contact with each if she were to counsel them well.

Miss Veed questioned as to whether or not this was the best way to get students to the advisor.

Dr. Smith noted that even though she was a member of the Academic Affairs Committee she could not agree with the proposal. She said she personally did not wish to have students "locked" in her class who did not wish to be there and did not care to be put in the position of lying to accomplish withdrawal. Dr. Smith was of the opinion that if a student were short in hours because he withdrew that it was the students responsibility. In her opinion teaching responsibility via such stringent policies is a lot of balony.

Dr. Pruitt responded by suggesting many faculty members were missing the intent of the proposal. Instead of approaching it negatively he asked that the positive side be considered. He stated that he felt faculty members on campus were fair and would not use this policy as a weapon. He suggested that the policy was designed to force students to "come to grips" with the situation.

Dr. Drinan moved that the proposal be tabled until the next meeting to allow him to consult his department.

Mr. Lojka seconded the motion.

The motion passed by voice vote.

Dr. McCullick remarked that while the Academic Affairs Committee did not distinguish itself for high production it did raise many significant issues.

V. Unfinished Business:

Dr. Forsythe indicated there was nothing to report regarding unfinished business

• VI. New Business

Mr. Ginther solicited the help of the faculty in reporting unsafe conditions on campus. He announced that beginning in the Spring semester each faculty member would receive a form to report possible unsafe conditions. The reports would be taken by Mr. Ginther to the Safety Committee for action.

Mr. Ginther also suggested that an evaluation of pre-enrollment be done. He noted that the Industrial Arts Department had to dismiss classes to take care of pre-enrollment.

Dr. Forsythe indicated that particularly in the case of departments with laboratory classes it was difficult to find the time for adequate advising.

Dr. Forsythe stated that the two proposals which were tabled would be brought up next meeting under unfinished business.

Miss Gillum suggested that Faculty Senate members contact students for opinion before revising the withdrawal policy.

Dr. Staven moved to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

* Christmas Greetings were extended to the Faculty Senate by the Student Senate.