

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

4-8-1974

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 8, 1974

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, April 8, 1974" (1974). *Faculty Senate*. 628.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/628

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.

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Rose Arnhold, Secretary,
Faculty Senate
RE: Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
DATE: April 8, 1974

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Monday, April 8, 1974, at 3:30 P.M. in the Smoky Hill and the Santa Fe Rooms of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call

Members absent: Dr. Edith Dobbs, Mr. Robert Lowen, Dr. Arris Johnson

Also present: Mr. Robert Smith for Mr. Marc Campbell, Mr. Louis Caplan for Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. William Thompson, Dr. Doug Heeter, Ms. Sharon Barton, Ms. Vera Thomas, Dr. Ann Liston, Dr. John Hocutt, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. James Costigan, Ms. Katherine Rogers, Dr. Bill Jellison, Dr. Elizabeth Hodges, Mr. David Ison, Ms. Cynthia Hartman, Ms. Janie Huffaker, Mr. Mike Wilcox, Ms. Barb Broeckelman, Ms. Sue Gillum, Mr. Jim Munsey, Mr. Steve Major, Mr. Mike Schardein, Mr. Al Link, Mr. Rick Rice

*Names of other individuals in attendance were not recorded because they arrived after the meeting convened.

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

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

III. Announcements

Dr. Forsythe reminded those present that departmental elections to the Senate must be held by April 19, 1974. The departments should forward the results of the election to Dr. Forsythe as soon as completed. Those Senators with expiring terms were listed in the February minutes.

Dr. Forsythe reported on his several meetings with President Gustad. Dr. Forsythe stated that President Gustad had agreed with all the Senate actions at the January, February and March meetings with the exception of the action placing curriculum within the Faculty Senate. Dr. Gustad suggested that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee members meet with him to discuss possible alternatives.

Dr. Forsythe reported that President Gustad suggested that it was unnecessary for a faculty member to be on campus full time in the event he/she is employed only part-time as so frequently is the case in summer. A faculty member might have a responsibility such as a thesis meeting. President Gustad said that it is hard to convince people that professors are also hired to think, to read, and to research.

Dr. Forsythe stated that he had discussed with President Gustad the necessity of preplanning if faculty members are expected to participate in recruitment efforts.

Dr. Forsythe reported that according to President Gustad salary notices should be distributed either today or within the next few days.

Dr. Forsythe noted that while Dr. Gustad approved in principle with the evaluative criteria formulated by the Faculty Senate as the Criteria identified the areas for evaluation, he nevertheless prefers adjectives to the use of percentages in the evaluative guidelines. He does not like strictly quantitative information on the faculty. He wants to know if they are excellent,

good, or bad. He said that faculty are hired to teach and that is their prime responsibility. Research and community activities is just a little extra beyond what people are hired to do.

Dr. Tomanek asked Dr. Forsythe if Faculty Senate approval was needed to change the location of graduation exercises from Lewis Field to the Gross Memorial Coliseum. Dr. Forsythe suggested to Dr. Tomanek that this was not a decision to be made by Faculty Senate. Dr. Forsythe jokingly pointed out that it would certainly affect faculty members as the probability of graduation exercises being cancelled due to rain was drastically diminished.

Dr. Forsythe reported that a central reproduction and duplication center is being considered at Fort Hays Kansas State College and is to become effective July 1, 1974. The proposed center is seen as a means to save an estimated \$20,000.00. Dr. Forsythe pointed out that all department chairmen and all members of the Council of Deans opposed such a move. Dr. Forsythe noted that his opposition to the action (one reason) was that it was a major policy decision that was made without Faculty consultation.

Dr. Forsythe reminded those present that Junior College registration will be held on April 11, 1974.

Dr. Forsythe informed Faculty members that they could purchase tickets to the luncheon on April 23, 1974, and be present for the Phillips Oil Company presentation of paintings to the college. He urged those who could to attend.

Dr. Forsythe reported that the Council of Presidents are discussing and studying the proposal of allowing female athletes to participate in out-of-state competition.

Dr. Forsythe requested that departments advise their deans regarding ideas and plans for advertising. The President must have this information very soon.

Dr. Forsythe noted that both Pittsburg State and Kansas State University are discussing collective bargaining.

Dr. Forsythe also noted that the 1976 Fiscal year is being discussed and that departmental feedback on the subject is requested by Mr. Keating. Departments should be requesting additional Civil Service positions and requesting material needed for program expansion.

Dr. Forsythe reported that Dr. Stewart is still working on the Faculty Activities Report.

Dr. Forsythe reported on his meeting with Mr. Lynn Rogers regarding matters discussed at the last Faculty Senate meeting. Mr. Rogers indicated that there is no faculty discount given on books except in the cases where faculty members create a scene and/or insist on receiving such discount. He suggested that if Faculty Senate would move against such a practice it would please the Trading Post Book Store personnel. Also, Mr. Rogers noted that the only individuals who seem to receive free food are those who receive it as part of their job benefits as they are required to be on duty at all times and that the Regents, Mr. Bibb, Mr. Keating, and the Internal Revenue Service are aware of the practice which dates back to 1958.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Alumni Association was recognizing an outstanding Senior female and an outstanding Senior male this year with the Torch Award. The Association guidelines state that the Chairman and Vice-Chairman

of the Faculty Senate and three individuals appointed by the Chairman will serve on the Committee. Dr. Forsythe and Dr. Drinan will serve, and Dr. Forsythe appointed Ms. Baxter, Dr. Parish and Ms. Powell to select the two recipients.

Dr. Forsythe announced the establishment of an AD HOC Committee on Fees and Program Change. The following memorandum was distributed to those present.

TO: AD HOC Committee on Fees and Program Change
FROM: Dr. James L. Forsythe, Chairman, Faculty Senate
DATE: March 28, 1974

I hereby appoint the following Ad Hoc Committee to develop a program on fees and program change and to report the recommended program to me. The committee members are:

Chairperson: Ms. Nancy Popp, Assistant Professor of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

Mr. Donald E. Barton, Instructor of Industrial Arts

Mr. Dale Ficken, Assistant Professor of Art

Mr. Ronald J. Fundis, Assistant Professor of Sociology

Dr. Norma J. Herman, Assistant Professor of Biology

Ex Officio: Mr. Walter E. Keating, Vice-President for Business and Finance

Ex Officio: Mr. James Kellerman, Registrar

Ex Officio: Mr. Robert S. Crissman, Associate Professor of Business

Student: Mr. Al Link

Student: Mr. Michael Schardein

The committee will elect its own secretary.

The committee should determine the practicality of asking the President to change the fee structure from its existing pattern to one where a charge of \$10 per credit hour will be made. Other fees, such as Memorial Union and the PE complex, would be extra. I would also like the committee to consider recommending to the President a fee charge of perhaps \$3 per each add and withdrawal. Students are allowed to pre-enroll to get the class they desire, but they persist in changing once the semester begins, thus aborting the pre-enrollment and advisement process. The existing system works great difficulties as classes close, students drop, and there are vacancies. The committee should also consider that there are some unusual circumstances that must be accommodated, such as the assigning of sections in certain Music classes which are accomplished by adds by the department.

The committee should also consider whether or not the college should limit the number of hours that a student may take. If the college charges \$10 per hour, this will prevent high credit hour enrollments, but students may need to take more hours and will be willing to pay the extra charges. I suggest that the committee consider a range of 15-17 hours as a normal load, with permission to take 18 or more hours. The permission would be granted by the advisor and someone from the administration. Simple departmental permission could get out of hand as a department, desiring greater student credit hour production, could conceivably allow individuals to take all the hours they wanted without considering past performance and the needs of the student.

The final date of withdrawal is still a problem, and I suggest to the committee that it consider recommending that the last date for withdrawal be moved back one week from the present date. This would prevent the unduly heavy burden on the Registrar's office and the computer at the time final rosters are being compiled. The committee should also consider not allowing any changes by pre-enrolled students during the first week of class. New students could add by the normal enrollment procedure.

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had received thanks from Ms. Sally Ward regarding faculty participation in the Tiger Parent Safari weekend. Dr. Forsythe noted that the point stressed by him when addressing the Parents was the quality of instruction received at Fort Hays State. He met each parent in attendance. The chief question asked Dr. Forsythe by parents related to classroom instruction and the quality of instruction.

Dr. Forsythe reminded Senate members and others in attendance about the decorum on debate in the Senate. He noted that while anyone present could be recognized by the chair only Senate members could vote. He asked that remarks be addressed to the chair and not to other individuals and cautioned all to wait to speak until recognized.

Dr. Forsythe announced that applications for enrollment at Fort Hays for the Fall are running about 100 ahead of last year.

IV. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Pre-Enrollment:

Mr. Ginther reported that the committee would have a report ready for the May Senate meeting.

Ad Hoc Committee on Student Advising:

Dr. Robinson reported that the committee would have a report ready for the May Senate meeting.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Student Affairs Committee

Dr. Marshall indicated that the Committee had nothing to report at this time.

B. Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

Dr. Frerer indicated that the committee had nothing to report at this time.

C. College Affairs Committee

Ms. Veed,,referring to the document entitled "Evaluative Criteria for Faculty Performance and Tenure" which had been distributed at an earlier Senate meeting, moved that the statement "Tenure would be reviewed" be changed to "The Performance of Tenured faculty should be reviewed periodically." Mr. Heather seconded the motion.

Evaluative Criteria for Faculty Performance and Tenure
Subcommittee on Tenure and Competency

Basic Assumption: That Evaluative criteria for faculty be concerned with performance in an assigned position.

I. Evaluation of Teaching

A. Suggested Methods of Assessment

1. Opinions and comments of graduates
2. Unsolicited student assessment that contains "hard evidence."
3. On-campus peer assessment.
4. Off-campus peer assessment.

II. Research

A. Suggested Methods of Assessment

1. Shall be beyond the scope of basic class preparation and general use.
2. Evidence of continuous production.

III. Service

A. Types of Performance

1. On-campus activities.
2. Off-campus activities.
 - a. Related to assigned position.
 - b. Non-related activities.

Some suggestions regarding tenure:

1. A review of a faculty member's performance at the end of his first year on campus with subsequent recommendations for improvement.
2. An assessment of a faculty member's performance should be made each year thereafter until the final sixth year.
3. The performance of tenured faculty should be reviewed periodically.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that the motion was that this was recommended Criteria which a department could use as each department should have some evaluative criteria so that faculty members in each department would know how they are evaluated. Departments are not required to act but it is recommended.

Dr. Forsythe called for further discussion. There was no further discussion.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Ms. Veed moved that "Faculty Senate is opposed to the centralization of duplicating." Dr. Frerer seconded the motion.

Dr. Forsythe called for discussion.

Dr. Drinan asked whether this motion if passed would allow for a partial centralization of duplicating services. Ms. Veed answered it would.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

D. Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. Jack McCullick moved that the general education as distributed be adopted. Dr. Miller seconded the motion. The proposal under discussion reads as follows:

General Education Program

Section A: Distribution of Requirements

I. Communications: 6 hours

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------|
| A. English Composition I | 3 hours |
| B. English Composition II | 3 hours |

II. Area Studies: 36 hours

A. The Humanities: 12 hours

Students must take a total of 12 hours from the area of the Humanities. (1) No more than six hours may be taken in any single department. This rule does not apply to the department of English where only one three-hour course may be taken under this category. (2) Courses must be taken from at least three different departments. The departments are: English, Speech, Foreign Languages, Art, Music, and Philosophy

General Education Program (con't)

B. The Natural Sciences: 12 hours

Students must take a total of 12 hours from the area of the Natural Sciences. (1) No more than six hours may be taken in any single department. (2) Courses must be taken from at least three different departments. The departments are: Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, and Earth Sciences.

C. The Social and Behavioral Sciences: 12 hours

Students must take a total of 12 hours from the area of the Social and Behavioral Sciences. (1) No more than six hours may be taken in any single department. (2) Courses must be taken from at least three different departments. The departments are: Psychology, Sociology, History, Political Science and Economics.

Section B: General

- (1) Each of the departments listed under area studies will be asked to submit a maximum of three courses for inclusion in the General Education offerings. If this should constitute an undue hardship, the department may show cause and the General Education Committee may take appropriate action.
- (2) The General Education Committee as presently constituted will continue in operation during the Academic Year 1974/75. It will provide continuity and direction for the new program.
- (3) The make-up of the General Education Committee for the Academic Year 1975/76 is envisioned as follows:
 - a) The Chairman of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will submit to the President a slate of candidates which may include, but shall not be limited to, members of the Faculty Senate.
 - b) From this slate of candidates the President of the College will select the members of the General Education Committee as follows: one representative from each of the four "old" divisions (Education, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social and Behavior Sciences), and a fifth representative who will also be a member of the Faculty Senate's Academic Affairs Committee, this member to serve as a liaison person between the two committees.
 - c) The Student Senate will submit to the President a slate of candidates from which one undergraduate student and one graduate student will be selected to serve on the General Education Committee. The undergraduate student cannot be a transfer student.
 - d) The Chairman of the General Education Committee shall be the Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts.

Dr. Forsythe noted that before discussion began on the General Education Proposal it should be noted that general education does not contain physical education. Dr. Forsythe also noted that President Gustad does not support required physical education but that it appears necessary at this time. President Gustad suggested that the physical education requirement be retained for at least two more years and that during that period of time it be debated by Faculty Senate with recommendations to continue at four hours, to reduce, or to eliminate the requirement. Dr. Forsythe has transmitted this information to Dr. Drinan so that a committee can be appointed

during the next school year. President Gustad has also indicated to Dr. Forsythe and to Dr. Bogue the desire to make changes in physical education to make it more relevant and more useful in later life.

Dr. McCullick stated that the general education proposal was the culmination of much debate between the general education committee and the Academic Affairs Committee. He then introduced Dr. William Thompson who addressed the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Thompson thanked the Faculty Senate for inviting him to present his thoughts on the general education proposal. He conveyed to those present his desire to institute a general education program that would best serve the students and the college. He stated that his position was not necessarily fixed and that he hoped polarization of faculty on the matter could be diminished.

Dr. Thompson stated that President Gustad wanted a more structured program and a philosophy of general education developed which would devolve on strategies of learning. Dr. Thompson suggested that what we did four years ago was not necessarily bad. He noted that Fort Hays State as well as the other five schools got away from enumerating specific courses and course sequences. The other schools, however, did not go as far as did Fort Hays State. For example, in communication Kansas State requires 9 hours, Kansas University requires 11 hours, Wichita State requires 8 hours, Emporia requires 9 hours, and Pittsburg requires 9 hours whereas Fort Hays State only 3 hours.

Dr. Thompson reported that an examination of Junior College requirements in communication reveals that Dodge City requires 8 hours, Kansas City Junior College requires 8 hours, Colby requires 9 hours, Butler County requires 8 hours and Hutchinson Junior College requires 9 hours.

Dr. Thompson reported that in the area of the Humanities Emporia requires 8 hours, Pittsburg State requires 9 hours; Fort Hays State requires 6 hours. In the area of Natural Sciences and Mathematics Emporia requires 8 hours, Pittsburg 9; and Fort Hays State requires 6 hours. In Social and Behavioral Sciences Emporia requires 9 hours, Pittsburg requires 9 hours and Fort Hays State requires 6 hours.

Dr. Thompson directed the Faculty Senate's attention to Senate Bill #882 which directs Regents institutions to pay attention to career development. He then noted that one of the five stated objectives in the Fort Hays State Catalogue is "to help students make a living." Dr. Thompson noted that the 1930's were characterized by a static nature, the 1940's by a boom, the 1950's by a static nature and the 1960's by a boom financed largely by the federal government. He suggested that the 1970's reflect largely a static state in academe.

Dr. Thompson indicated that he was aware of the fact that considerable dissatisfaction existed with the general education proposal because it omits the professional department. He pointed out that the liberal arts in a static period will accrue few majors and therefore will get the "spin-off" from other departments. He suggested that the liberal arts must be kept alive and that employers still preferred students with a liberal arts background to students without. Dr. Thompson noted that at Chadron State in Nebraska the foreign language department has been deleted. Dr. Thompson pointed out that anything we bleed off of a department will have the effect of hurting all. He ended his remarks by humorously suggesting that referees were on their way in for the debate.

Dr. Forsythe asked for members to engage in full debate before offering amendments. He said that he would enforce Robert's Rules of Order so if there was an early amendment he would restrict debate to the motion. He urged full debate so all the issues could be discussed.

Ms. MacFarland reported that the English Department curriculum committee and the English Department unanimously agreed that instead of requiring English Composition I and English Composition II that a choice be given to students to select either English Composition II or Technical writing.

Dr. Frerer asked whether writing courses in other departments had been considered.

Dr. McCullick noted that Business also engages in much writing and asked Ms. Vera Thomas what the enrollment was in the business writing course.

Ms. Thomas answered that it was approximately sixty.

Dr. McCullick suggested that perhaps the business writing course be considered as well as technical writing or Composition II.

Ms. Sue Gillum asked why the general education proposal limited communication to written communication. She questioned why oral communication was not recognized.

Dr. Smith noted that she, too, was of the opinion that every college student should be required to take a speech course. Dr. Smith indicated that it was her understanding that the Speech department preferred not to include such provision.

Dr. Costigan remarked That the Speech Department had not taken that position and he did not know the source of the information. He said that the Speech Department does offer such courses and could offer more but the decision was made to support their current level of offerings for this year.

Dr. Drinan stated that given the deliberations in the General Education Committee the possibility of departments petitioning for substitute courses existed. That is the purpose of the General Education Committee.

Dr. Robinson asked whether or not Dr. Drinan was suggesting that departments petition the committee regarding both written and oral communication.

Dr. Parish indicated that departments could specify what they felt would best serve their majors.

Ms. Gillum asked whether students would then be bound by department decision.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the affirmative.

Dr. Wall noted that because the business department was not represented on the General Education Committee he felt they might have difficulty in terms of petitioning the committee.

Dr. Drinan remarked that there would be no reason for the General Education Committee to be either rigid nor uncooperative. The entire function of the General Education Committee is to facilitate the General Education program.

Mr. Schardein noted that departments were perhaps more capable regarding selecting courses that would best serve their majors. He noted that students would generally agree that department selections would be preferable over college-wide requirements.

Dr. Staven asked why the Faculty Senate didn't allow the students to decide the matter.

Dr. McCullick pointed to a possible difficulty that could be encountered in the case of the non-major student. Some people do not decide on a major until they are juniors.

Mr. Ginther noted that students who have not declared a major until relatively late and students who change majors might well be caught in the cross-fire because of conflicting departmental requirements in general education.

Ms. Cynthia Hartman, a member of the General Education Committee, pointed out that the second course was to be taken the junior year so those problems mentioned by Mr. Ginther and Dr. McCullick might not be of as serious magnitude as we might originally think.

Mr. Caplan noted that it was a policy in many colleges and universities to require a student to take composition I and then require an additional course in composition only if the student did not achieve an A or B grade.

Dr. Drinan noted that on the Fort Hays campus proficiency tests allow students to receive credit for hours without taking the classes specified.

Dr. Parish explained that all students enrolled in English Composition I are given the proficiency test the first class period and are automatically given credit for composition I if they score high enough.

Ms. Veed noted that while the rationale for the new general education proposal was to arrive at a more structured program she would like to see how the move being debated would provide this structure.

Dr. McCullick noted that the proposed general education program would force the student to spread himself into more areas and therefore provides greater structure.

Dr. Fleharty added that additional structure is also derived from limiting the number of general education courses.

Dr. Costigan remarked that while this is a good idea for the Natural Sciences and the Social and Behavioral Sciences he questioned how humanities would fare. He stated he preferred to think of Fundamentals of Speech and Fundamentals of Interpersonal Communication as basic communication courses.

Ms. Hoffman stated that the limitation of not more than six hours in one department was limiting in light of the fact that the Placement Office is pushing toward more specialization.

Dr. Adams pointed out that the limitation of six hours in a single department referred only to general education credit and that students could still pick up areas of concentration.

Dr. Staven questioned why, when Dr. Thompson noted the other colleges required 9 hours in these areas, that Fort Hays State via this proposal was considering twelve hours.

Dr. Drinan suggested that other proposals were considered by the committee and that while there is nothing sacred about the number twelve it was used because it would channel approximately one-third of a student's work in general education.

Mr. Ginther distributed copies of a modified proposal similar to the general education committee and the academic affairs committee proposal. Mr. Ginther noted that this proposal required nine hours instead of twelve, and allows for more electives. The proposal reads as follows:

GENERAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Section A: Distribution of Requirements

- I. Communications: 6 hours
 - A. English Composition I 3 hours
 - B. English Composition II 3 hours
- II. Area Studies: 36 hours
 - A. The Humanities: 9 hours
Students must take a total of 9 hours from the area of the Humanities.
(1) No more than six hours may be taken in any single department.
This rule does not apply to the department of English where only one three-hour course may be taken under this category. (2) Courses must be taken from at least two different departments. The departments are: English, Speech, Foreign Languages, Art, Music, Philosophy.
 - B. The Natural Sciences: 9 hours
Students must take a total of 9 hours from the area of the Natural Sciences. (1) No more than six hours may be taken in any single department. (2) Courses must be taken from at least two different departments. The departments are: Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics, Earth Sciences.
 - C. The Social and Behavioral Sciences: 9 hours
Students must take a total of 9 hours from the area of the Social and Behavioral Sciences. (1) No more than six hours may be taken in any single department. (2) Courses must be taken from at least two different departments. The departments are: Psychology, Sociology, History, Political Science, Economics.
 - D. Elective Courses: 9 hours
Students must take a total of 9 hours of elective general education courses. These courses may be selected from any of the approved general education courses from any department.

Section B: General

- I. Each of the departments listed under area studies (A, B, and C) will be asked to submit a maximum of three courses for inclusion in the General Education offerings. If this should constitute an undue hardship, the department may show cause and the General Education Committee may take appropriate action.
- II. All departments on campus other than those listed in area studies (A, B, and C) are entitled to offer for elective general education a maximum of one course.
- III. The General Education Committee as presently constituted will continue in operation during the Academic Year 1974/75. It will provide continuity and direction for the new program.
- IV. The make-up of the General Education Committee for the Academic Year 1975/76 is envisioned as follows:
 - A. The Chairman of the Faculty Senate and the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate will submit to the President a slate of candidates which may include, but shall not be limited to, members of the Faculty Senate.
 - B. From this slate of candidates the President of the College will select the members of the General Education Committee as follows: One representative

General Education Program (con't)

from each of the four "old" divisions (Education, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences), and a fifth representative who will also be a member of the Faculty Senate's Academic Affairs Committee, this member to serve as a liaison person between the two committees.

- C. The Student Senate will submit to the President a slate of candidates from which one undergraduate student and one graduate student will be selected to serve on the General Education Committee. The undergraduate student cannot be a transfer student.
- D. The Chairman of the General Education Committee shall be the Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts.

Dr. Forsythe asked whether or not Mr. Ginther was seeking consideration of the new proposal as an alternative.

Mr. Ginther answered in the affirmative but that he was not offering it as an amendment only as an item to be considered in the debate.

Mr. Schardein indicated that another fear of the students was that by requiring twelve hours in each of the areas it would require over four years to graduate. Mr. Schardein suggested that from the standpoint of the student a nine hour requirement would be more palatable than a twelve hour requirement.

Dr. Miller questioned what Industrial Arts as a department would offer.

Mr. Ginther suggested that the philosophy of the new proposal included the premise that there were departments outside of Liberal Arts that were capable of offering general education courses.

(Round of applause)

Dr. Wall questioned whether or not the proposal in question would work a hardship on transfer students.

Dr. Forsythe reported that an item that had been discussed by the Council of Chief Academic Officers suggested that any person transferring from a Junior College would automatically met the general education requirements, but this never passed COCAO.

Dr. Wall questioned whether the individuals receiving A.A. degrees from Fort Hays State would come under this same ruling.

Mr. Jack Logan expressed the idea that if the proposal passes Fort Hays State will turn into a Junior/Senior institution because more students will attend a Junior College which requires a twenty-three hour general education program.

Dr. Frerer stated that while forcing students to spread into other areas was consistent with the liberal education philosophy the limitation of departments to three general education courses is questionable. He cited Speech as being not one department but a collection of four separate departments. He stated that the limitation of three general education courses would have the effect of entirely leaving out one of the areas in Speech.

Dr. Fleharty pointed out that the President would not approve of any program where the student was so limited.

Dr. Drinan explained that the General Education Committee did discuss three courses per department in an attempt to arrive at a place where appeals were possible. He reiterated the idea that there is no reason to assume or to expect the committee to be hostile to appeals. He explained that the entire philosophy of the General Education Committee is to put the burden of proof on departments. Each department will be encouraged to devise its own general education courses in a flexible manner.

Dr. Forsythe interjected the comment that President Gustad foresaw a two or three year period necessary to develop these general education courses. Departments will have to devise general education courses, not just offer the general survey courses.

Dr. Staven asked whether or not implementation of the proposal, in the event it passed, would be a violation of contract with students.

Dr. Forsythe noted that it seemed that there might have been court cases that demonstrated that a student who enrolls under certain catalog conditions can demand to graduate under that contract, but he was not sure.

Dr. Staven suggested this matter be checked out completely before pursuing any line of action.

Dr. McCullick noted that if one department needs another department's offering and it is not designated general education then the department providing the class should assume responsibility for petitioning to have the course designated general education.

Mr. Caplan asked how many courses above three could be added and questioned how rigid this formula would be.

Dr. McCullick noted that if the proposal had read "a reasonable number" instead of three courses the same debate would have ensued.

Ms. Gillum reported that the proposal had been brought up in Student Senate, tabled for one week to facilitate students studying it, and had been opposed by Student Senate. She remarked that the success of the proposal would require her to spend four and one-half years to get a degree in nursing. Ms. Gillum stated that one of the appealing features of Fort Hays Kansas State College is its lack of rigidity and the fact that students are not only allowed but encouraged to develop their own program in a flexible environment. She expressed the belief that reintroducing a highly structured program would have the effect of discouraging students from attending.

Dr. Miller pointed out that a department can encourage cognate courses and the fact that there are still elective hours. The proposal is very flexible.

Ms. Popp suggested that pleasing people is much less important than establishing a quality institution. In her estimation the quality of a college, not how easy it is, holds much more appeal for potential students.

Dr. Marshall asked whether or not general education courses can be applied to a minor.

Dr. Forsythe noted there are no designated minors at Fort Hays State.

Mr. Ison distributed a memo from his English Department Curriculum Committee and pointed out that for students wanting to build a second major or area there is still considerable room to specialize. Mr. Ison continued by stating that para-professional or professional courses do not deserve general education credit. He cited

as an example students needing business communications should take it in addition to the core general education requirements. He was of the opinion that broadening the requirement of English Composition II or Technical writing to include other courses undermines the attempt of the proposal.

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: David L. Ison, Chairman, English Department Curriculum Committee
RE: General Education Committee Proposal

The English Department Curriculum Committee had read and discussed the General Education Program proposal recommended by Professors Bill Thompson and Jack McCullick carefully, paying specific attention to the suggested requirements in composition. It was the feeling of the committee that the proposal must surely have been written without adequate information on the basis of course work in composition offered by the English Department. Thus, a motion within the committee was unanimously passed that the requirement for a second three-hour course in composition be modified to allow choice of Composition II or Technical and Report Writing. This Curriculum Committee proposal was presented to the English Department during its regular meeting on 1 April 1974 and was passed unanimously by the entire department.

The reasons underlying the acceptance of an alternative course to Composition II are:

1. General Education courses should be designed with appropriateness to student needs (though not necessarily demands!) foremost in mind.
2. General Education composition courses must provide both theory and practical experience in writing for students; such courses should also have immediate carry-over value for the students' chosen majors, regardless of academic discipline.
3. The necessary theory of rhetoric is provided in Composition I. It is a basic course valuable to all students, save those whose writing competency is such that they may test out of the course.
4. Composition II emphasizes exposition and argumentation with practical writing experience designed to increase matters of style and form; it is designed specifically for students whose majors belong to the humanities.
5. Technical and Report Writing is designed with similar rhetorical principles and emphases, but for non-humanities majors.
6. Technical and Report Writing has been requested by the departments in the Sciences, Business and Economics, Industrial Arts, Psychology, and Agri-Business--possibly others may use the course for their majors. The English Department should not now be placed in an unfavorable relationship with those departments whose students now use Technical and Report Writing by the arbitrary stipulated requirement of Composition II as indicated by the General Education Proposal being now considered.

Mr. Al Link expressed the opinion that requiring students to spread into various areas was not objectionable but he feared that all departments would develop introductory courses, label them general education and thereby lower the quality of education.

Dr. Forsythe stated that President Gustad would not agree with such action. President Gustad's definition of a general education course would not be met in an introductory course. President Gustad wants general education courses developed.

Dr. Drinan stated that the members of the general education committee did not intend to have a department state that students will now have to take forty-two hours in addition to what you now take. The way the committee envisioned the process working was to encourage the departments to decide the needs of students. For most departments Composition II or Technical Writing will satisfy needs but flexibility is important. Essentially what the committee is attempting to do is to tell departments to reevaluate courses, needs, and cognate courses.

Dr. Frerer argued that the proposal is one-hundred times more rigid than what we now have and that he personally felt the proposal should be flexible.

Dr. Robinson stated that he saw Mr. Ginther's alternative proposal as being a compromise and that on this basis it deserved consideration.

Ms. Allen remarked that Mr. Ginther's alternative proposal would be most pleasing and acceptable to the Nursing department. Nursing questioned several features about the general education committee proposal such as the limitation of communication to written communication, the additional time the proposal would require of students to complete a degree, and the discouragement of depth by requiring that students select from three departments. Also, Ms. Allen questioned why nursing was being omitted from representation on the committee. The memorandum sent to members of Faculty Senate from the Nursing Department reads as follows:

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Faculty of Nursing
RE: Review of proposed General Education Program

The proposed program was discussed by the Faculty of Nursing on April 1, 1974. The following concerns and suggestions were expressed.

Section A: Distribution of Requirements

What characterizes a general education course to qualify as a general education course?

What is the rationale behind the organization of the proposed program and the credit hour allocation?

Why are the courses under - I. Communications - not included under - II. Area Studies - English?

If the term "Communications" is necessary, why is it only written communication?

Dependent upon which courses are included in the General Education offerings, the program could require as much as 15 additional hours for nursing students with the distribution as follows:

Communications - 3 hours	Natural Sciences - 3 hours
Humanities - 6 hours	Social & Behavioral Sciences - 3 hours

Demands and difficulties would be increased for the registered nurse students in our program who sometimes commute from distances as far as 100 miles.

A philosophy and objectives for the program would be most helpful.

Nursing Department Memo (con't)

Why should all students be required to select courses from at least three different departments under each of the Area Studies? It could be more helpful to some students to be able to concentrate these hours in primarily one department.

Is this program not adding restraints to opportunities for individual decision-making and choice for students? Could this have a projected effect of further decreased enrollment?

Section B: General

Why select members of the General Education Committee from the four "old" divisions rather than the "new"? (Were there not five divisions with Nurse Education as one of them?)

Why isn't there representation from the Faculty of Nursing on the committee?

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that President Gustad had appointed members of the General Education Committee and that the Academic Affairs Committee was comprised of individual Senate members who indicated a preference to serve on that particular committee.

Dr. McCullick then asked whether or not the General Education Committee's proposal comes closer to certification requirements than the program under which we are presently operating.

Dr. Staven answered in the affirmative.

Dr. McCullick suggested that perhaps the 9 hour requirement would be more amenable than the suggested 12 hour requirement.

Dr. Forsythe cautioned that according to Robert's Rules of Order individuals can't speak against their own motion and Dr. McCullick had made the motion.

Mr. Heather charged that the proposal is suggesting adoption of a highly restrictive program and that department feedback should be secured before further action is taken.

Dr. Drinan suggested that perhaps the language should reveal more flexibility.

Mr. Heather stated that while Dr. Drinan read flexibility into the program he could not speak for the entire committee.

Dr. Forsythe indicated that the President had requested the Senate to develop general broad guidelines. The detail would be filled in. President Gustad had indicated that the General Education Program was like building a ballpark. You define the area, the limits, and then you work out the rest.

Dr. Miller asked how many hours are involved in a nursing degree.

Ms. Allen answered that there are approximately 50 general education hours and 70 nursing hours.

Dr. Wall noted that in his department there was also concern because there were hours required in terms of developing a major, in terms of meeting general education requirements and finally hours required by the State Board of Accounting.

Dr. Frerer suggested that consideration be given to requiring 9 hours in Communication, 9 hours in Natural Sciences and Mathematics, 9 in the Humanities and 9 in the Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Dr. Drinan indicated that he would see this as a friendly amendment if anyone wished to suggest it.

Dr. Drinan offered as a friendly amendment the following: Change Section B (1) to read "submit a limited number of courses". The friendly amendment was accepted.

Dr. Staven pointed out that one and one half hours had been given to the debate on this issue. He was of the opinion that perhaps Senate should adjourn and reconvene to decide the issue.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that three possibilities existed. Senate could call a recess and reconvene later in the evening or some near time; the Senate could adjourn and the Executive Committee could call a special meeting to debate and resolve only this one issue; or Senate could adjourn and carry the issue over to the May meeting.

Dr. Staven moved that Senate adjourn and the Executive Committee call a special meeting at a later date. Ms. Popp seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 P.M.