

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

3-8-1976

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 8, 1976

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, March 8, 1976" (1976). *Faculty Senate*. 652.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/652

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: Vera Thomas, Secretary
Faculty Senate
RE: Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
DATE: March 8, 1976

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Monday, March 8, 1976, 3:30 p.m., Santa Fe Room, Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call and Approval of Minutes.

Members Absent: Mr. Robert Brown, Mr. Keith Campbell, Mr. Isaac Catt, Mr. Donald Jacobs, Ms. June Krebs, Ms. Esta Lou Riley, Dr. Lavier Staven, Dr. Steven Tramel, Dr. Charles Votaw.

Also Present : Ms. Ellen Veed for Dr. Charles Votaw.
Students: Mr. Ed Barker, Mr. Gary Hennerberg, Ms. Emily Megaffin, Ms. Susan Morrison, Ms. Kristi Parry.

The minutes of the February 9 meeting were approved.

II. Announcements by Senate President.

- A. Policy-making Process - The question was raised at the February 9 meeting concerning the procedure which will be used by the administration of the college to react to recommendations which come to it from the Faculty Senate. On February 11 President Tomanek sent a memorandum to the Faculty Senate President indicating that all academic matters probably should go to the Office of Vice President for Academic Affairs, while all administrative (other than academic) and financial matters should go to the Vice President for Administration and Finance. Student personnel matters should go to the Dean of Students.

The reactions of President Tomanek to all actions taken by the Senate since November 11 are listed below:

November 11, 1975, Minutes

Page 5--Sick Leave--I heartily approve the philosophy behind the statement, but we need to get Regents' funding.

Page 5--Part-time Faculty--I am in sympathy with the motion by Dr. Frerer, but will need to check with Mr. Keating and perhaps even the Board of Regents to see if we can implement this.

Page 6--I am very much in favor of advising handbooks and strongly support the idea that each department compile such a book even if it is mimeographed. In many cases, even mimeographing may create something of a hardship on a department. In those cases, the problem should be brought to the attention of the appropriate dean.

December 8, 1975, Minutes

Page 8--The revision to the by-laws on representation in the Faculty Senate, proposed by Mr. Ginther and amended, meets with our approval and should now be put into effect.

January 13, 1976, Minutes

Page 3--With reference to Dr. Frerer's motion that a student's overall GPA be counted, but that the student must also maintain a 2.0 or better GPA in work taken at Fort Hays State, I am in agreement and would recommend that this policy be put into effect beginning the summer of 1976.

Page 5--The action of the Senate resolving that the references to the sex of an applicant are inappropriate in letters of recommendation and other such transmissions regarding students, is to be commended. Our Affirmative Action officer is in complete agreement and so am I.

February 9, 1976, Minutes

Page 2--With reference to the resolution on the Honor Roll which accords the honor to the upper ten percent of students in each of the undergraduate schools..., I feel that it is a good resolution but that we should watch it carefully and evaluate it after the first year.

Page 3--Continuing Education--It is fine for the Academic Long Range Planning Committee to investigate CEU's. However, the concept has been adopted through COCAO, COPS, and the Board of Regents. We don't have to use them, but it seems to me that we would be foolish not to.

Page 3--Mini-courses--I was disturbed by the Senate's recommendation to place the mini-courses in Continuing Education. I don't think this would be in the best interests of the students or the departments. The cost to the student would be almost five times greater and would probably result in our losing the utilization of mini-courses. I feel that the mini-courses can serve many purposes such as adding credit-hour production, but more importantly, well-organized mini-courses can be an exciting and stimulating experience for students. I feel that the Faculty Senate is moving in the wrong direction on this recommendation and would like to ask them to reconsider it.

Page 5--Grievance Committee Members--I think the proposal by Dr. Frerer as amended is an excellent one and would work very well for us.

There are still some procedural matters that need to be established concerning the time and place that administration approved Faculty Senate recommendations will take effect. After each Faculty Senate meeting, the President of the Senate will review all action taken with President Tomanek and with the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Then President Tomanek will communicate with the Senate relative to the acceptance or rejection of its recommendations.

- B. Actions of the House Ways and Means Committee - The House Ways and Means Committee made several policy decisions on March 3 which will be incorporated in the appropriation bill for the state colleges and universities. These recommendations are subject to change, but it is doubtful that the Committee would change its position at this date. These recommendations must go through the House and then through the process in the Senate. Some items of significance are:

Faculty Salaries: An increase of 8 percent for all institutions except for Fort Hays Kansas State College. The increase provided for our faculty is 9 percent.

Other Operating Expenses: An increase of 10 percent for all institutions except the Medical Center.

Libraries: The approved increases are as indicated below. There was no reason given as to how the decision to provide the listed amounts was reached:

University of Kansas	\$130,000
Kansas State University	85,000
Wichita State University	85,000
Emporia Kansas State College	40,000
Fort Hays Kansas State College	40,000
Kansas State College at Pittsburg	20,000

Computer Support: Increases allotted for computer support were:

Kansas State University	\$168,000
Wichita State University	61,000
Fort Hays Kansas State College	65,000
Kansas State College at Pittsburg	60,000
Emporia Kansas State College	50,000

Women's Intercollegiate Athletics: No increase.

Classified Positions for the Three State Colleges: No increase.

Increases for Utility Costs: The decision will be made later.

Student Salary Increase: As recommended by the Board of Regents.

Funds for Equipment Replacement: \$190,000 for Kansas State College of Pittsburg. All other requests were rejected.

Research Funds for the State Colleges: All requests were denied.

- C. University Status - At the last Regents' meeting there was a suggestion made that the state colleges might be accorded university status. President Tomanek has requested the college to draw up a policy statement concerning this proposal which can be used to justify the change in status. Dean Jellison will coordinate the campus policy formulation effort. The Student Government Association has been working on this question for some time, and all faculty are invited to contribute to the effort.
- D. Posting Mid-Term Grades - COD has asked us to remind the faculty that generally mid-term grades should not be posted. It is acceptable to use a random number system to post grades as long as a given student's grades are not identifiable.
- E. Shorten classes on October 15, 1976 - The Homecoming Committee has requested the Faculty Senate to consider shortening classes on Friday, October 15, 1976. It is anticipated that classes will be dismissed at noon to allow for the fullest participation possible in the Oktoberfest and the homecoming activities. The Senate can react to this under new business.

- F. Collective Bargaining - The Public Employee Relations Board ruled that the appropriate bargaining unit for the faculty at Kansas State College at Emporia is as follows:

Include: all faculty members holding regular appointments (more than half-time) and who are regularly engaged in at least half-time teaching, research, training of student teachers, or library services (Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor and Instructor).

Exclude: Deans, Department/Division Chairpersons, Director of the School of Library Sciences, Director of Library Sciences, Adjunct Professors and Instructors.

This means that bargaining units have now been established at Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Emporia Kansas State College, and Kansas University.

- G. Programs Approved by Council of Presidents - President Tomanek indicated that the Council of Presidents had approved the M.F.A. and the M.B.A. and the Associate in Business degrees. The cooperative doctoral program with Kansas State University has also been approved. However, it was noted that the M.F.A. program might be difficult to push through the Academic and Extension Committee of the Board of Regents.
- H. Part-Time Faculty Fringe Benefits - At the November 11, 1975, Faculty Senate meeting, we approved a proposal calling for the establishment of fringe benefits for part-time faculty members. On March 2, 1976, Vice President Keating responded:

The participation of part-time faculty members is governed by the Board of Regents' policies. This was first covered by a minute dated December 4, 1963, later amended by minute dated January 19, 1964. We are currently complying with these policies.

Most of our part-time, temporary people are employed for less than half time; and, hence, are not eligible for fringe benefits either as authorized by law under Kansas Statute 74-4925 or the Board of Regents policy previously quoted. Perhaps the appropriate committee of the Faculty Senate would want to review the Regents policies and the law to see if they would recommend any changes at this time.

III. Reports from Standing Committees.

A. Academic Affairs Committee.

Dr. Zakrzewski, noting that there was apparently a great deal of confusion regarding the recommendation of the Senate at the February meeting that mini-courses be included in Continuing Education, reported that the Academic Affairs Committee, President Tomanek, Dean Garwood, and Mr. Rupp had met and discussed the issue. The decision reached was that mini-courses may either be put in Continuing Education if the department feels that is appropriate, or they may be offered as regular short-term classes for as many credit hours as the department desires. They may be offered pass/no credit or for a grade. The term "mini-course" will be abolished. All regular short-term courses will be listed in the regular schedule; there will be a separate printing for variable classes and a second period of enrollment for these.

Any new courses, whether they are taught as regular courses or in Continuing Education, should come to the Academic Affairs Committee for approval, as the present policy dictates.

Dr. Drinan said that the meeting was beneficial in that it cleared up a confusion as to the purpose of the mini-course program. Many faculty members believed the mini-course program was designed to attract off-campus people to the campus. According to the Academic Vice President and the President, these courses were intended for both the regularly enrolled students and also to attract off-campus people.

Mr. Rupp commented that this statement from Dr. Drinan is a valuable contribution, especially in light of the fact that 87 percent of the students who took mini-courses last semester were regularly enrolled students.

Dr. Miller asked if it was decided whether courses that are currently offered as mini-courses will have to be approved by the Academic Affairs Committee.

Dr. Zakrzewski said he is under the impression that only new courses will require such approval, but suggested that this could be changed.

Dr. Miller said that he believed any courses that are not offered through Continuing Education ought to be approved, whether they have been offered as mini-courses or not.

Mr. Rupp asked Dr. Miller if he would like the Academic Affairs Committee to make a study of this matter and make a proposal at the next Senate meeting. Dr. Miller replied that he would.

Dr. Zakrzewski moved that the final day to withdraw from regular 16-week classes be the Friday of the week that mid-term grades are distributed.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Ginther.

Dr. Frerer suggested that it might be better to set the date as the Friday of the week following the distribution of mid-term grades, since mid-term grades might be distributed on a Thursday, allowing only one day for students to withdraw.

Dr. Edwards asked what the rationale of the motion is.

Dr. Zakrzewski replied that the rationale is to have students make a commitment to a class once they are in it. He added that probably the only reason that the motion didn't give students only until the 20th day of classes is that some instructors give only mid-semester grades and the students don't know how they are doing until then.

Dr. Edwards asked if, according to this motion, a student would not be able to withdraw from a class after the stated date.

Dr. Miller said that traditionally exceptions have been made, such as when a student withdraws from school entirely because of health reasons or for financial reasons.

Mr. Rupp mentioned that historically there was a rule that if you withdrew after the date that you could legally withdraw, you would withdraw passing or failing.

Dr. Edwards said that is another clarification of the motion he would like. Dr. Zakrzewski said that he believes the meaning is just withdraw, with nothing regarding passing or failing.

Dr. Drinan remarked that he is a member of the Academic Affairs Committee who did not support this motion. He explained that he would support moving the withdrawal date from three weeks prior to the end of the semester to four or five weeks, but that many courses have only about 25 percent of the course credits accumulated by one week following mid-term, with important examinations and major papers coming during the last eight weeks of the semester, and that a grade at that time would reflect only about 20 to 25 percent of the student's progress during the semester.

Dr. Drinan proposed an amendment to the motion to provide that "the Friday of the week that mid-term grades are distributed" be stricken and that "four weeks prior to the end of the semester" be inserted.

The motion to amend was seconded by Dr. Edwards.

Mr. Ginther stated that he considered that a very long time to work with a student and have him withdraw from a class because he is getting a C and wants to maintain a better grade average.

Dr. Frerer said he would support the amendment, citing the fact that he has a number of courses that run on a 3-exam basis and the second exam comes after mid-term.

Dr. Miller, stating that he was speaking for the original motion and against the amendment, suggested that faculty could tailor their examination schedules to any withdrawal date. He noted that the reason for this motion is to fight grade inflation and also to create a sense in students that they are committed to a course. He added that every day that we push the withdrawal date in the future makes the commitment less for the student.

Dr. Adams said he didn't think he would want to restructure a course to fit an administrative policy that is basically designed to be punitive.

Dr. Marshall asserted that he would like to speak in support of the original motion and stated that he does not see that it is punitive, but that our present policy is punitive in that students are not forced to commit themselves; they can enroll in an excess number of hours and they have no obligation to complete the courses.

Dr. Edwards questioned whether this measure would involve the student in the class and cause him to make a commitment. Dr. Miller commented that it would make the students work harder and that is a commitment.

Mr. Rupp mentioned that the original reason for extending the withdrawal date was to encourage students to widen their horizons.

Dr. Edwards suggested that perhaps some of the students in attendance would like to speak on the issue.

Kristi Parry said that she had never withdrawn from a class. Gary Hennerberg said that last semester he had withdrawn from a course late in the semester in which not many tests were given until the latter part of the semester.

The amendment proposed by Dr. Drinan was voted on: the vote was 8 Yes and 15 No. The motion to amend failed.

Dr. Frerer proposed an amendment to the original motion providing that the last day to withdraw be Friday of the week after mid-term grades are received by the advisors.

The motion to amend was seconded; the motion was voted on; the motion carried.

The original motion, amended as follows, was voted on:

"That the final day to withdraw from regular 16-week classes be the Friday of the week after mid-term grades are received by the advisors."

The motion carried.

B. College Affairs Committee.

Dr. Frerer explained that the motion passed at the last Senate meeting regarding faculty grievance procedures is in conflict with the Procedures for Hearings and Appeals approved by the Senate in July of 1974. (Copies of the Procedures for Hearings and Appeals approved July 23, 1974, were distributed to Senate members.) Dr. Frerer then moved that the motion made at the February meeting relative to the establishment of a grievance procedure be withdrawn.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Ginther.

Dr. Drinan remarked that we haven't spelled out anywhere in the Procedures for Hearings and Appeals how the committee is to be constituted or how it is chosen.

Dr. Frerer quoted from Article VI, Section 2d(4) (revised December 1975) of the By-Laws, which states that "In all cases where a faculty member must have a hearing, the College Affairs Committee shall nominate a panel of at least five members of the faculty who have tenure; this nomination shall be subject to approval by the Senate."

Dr. Busch pointed out that if the motion is in conflict with the By-Laws, it doesn't have to be withdrawn.

Dr. Edwards moved that the Procedures for Hearings and Appeals be placed in the Faculty Handbook.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Frerer.

Ms. Veed said that the reason for the broader statement in the Faculty Handbook is so that if the procedures are changed by experience, it will not require that the Faculty Handbook be changed each time.

Dr. Edwards said that the Faculty Handbook is what faculty members consult, and there seems no reason that subsequent amendments could not be distributed and supplements made for the Handbook.

Dr. Drinan explained that the reason that only a general statement is included in the Handbook is that the administration was expecting some changes in the procedure during the next year.

Ms. Veed said that the provision in the By-Laws still leaves a lot of questions to be answered.

Dr. Adams moved that the College Affairs Committee reconsider the issues involved in the grievance procedure and present at the next meeting a policy consistent with the By-Laws.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Marshall.

Dr. Edwards proposed an amendment that as soon as the Faculty Senate formalizes procedures, these procedures be printed in the Faculty Handbook.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Zakrzewski. Dr. Zakrzewski suggested that the time of implementation be suggested in the resolution.

Dr. Robertson commented that the College Affairs Committee is looking into the Faculty Handbook in general and has found a number of areas in which the Faculty Senate should do some inquiring. He added that there are policies that perhaps should be discontinued and others that should be included. Dr. Robertson asked how often the Handbook is revised.

Dr. Drinan said that he had recommended that the Faculty Handbook not be redone until there had been a chance to examine some of these issues after the new President was installed, but that his informal recommendation fell on deaf ears and there was a hurry to get it done by last fall.

Dr. Robertson asked if there were any statutory reasons that the Handbook cannot be revised for a given period of time. Dr. Drinan replied that budgetary considerations inhibit revision more than anything else. He added that perhaps it would be appropriate for the Senate to encourage an updating of the Faculty Handbook every three or four years.

Mr. Rupp called attention to the fact that a review is currently taking place to determine any conflicts between the old Handbook and the new one, and it seems entirely possible that the College Affairs Committee will make a recommendation that the policy should be pursued every three or four years.

Dr. Frerer noted that so far it has been determined in comparing the Handbooks that there are few similarities between the old and the new.

Dr. Busch asked if supplements couldn't be made and inserted.

Dr. Drinan said that some universities use a format whereby amendments and revisions can be inserted constantly.

The motion to amend was voted on. The motion carried.

The original motion, amended as follows, was voted on:

"The College Affairs Committee reconsider the issues involved in the grievance procedure and present at the next meeting a policy consistent with the By-Laws. As soon as the Faculty Senate formalizes procedures, these procedures should be printed in the Faculty Handbook."

The motion carried.

Dr. Frerer moved that when a suspended student has passed through the probationary period and been reinstated, the word "suspended" should be stricken from that student's record.

The motion was seconded by Mr. McNeil.

The motion was voted on. The motion carried.

Dr. Frerer proposed the following recommendation from the College Affairs Committee:

"If, for any reason, the seven-year probationary period of an untenured employee will terminate on any date other than the last day of an academic year, the college and the untenured employee may agree in writing to extend that probationary period for a time not to exceed six calendar months beyond the date on which the employee's probationary period would be completed."

The motion was seconded by Dr. Marshall.

The motion was voted on. The motion carried.

Dr. Frerer reported that the College Affairs Committee had discussed the issue of final examination week and had agreed that the present policy should be enforced. He moved that the Faculty Senate ask the President of the college to enforce the college policy regarding final examination week.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Busch.

The motion carried.

C. Student Affairs Committee.

Dr. Adams made the following proposal:

"That the Faculty Senate recommend that the Dean of the Graduate School establish a review committee for research projects which involve the participation of human subjects. The actions of this committee shall be in compliance with the guidelines proposed by the U.S. Department of H.E.W. and shall include a member from any academic department whose project is under consideration. This member shall be appointed on a temporary basis if the department in question has no permanent member."

The motion was seconded by Dr. Frerer.

Dr. Busch asked if the Graduate Council has acted on this, and Dr. Adams said he didn't think so.

Dr. Busch expressed the opinion that this motion deals with the graduate faculty and the Senate doesn't control what the Graduate School does.

Dr. Adams said he thinks the Senate can make recommendations that concern all faculty and all students.

Dr. Miller asked if the intent of this motion is to establish a committee beyond the Research Committee of the Graduate Council, and Dr. Adams replied that that committee could probably function as this committee.

Dr. Miller asked if there is some reason that the motion does not state that the Research Committee of the Graduate Council could handle this.

Mr. Rupp asked if we couldn't adopt the proposal as a campus-wide program.

Dr. Miller said that the motion states that the Dean should establish a review committee, which strongly suggests a committee different from the Research Committee already established.

Dr. Zakrzewski suggested that it would be more appropriate for this issue to go to the Graduate Council rather than to the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Drinan proposed an amendment that the Dean of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council consider establishment of a review committee.

The motion to amend was seconded by Dr. Busch. The motion carried.

The motion, amended as follows, was voted on:

"The Faculty Senate recommends that the Dean of the Graduate School and the Graduate Council consider establishment of a review committee for research projects which involve the participation of human subjects. The actions of this committee shall be in compliance with the guidelines proposed by the U.S. Department of H.E.W. and shall include a member from any academic department whose project is under consideration. This member shall be appointed on a temporary basis if the department in question has no permanent member."

The motion carried.

Dr. Adams proposed the following resolution:

"That the president of the Senate invite the president of the Student Senate to appoint a student representative to participate ex-officio on each of the committees of the Faculty Senate."

The motion was seconded by Dr. Marshall.

The motion was voted on. The motion carried.

Dr. Adams proposed the following resolution:

"That the Faculty Senate supports the concept of campus-wide systematic student evaluation of faculty to be administered by the Dean of Instruction."

The motion was seconded by Dr. Marshall.

Dr. Adams noted that this resolution is consistent with a resolution from the Student Senate. He then requested the floor on behalf of the students present.

Kristi Parry said that the Student Senate is in favor of Dr. Adams' resolution, and that the resolution passed by the Student Senate was that the results of such evaluations be publicized.

Dr. Miller asked what the word "administered" means in the sense of the motion; he inquired if the minions of the Dean of Instruction are actually going to hand out the papers.

Dr. Adams said that the Student Senate has volunteered their services, but that the project is too big for the Student Senate alone.

Kristie Parry said they have discussed this with the Dean of Instruction and that the reason they have asked him to do this is that for the Student Senate to do it, it would have to be strictly on a voluntary basis.

Dr. Miller commented that the sense he gets is that having the Dean of Instruction being the administrator will compel faculty members to participate. He then asked if that was correct, and Ms. Parry replied that it was.

Dr. Drinan asserted that this motion seems to be a rather dramatic reversal of the policy of voluntary participation of the faculty for evaluation of instruction and evaluation of course content. He said that it seemed to be a move toward compelling the administration of student evaluation forms through the Dean of Instruction's office, that he would view that as a very dramatic reversal, and that he would be in opposition to it if that is the intent of the motion.

Dr. Frerer said that he wonders how the evaluations are to be used, and that while the students are interested in letting students see the results, they could be used in many other ways, such as to determine raises in pay and academic rank.

Dr. Busch said that the recommendation says nothing about the kind of criteria that the faculty members will be subjected to.

Ms. Parry said that in the Student Senate resolution, they suggested that the form and all of the questions be approved by the Faculty Senate.

Ms. Pfeifer said that this issue came up two years ago when she served on the College Affairs Committee and that they went through numerous forms to try to find a good evaluation form, that the evaluations were carried out, and that when the results were published they contained so many errors that they were practically useless.

Mr. Ed Barker said that the main argument against such evaluations is that it is a student popularity poll, and that they are trying to establish a cooperative program to establish guidelines so that nobody will feel that they are being threatened and everybody will be satisfied with the results.

Mr. McNeil asserted that he is opposed to letting students evaluate faculty without giving any justification for it. He said he believes students should have to sign such evaluations; faculty have to sign their names to student grades and the student has the right to question and protest the evaluation.

Dr. Robertson proposed an amendment to the motion to read that there be systematic student evaluation of faculty with the results to be made available to students with faculty consent; that if they need help in administering the evaluations, it be made available; and that all questions that appear on the form be approved by the Faculty Senate or a committee thereof.

The motion to amend was seconded by Dr. Zakrzewski.

Dr. Drinan remarked that this seems a very difficult subject that has engaged the College Affairs Committee and the Senate for a long time. He added that it seems to him that there are a host of issues involved here in the faculty status on campus, and that the College Affairs Committee ought to be working out in detail something as important as a reversal of the existing policy.

Dr. Frerer moved that the entire motion be tabled and referred to the College Affairs Committee.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Ginther.

Dr. Busch suggested that the College Affairs Committee find out how many departments conduct evaluations now and consider why a second evaluation is necessary.

Dr. Adams explained that this motion was introduced in response to a decision made by the Student Senate and without objection from members of the Student Affairs Committee. He said he would be happy to see it go to the College Affairs Committee--that it was simply a recommendation in support of the Student Senate Action.

The motion to table was voted on. The motion carried.

Dr. Adams referred to the statement in Dr. Tomanek's letter to Mr. Rupp dated February 27, 1976, regarding references to sex in letters of recommendation, and suggested that that statement should be clarified.

Mr. Rupp said that he will clarify this with the President.

Dr. Adams urged that the College Affairs Committee work closely with the Student Senate Committee, whose chairperson is Kristie Parry, on the issue of faculty evaluations.

D. By-Laws Committee.

Mr. Ginther read the names of Senate members whose terms expire this year and said that he will notify department chairmen within the week, indicating that representatives are to be elected according to the By-Laws by the third week in April and that their terms will begin in the fall of 1976. Those Senate members whose terms expire this year are Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Delbert Marshall, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Patrick Drinan, Dr. Arris Johnson, Dr. Lavier Staven, Mr. Glenn Ginther, and Ms. Jane Littlejohn.

IV. Old Business. None.

V. New Business.

Dr. Drinan announced that the deadline for new course proposals for the second semester of next year is April 1.

Dr. Edwards suggested that the Student Affairs Committee consider the establishment of a loan fund similar to that of the Faculty Association, from which students could borrow in case of emergencies, such as not receiving a check on time.

Mr. Rupp agreed that this is a good idea and suggested that the Student Affairs Committee look into this in conjunction with the Student Senate.

Mr. Rupp mentioned the request that classes be shortened on October 15 and pointed out that a requirement for such action is Faculty Senate approval.

Mr. McNeil moved that classes be dismissed at 12:30 on Friday, October 15.

The motion was seconded by Dr. Marshall. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.