

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

3-3-1980

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 3, 1980

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 3, 1980" (1980). *Faculty Senate*. 701.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/701

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.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 3, 1980

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Louis Caplan, Faculty Senate President, at 3:30 p.m. in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll, and the following members were present: Dr. James Stansbury, Dr. Bill Daley, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Ms. Joye Witten, Mr. Don Barton, Mr. Mac Reed, Ms. Joanne Harwick, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Mr. David Lefurgey, Dr. Sam Warfel, Dr. Al Geritz, Dr. Lewis Miller, Mr. Thaine Clark, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Erwin Eltze, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Louis Caplan, Dr. Robert Meier, Ms. Patricia Baconrind, Ms. Sharon Barton, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Ann Liston, Mr. Richard Heil, and Dr. Ron Smith.

The following members were absent: Dr. Emerald Dechant, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Dr. John Knight, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Stephen Tramel, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Ms. Carolyn Gatschet, Ms. Betty Roberts, and Dr. Nevell Razak.

The following alternates were present: Ms. Calvina Thomas for Gatschet and Dr. Gerry Cox for Razak.

Also present was Mr. Larry Dreiling of the University Leader.

The minutes of the February meeting were approved with the following change: on page one in announcement three the word "and" beginning the second line should be omitted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Dr. Robert P. Markley and Dr. Edward H. Stehno have been nominated to serve on the Sabbatical and Leave Committee.
2. President Tomanek presented an appeal to the Joint House/Senate Ways and Means Committee for restoration of funds which were not approved by the Governor in the Fort Hays State University budget request. All six university presidents/chancellors, as well as the Board of Regents, listed faculty salaries as the number one priority. Although the Committee listened attentively, no overwhelming support seemed to exist for salary increases above the Governor's recommendation of 8 percent.
3. The Board of Regents, at the February 15 meeting, has amended the tenure policy as shown below. The change is underlined.

Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank, the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a

teacher is called to another institution it may be agreed in writing that his new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person's total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years; except when the interests of both parties may best be served by mutual agreement at the time of initial employment, institutions may agree to allow for more than four years of probationary service at the employing institution provided the probationary period at that institution does not exceed seven years. Notices should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period, if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs - Dr. John Watson, Chair

In Dr. Watson's absence and on behalf of the Committee, Dr. Lewis Miller moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following courses:

Education 113: United States Defense Establishment
 114: Introduction to Leadership & Management
 200: ROTC Basic Camp
 223: Fundamentals of Military Training
 224: Introduction to Tactics
 333: Advanced Military Tactics
 334: Advanced Leadership Development
 400: ROTC Advanced Camp
 443: Theory and Dynamics of Military Team
 444: Seminar in Leadership & Management

Dr. Frerer asked for the number of credit hours for each course. Dr. Miller responded that the following courses are one credit hour: 113, 114, 223, and 224. Courses numbered 333 and 444 are two credit hours. Courses numbered 334, 400, and 443 are three credit hours. Course number 200 is four credit hours, and that course also has a lab attached to it. Dr. Zakrzewski asked if it had been determined whether Fort Hays State would receive the base count credit for ROTC. Dr. Miller responded by stating that there was some uncertainty about this issue. Dr. Chalender is investigating that question. The Fort Hays ROTC program is a branch of the Wichita State University program. Dr. Caplan was under the impression that the Emporia State University ROTC program, which is a branch of the Kansas State University program, allows ESU to receive credit hour production for the ROTC program on its campus, but he was not certain on that point. Dr. Votaw asked if these courses all counted as electives toward graduation. Yes, they are counted in the 124 hours needed for graduation. Dr. Frerer suggested that ROTC can be a minor. Dr. Zakrzewski pointed out, with Dr. Caplan's support, that the four-hour Education 200 ROTC Basic Camp is for students who did not enroll in ROTC during their freshman and sophomore years. This course allows them to catch up with the students who have been enrolled for two years. During the junior and senior years, the student would take five hours per year. Dr. Rumpel pointed out that there is an advanced camp the student attends between their junior and senior year. Dr. Caplan

pointed out that ROTC could not be a minor at this time since less than twenty hours of course work is offered. Dr. Frerer pointed out that these courses could diminish enrollment in other programs so this was a very important issue. Dr. Miller agreed it was important but wondered whether the Senate's action was that significant. Dr. Caplan commented that the contract establishing ROTC on campus has been signed, although it can be discontinued with a one-year notice by either party. The question before the Senate is the approval of the courses not the approval of ROTC. If it is determined that Fort Hays State does not receive the base count credit, then the Senate might want to request a termination of the agreement but that is not the issue before the Senate today. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Caplan stated that at the next Senate meeting a motion on physical education credit exemption for ROTC credit will be presented for consideration.

Bylaws and Standing Rules - Dr. Stephen Tramel, Chair

M₂ In Dr. Tramel's absence and on behalf of the Committee, Mr. Lefurgey moved that: "Course proposals not approved by the Academic Affairs Committee shall be brought to the attention of the full Senate in the form of a report on the Committee's activities, and the report shall contain the reasons why each such course was not approved. No motion regarding any such course will be made by the Committee."

Dr. Votaw asked if this proposal is intended to be a Standing Rule. Dr. Caplan said that he had talked to Dr. Tramel; and it was his preference to try this procedure. If it is successful, then introduce it as a Standing Rule. Dr. Rumpel questioned whether the intent of the last sentence was to exclude motions or to suggest that no motion will normally be made. There might be extenuating circumstances where related motions might be appropriate. Mr. Lefurgey responded that it seems pointless for the Academic Affairs Committee to move the disapproval of courses at full Senate meetings. To not move their approval is both sufficient and appropriate to the usual understanding of how committees are to function. It is desirable that the Senate members be informed which courses were not approved by the Committee, and why. Although the Academic Affairs Committee shall make no motion regarding such courses, any Senate member is, of course, free to challenge the judgment of the Committee by moving the approval of such courses. Dr. Rumpel suggested that this proposal might preclude other motions related to the issues raised by a particular course proposal. Mr. Lefurgey observed that the motion applies only to one Senate Committee, and to only one part of its business. The decision not to extend the motion to all business of all Senate committees rests on the fact that not all items conform to the course approval model, and motions to disapprove certain things may be appropriate in other contexts. There followed several suggestions for alternative wording of the last sentence, but no motions were made. A₁ Dr. Votaw moved "to amend the motion by striking the last sentence which reads, 'no motion regarding any such course need be made by the Committee.'" There was no discussion on the amendment. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted with one dissenting vote. (Mr. Lefurgey is recorded as duly representing his chairman.) There was no further discussion of the amended motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

M₃ On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Lefurgey moved that "The President of the Senate shall include in the announcements to the full Senate all items of business that have been assigned to Senate Committees."

Dr. Frerer asked for an explanation. Dr. Caplan responded by stating that in case the Senate President is forgetful, other members of the Senate will be aware of what issues have been sent to committee. Mr. Lefurgey pointed out that this proposal would make it more difficult for a committee to avoid acting on a proposal if that was its intention. Dr. Miller indicated that the wording of the motion was unclear concerning when this reporting was to be done, at every meeting or when it was first reported to the committee. Dr. Caplan provided his interpretation by saying that if something new is given to committee and it is not going to report on it, and it was given to them by the President since the last Senate meeting, he will announce what has been given to the Committee for consideration. Dr. Frerer asked if the intent of the Committee was that the President should report on all items of unfinished business. Mr. Lefurgey then read the Committee's rationale. The previous motion, derives partly from a conviction that the full Senate has a right to know about proposals that are not approved by Standing Committees. This supplies both the information and the opportunity for Senate members to challenge the judgment of committees by forwarding motions of their own. Merely requiring each committee to report on items that have been disapproved is not sufficient, since a Committee may simply ignore a proposal that has come before it, in which case the Senate need never have any knowledge of the existence of the proposal. Listing all items of business given to committees in the announcements solves this problem; each member of the Senate will thereby be made aware of all items of business before each of the Standing Committees. This motion is also being put forward as an ad hoc procedural rule rather than as a Standing Rule. If the rule seems beneficial after a trial period, it should be reconsidered as a Standing Rule at a future date.

Mr. Smith raised the question of whether or not all items of business taken up by Senate committees are referred there by the Senate President. Dr. Caplan responded by saying that the By-laws indicate the distribution of proposals to committees. Committees can develop their own proposals and present them to the Senate without Presidential approval. Dr. Warfel moved "to amend the motion by adding the words 'at the first regular meeting of the full Senate after their assignment' after the word 'Committees'" (seconded by Dr. Votaw). Dr. Miller suggested that the amendment was somewhat unwieldy and suggested a friendly amendment to the amendment (agreed to by Dr. Warfel and Dr. Votaw). Dr. Miller moved "to strike motion 3 and replace it with 'The President of the Senate shall keep the Senate apprised of all new business given to Senate committees.'" Mr. Lefurgey opposed the new wording and supported the original wording as developed by the By-laws and Standing Rules Committee. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The result was unclear. The President asked for a show of hands. The motion (to strike M3 and replace with A2) was adopted.

Mr. Lefurgey made the following additional reports:

1. We had been asked to consider the merits of automatically designating the President-Elect to be Senate Parliamentarian. The benefit of this practice is to acquaint the President-Elect with Parliamentary Procedure before he or she becomes President of the Senate. The drawback is that some other Senate member might be much more qualified to be Parliamentarian. Our Committee decided that the present practice (viz. leaving the choice of Parliamentarian to the Executive Committee, as stipulated in the By-laws) is superior. It is more flexible. The Executive Committee is, naturally, free to appoint the

President-Elect to be Parliamentarian, but they are also free to do otherwise when circumstances so dictate. The present system, that is, can avail itself of any advantages gained by the proposed change without incurring any of the disadvantages.

2. We had been asked to consider the merits of building a nominating committee of the sort employed last year into the By-laws and Standing Rules. Last year's experience indicates that such a committee may be beneficial. It allows candidates more time to decide whether to accept nomination, and it allows Senators more time to decide how they wish to vote. The use of the nominating committee, of course, does not prevent additional nominations from the floor at either the May or the September meetings, thereby allowing input from newly elected Senators. Nevertheless, our Committee decided that considering such a change in the By-laws and Standing Rules is premature. We feel that the nominating committee should be used again this year as it was last year, but as an extension of a trial period. If three years of experience give the committee a good bill of health, it would then be appropriate to consider it as a permanent feature of Senate procedure. In the meantime, the Executive Committee is quite free to do as it sees fit in this matter.

3. Departments are currently being notified of the need to elect Senators for next year. Sharon Barton of our committee is in charge of the election process.

Student Affairs - Mr. Mac Reed, Chair

No report.

University Affairs - Mr. Dan Rupp, Chair

M₄

On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Rupp moved "to approve the Promotion Policy with the following three changes: 1) the three-year minimum years of service in the rank of assistant professor and associate professor before promotion to the rank of associate professor and professor respectively be changed to a five-year minimum; 2) the sentence that reads "Promotions are normally initiated at the request of the individual; however, departments may initiate the promotion process through nominations" be changed to "Promotions are normally initiated by the department; however, the promotion may be initiated at the request of the individual"; 3) the following sentence should be stricken, "The nominee will solicit letters from those individuals to be submitted directly to the department chairman." (Note: the Promotion Procedure as adopted by the Faculty Senate appears in the April 8, 1980, Senate minutes.)

Mr. Rupp explained that this Promotion Procedure was the product of an ad hoc committee appointed by the University administration, and the University Affairs Committee was asked to make recommendations. Dr. Warfel asked for the rationale of number 2 in the motion. Mr. Rupp responded that the Committee felt that the department should initiate the request for promotion rather than the individual but that the individual would still have the option to initiate a request for promotion.

Dr. Geritz asked for the rationale concerning the five as opposed to three-year minimum for promotion. Mr. Rupp responded by providing a sense of the Committee that some departments make a habit of promoting more rapidly than others. As a consequence, they receive a larger share of the total faculty salary budget. Mr. Lefurgey was not convinced that the five-year minimum

would solve this problem. Dr. Miller stated that it was his understanding that departments do not grant promotions but that this was the responsibility of the Deans and the Academic Vice President. He felt that the Deans are supposed to act as watchdogs and assure that some departments are not placed in a disadvantage. Dr. Caplan responded that in an ideal world, things work ideally. He also pointed out that he was a member of the ad hoc committee that wrote this Promotion Procedure document. While serving on the committee, he did a study of promotion history on campus and discovered that there were two departments that routinely promote from assistant professor to associate professor in two years and associate professor to professor in three years. Other departments routinely promote after a five-year period in each rank. A time limit was established in an attempt to equalize the policy across campus. Now, the discussion here is whether it should be equalized at three years or five years. Mr. Lefurgey questioned again how a time limit of five years addresses the problem of having one department recommend promotions more than other departments. Mr. Rupp pointed out that currently there is no time limit. Mr. Lefurgey stated that he assumed that the current policy was a three-year time limit. Dr. Geritz expressed the view that the responsibilities were not differentiated very clearly between the ranks. He felt those differences should be more clearly specified. Dr. Caplan responded by indicating that an attempt was made to specify that promotion from assistant to associate would be granted to individuals who, after a certain period of time, showed promise through their work. Promotion from associate to full professor would be granted when the evidence showed continued promise. Mr. Dreiling inquired of Dr. Caplan whether he would be willing to mention the two departments that he found that promoted most rapidly. Dr. Caplan said no.

Dr. Frerer made the case for a five-year minimum period in rank by stating that with a three-year period, one would be a full professor before being awarded tenure. He said no decent university promotes that rapidly. The standard period at the University of Iowa is seven years. Mr. Lefurgey asked if the feeling was that promotions would be automatic after five years. Mr. Rupp did not think so pointing out that the other criteria would have to be satisfied, and the department would have to approve the promotion. Dr. Geritz also wondered if a time period did not leave the impression that promotion was automatic after a certain period of time. Possibly that could be altered by more carefully stipulating the criteria for promotion. Mr. Rupp reiterated that qualifications, not time in rank, should be the criteria for promotions. Dr. Frerer suggested that our disciplines are so different that it would be extremely difficult to devise specific qualifications that would fit every department. Dr. Liston felt that there were significantly different qualifications for the various ranks. She asked for clarification, however, on the following statement which was taken from the Board of Regents, State of Kansas. Policies and Procedures, page 37, which reads: "The rank of professor shall be awarded only to those who are proven masters of their field and outstanding in it and whose general attributes of culture are recognized by their fellows." Dr. Caplan indicated he did not know what that meant. Dr. Ruppel clarified the question (to some laughter) by reading the rest of the quotation which states that, "such determination to be made by administrations and faculties in the traditional manner."

Dr. Warfel expressed some concern that the document under discussion may place an overemphasis upon research for this type of institution and also given the recent efforts of the administration to stress the importance of advising and participation in continuing education. His preference was for a policy that would recognize achievement in all five areas. It is obvious that we cannot be excellent in all five areas. There just is not enough time. It was

Dr. Warfel's view that a person who is doing a good job in the classroom, an excellent job of advising, and is doing committee work on campus should be given consideration for promotion even though they have not published any scholarly papers in the last three to five years, given the realities of our campus. Dr. Zakrzewski and Dr. Votaw interpreted the document to support that situation. Dr. Warfel felt that good teaching was essential, but he was not certain that teaching and research should be preeminent with the other three areas (advising, professional development, and service) being used to compensate for other weaknesses. Dr. Geritz expressed the view that service outside the University should not be included at all in determining whether one is promoted or not. Dr. Caplan stated that service is based upon professionally-related activities outside the University. Dr. Miller made the observation that advising has only become a criteria for promotion since enrollment started declining. Dr. Caplan agreed with that astute observation. He then shared with the Senate a promotion procedure employed at another university. Three factors are necessary for promotion:

1. Satisfactory participation in the educational tasks of the university which is teaching and associated activities, 2. Intellectual or creative activity related to their disciplines, and 3. Responsible participation in other departmental, school or university activities. Then it states, "Recommendations for promotion result from good contributions in all three areas of teaching, research, or service, or superior performance in two of the three areas, or outstanding performance in either teaching or research. If the promotion is based on outstanding performance in one or superior performance in two areas, adequate accomplishment and participation is still expected in all three areas." Dr. Caplan suggested that such a statement would improve the document. Dr. Liston asked if it was urgent that this issue be decided today. Is this an issue that could be referred back to the University Affairs Committee? Dr. Caplan answered the question by stating that there was no urgency since promotions are already being decided for next year using this document on a temporary basis. Dr. Warfel moved "to recommit the Promotion Procedure to the University Affairs Committee with the recommendation that the Committee consider this issue again with reference to the Senate's discussion" (seconded by Dr. Liston).

Dr. Frerer indicated the Committee's willingness to rewrite the Promotion Policy. Dr. Smith felt the document was somewhat confusing and expressed his preference for the statement read earlier by Dr. Caplan. Mr. Rupp wondered if it was the Committee's responsibility to re-write it or should it be returned to the administration. Dr. Caplan felt this was the University Affairs Committee's responsibility. Dr. Zakrzewski suggested that the phrase "public administrative service" might be rewritten to read "public administrative service which relates to the discipline of the individual" as a more specific criteria. Dr. Miller agreed with Dr. Frerer that the Committee needs some specific guidance in revising this policy. Dr. Warfel reiterated his objection to the overemphasis in the document of teaching and research and the impression he had that other Senators felt the same way. He also, like Dr. Smith, approved of the statement read earlier by Dr. Caplan. Dr. Caplan indicated that the concern he heard was that if you follow this document and try and get promoted by doing good teaching and research and giving lip service to public and administrative service, advising and professional development, that what will happen is that you will be promoted rapidly according to this document; but along the way, you will receive very small salary increases because of

the great stress that is being placed now on academic advising and public service. Dr. Miller asked about the original genesis of this document. Dr. Caplan replied that it probably resulted from his complaint as to the manner in which promotions were handled on campus. The Academic Council appointed an ad hoc committee made up of the four academic deans, last year's faculty Senate President and Vice President and one faculty representative from each of the four schools. This document was written by that committee. It was temporarily put in place for use in promotions deliberations this year and has now been sent to the Faculty Senate for approval, comment, or disapproval. Dr. Miller asked if this document was related to a Destiny Implementation Task Force Committee. Dr. Caplan said it was not a part of that process. Mr. Rupp suggested again that it be returned to the ad hoc committee. He also stated that the ultimate implementation will rest with the departments. Dr. Caplan agreed but stated that the Promotions Committee is going to be looking at this document and then looking at departmental recommendations based upon this document. Mr. Rupp asked how often the Promotions Committee rejects a promotion recommended by a department. Dr. Caplan replied that this was done quite often. Dr. Frerer suggested that this Promotion Policy could be a protection for the faculty member. When there are some specifics, the faculty member can say, "I deserve to be promoted because I have done what it says in the document." Dr. Miller asked if the Promotions Committee makes the final decisions on who gets promoted on this campus. Dr. Caplan answered by saying that the Promotions Committee makes recommendations to the President of the University, and he approves or disapproves. Dr. Miller asked how long the Promotions Committee has existed on campus. Dr. Caplan did not know the answer to that question. Dr. Smith pointed out that the Promotions Committee and the ad hoc committee that wrote this document are different committees. Dr. Caplan agreed. Dr. Caplan further stated that it was probably too late this year for a new Promotion Policy to effect the deliberations of the Promotions Committee. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken on the motion to table motion 5 and return it to the University Affairs Committee. The motion was adopted.

Mr. Rupp asked for further guidance concerning the role of the University Affairs Committee in rewriting the Promotion Policy. Dr. Warfel expressed displeasure in the reluctance of the Committee to revise the document since they had already made several changes. Mr. Rupp made the point that this policy will have to be phrased in very flexible terms, especially since administrators preferred it that way. Dr. Warfel said that he did not object to flexibility. Dr. Caplan pointed out with at least some criteria on paper, a faculty member can appeal a denial of tenure. Dr. Frerer and Mr. Rupp both invited comments and recommendations from Senate members concerning their suggestions for revision of the Promotion Policy.

M₆ On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Rupp moved the adoption of the following motion: "The Faculty Senate proposes that intercollegiate activities not be scheduled during the final examination period except in those instances when a campus sponsored organization has won the right to participate in a nationally or internationally sanctioned event." Mr. Rupp explained that in January, the University Affairs Committee reacted to several requests from faculty members who were concerned that several students had missed final examinations due, primarily, to athletic events, during the final exam period. They proposed that the Committee react to this in the form of a motion presented to the Senate. Rather than do that, the Committee felt initially that this issue

could be presented to the Athletic Board and see if they would react to it and formulate a proposal that might eliminate schedule conflicts. The Athletic Board did not respond, so the Committee developed the motion now on the floor. Mr. Rupp pointed out that the motion includes all activities such as debate, animal judging contests, or similar events. Everything is included. The Committee also felt that the student participating should have won the right to participate in the event. The Committee did not want to deny someone who qualified for a national tournament the opportunity to participate even though the event may occur during a final examination period. Mr. Heil pointed out that one event that led to this motion was a basketball tournament scheduled on campus during final examination week. Dr. Caplan indicated that a wrestling meet and debate tournament also took place last December during finals. Dr. Smith asked if it would be difficult to interpret this motion and make the proper distinctions. Mr. Rupp did not think so since the motion states that in order to participate, the student must qualify by winning an earlier event. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

Finally, Mr. Rupp reported that the Committee recommended that no change be made in the current enrollment procedures. This recommendation (not a motion) was made in response to a proposal made by Dr. Tramel in January that Fort Hays State change the enrollment process so that those students who are pre-enrolled would enroll the first day of enrollment rather than the second. After a lengthy discussion covering two meetings and a visit with Mr. Kellerman, the Committee decided that it was too late to make such a change for the Fall, 1980 semester. Furthermore, the Committee was not persuaded that a change, as Dr. Tramel suggested, would improve the enrollment procedures. Mr. Kellerman did agree to insert a statement in the enrollment material that students who have pre-enrolled may enroll on the first day.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Zakrzewski suggested that motion M1 should be retitled M16. Dr. Caplan appreciated the humor but ruled Dr. Zakrzewski's motion frivolous and dilatory.

NEW BUSINESS

Following the new rules of the Senate, Dr. Caplan assigned two items to the Academic Affairs Committee:

1. General education requirements as applied to students with double and triple majors. There presently is a problem in not counting courses in the major towards general education requirements which, in the case of the triple major, leaves the student very short of fulfilling the requirements, and in the case of a double major, leaves the student with excessive requirements compared to the regular student.
2. General education requirements with students in the three plus two program where a student takes three years at Fort Hays State and two years at another institution. The student receives a degree from both institutions but possibly gets into a situation where he has to fulfill a four-year general education

requirement at Fort Hays State in three years because the general education requirements are much less stringent at the other university.

3. The third item dealt with the Statement on Academic Advising. Dr. Caplan was uncertain if it would be assigned to Academic Affairs or University Affairs. (Note: it was assigned to University Affairs.) Dr. Zakrzewski asked if the Academic Affairs Committee had not dealt with that issue in the past. Dr. Votaw indicated that the issue involved minors, not majors.

There was no further new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard P. Heil
Secretary

eb