

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

10-7-1986

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, October 7, 1986

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, October 7, 1986" (1986). *Faculty Senate*. 775.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/775

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

October 7, 1986

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Mark Giese, President of the Faculty Senate, at 3:30 p.m. in the Frontier Room of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dr. Brent Spaulding, Dr. Zoran Stevanov, Dr. Robert Nicholson, Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Jack Logan, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Jim Rucker, Dr. Delbert Marshall, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. John Ratzlaff, Dr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Billy Daley, Dr. Art Hoernicke, Dr. Mike Horvath (alternate for Dr. Ninia Smith), Dr. Paul Gatschet, Mr. David Ison, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Dr. Mark Giese, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. John Klier, Dr. Merlene Lyman, Mr. Jim Walters, Mr. Marc Campbell, Dr. Jeffrey Barnett, Dr. Ronald Sandstrom, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Mary Anne Kennedy, Ms. Eileen Curl, Dr. Paul Faber, Dr. Louis Caplan (Alternate for Dr. Roger Pruitt), Dr. Larry Gould, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Phyllis Tiffany, Dr. Nevell Razak.

Members absent: Mr. Frank Nichols.

Others present: Dr. Robert Masters, Dr. Robert Meier, Major Wayne Butterfield, Dr. Stephen Tramel, Dr. Cathy Hall.

The minutes of the September 8, 1986, meeting were approved.

Announcements: Dr. Giese called attention to the announcements attached to the Agenda. He reminded committee chairmen that Kevin Amack, S.G.A. president, will be appointing non-voting student members to the various committees.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: Dr. Ron Sandstrom presented the following motions from the Academic Affairs Committee:

- A. Approval of a new course, Political Science 539/739: Internship in International Relations. It will carry 1-9 hours credit, which can be spread over the two courses.
The course was unanimously approved in the Academic Affairs Committee.
The motion passed unanimously.
- B. Motion to approved the major title DP/IS (Data Processing/Information Systems) to CIS (Computer Information Systems). Dr. Sandstrom noted that the title change reflects current trends. The name change was approved unanimously in Academic Affairs Committee. The motion passed unanimously.

J. Motion to approve in the Department of Military Science:

Title changes:

| | |
|--------|--|
| MS 113 | Introduction to the United States Military |
| MS 114 | Learning to Lead |
| MS 223 | Military Skills I |
| MS 224 | Military Skills II |
| MS 443 | Officer Development I |
| MS 444 | Officer Development II |

Credit Hour Changes:

| | |
|--------|-------------|
| MS 223 | From 1 to 2 |
| MS 224 | From 1 to 2 |
| MS 400 | From 3 to 4 |
| MS 444 | From 2 to 3 |

Dr. Ratzlaff inquired as to the justification for changing the credit hours. Major Butterfield commented that the program was initially set up like that of Wichita State in regard to minimum contact hours with students, and that number is inadequate. The additional hours compensate for the extensive laboratory time involved. The course MS 400 is a Basic Camp course. The motion passed unanimously.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: Dr. Robert Markley distributed two handouts to the senators which summarized the process used by the University Affairs Committee in the selection of the names of four faculty members to submit to the Board of Regents for consideration for membership on the official Search Committee for President. There were no questions for Dr. Markley.

STUDENT AFFAIRS: Dr. Martin Shapiro reported that letters have been sent out to students with grade points of at least 3.0 to submit information for nomination to Who's Who.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: Dr. Bill Rickman had no formal report. The sole item on their agenda was a visit with Mr. Ron Pflughoft to see how the External Affairs committee could aid and support Mr. Pflughoft's effort. The meeting was not terribly productive.

BY-LAWS: Dr. Paul Gatschet reported that he had met with Dr. Rickman to discuss updating the language in the by-laws and clearing up places in the by-laws which are unclear. He will take corrections and suggestions to the By-Laws Committee to update and incorporate changes. He is waiting for the secretary to put the bylaws on the computer.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Dr. Murphy did not agree in total with the Student Grade Appeals Policy approved by Senate. The Policy will go back to the executive committee. Dr. Murphy would like a more formal process at the informal level.
2. Role and Scope Update: The Role and Scope Statement should be presented to the Board of Regents by Dr. Tomanek on October 25.

NEW BUSINESS

1. The University Affairs Committee presented the following motion:

The University Affairs Committee moves and recommends that the following four members (listed alphabetically) of the Fort Hays State University faculty be submitted to the Board of Regents for consideration for membership on the official Search Committee for President.

Dr. Marcia Bannister, Professor of Communication
Dr. Carolyn Ehr, Professor of Mathematics
Dr. Larry Gould, Associate Professor of Political Science
Dr. Bill Rickman, Associate Professor of Economics

The motion passed unanimously. Thanks were given to all those who nominated and to nominees.

Dr. Paul Faber presented the following motion for consideration by Senate:
Although the Faculty Senate firmly supports the review of programs by the Board of Regents, it disagrees with the criteria employed in evaluating the Fort Hays State University programs during 1986. Consistent application of these criteria in this and the next few years would eliminate programs essential to fulfilling our recognized role as the liberal arts university of western Kansas.

The motion was seconded by Jack Logan.

Discussion: Dr. Giese said that in the past few days they have been trying to pin down which programs were reviewed, what was the extent of the review and what are the dates for which certain responses have to be in.

Dr. Faber: He feels that the criteria this year are different from those used in previous years. This year the sub-committee seems to be recommending discontinuance of all programs except those which are directly involved in teacher preparation or those which have produced extremely large numbers of graduates. He feels that consistent application of these criteria would really lead to a reduction in the role of liberal arts. Programs in English, Music, Art, and the degree program in Philosophy will be cut. What is most troublesome at this time is the criteria that they are using, if used in the future, will drastically cut into the liberal arts at FHSU. He feels this is a good time to protest the preliminary recommendations of the Board of Regents. Since these are preliminary recommendations, this is a good time to step in; the Regents at least in theory can alter the preliminary recommendations of the committee. Once the criteria are in place they have precedence, they have the weight of history behind them, it will be much more difficult to alter three or four years down the road when the effect of these criteria begin to be felt.

Dr. Giese: The following information was obtained in a telephone conversation with Dr. Bartholomew, the Dean whose programs are most affected:

The procedure: FHSU is asked to do a self-study; the Regents review this self-study; an on-campus visit (Regents for this visit were Slawson and McMullen); and a visit in Topeka (Regents reviewing were Roy and Carruthers).

The Regents then makes a recommendation and then the University makes a response (due October 17). From this response the Regents who were involved listen to our response and make a recommendation to the full Board, probably in November.

The following departments were reviewed: Communications, Biology, Art, Music, Philosophy and English.

Preliminary Recommendations:

Communications: continue all programs

Biology: Taking the B.S. degrees in Biology, botany and zoology and make them into one degree in biology

Art: discontinue the MFA degree and "look at the art education program"

Music: discontinue the bachelor of music, and the master of music degree

Philosophy: (1) increase the number of majors, (2) merge Philosophy with another program, or (3) discontinue Philosophy

English: MA in English be only a summer program

Apparently there is some confusion with the Regents on how we handle our teacher education. It appears they assume that all the teacher education courses and contact that students get is within the School of Education, which is not the way we handle it.

Dr. Miller: Supports the motion, but since we do not know the criteria, how can we object to them? All we can object to is the results of the criteria.

Dr. Faber: The preliminary recommendations for Philosophy compliments them on quality of faculty, majors attending good graduate schools, efficiency. However, if a department has small numbers, there is a dilemma in upper-level classes and either one has only majors in classes, in which case it is being inefficient, or also have non-majors in the classes in which case they are diluting the quality of the education. The Philosophy department does not feel that the "dilution" is true. The BOR has isolated the low number of graduates as the problem.

Dr. Miller: Nowhere has he seen a set of standards published.

Dr. Shapiro: It appears one criterion is low numbers of graduates.

Dr. Faber: There is no list of criteria published. This is an attempt to figure out and interpolate what the criteria are.

Mr. Logan: DPIS was also reviewed. They recommended that the associate degree be dropped and the 4-year degree needs to be strengthened to remain a free-standing major, and at the same time Dr. Murphy wants us to cut out some hours.

Dr. Gatschet: There were criteria when the Masters in Chemistry was dropped. There were certain numbers of graduates specified.

Dr. Caplan: The Regents call the criteria "guidelines". The 5 majors in a masters predated the review. There are not numerical criteria written down that if you meet, you pass and if you don't you fail. It is purposely vague.

Dr. Gatschet: Supports the spirit of the motion but we would be better advised to decide what we are objecting to before we go on record as objecting.

Mr. Ison: suggested changing "criteria" in sentence one to "preliminary recommendations".

Dr. Faber: Not in favor of the change. Feels the major problem is establishment of this year's criteria being used in future years.

Dr. Miller: Questioned whether there is a total overall policy.

Dr. Rickman: Dr. Caplan summarized the feeling he has received. Not all Regents review programs the same. Objects because the criteria are nebulous. Bottom line is we do not like the results of procedures. If we object, we object to the outcomes.

Dr. Tramel: Reminded us that not all departments are necessarily unhappy with the results. No department at FHSU is more than five years away from its next review. If the kinds of decisions made this year are made for the same reasons they were made this year, many of you who passed in recent years will not the next time. If we wait and act reactively when that happens, there is the weight of precedent. The difficulty really isn't with the particular programs that are picked this year as much as what happens if whatever process they are using the same thing is applied down the road. The best you can do since they do not publish criteria, you can conjecture what they must have been from looking at the pool from the preliminary recommendations. That's the best that one can do. It is true what the vice president and the dean have said in several conversations. There is a pattern. The pattern is you've either got to be directly involved in teacher education or you'd better have very large numbers.

Dr. Caplan: I have been through enough of the review processes; I went through one when I was in foreign languages and that is exactly the way it goes.

Dr. Tramel: The word "criteria" is perhaps not the best word in this case. I would really suggest that we should not here act like we reject all the preliminary recommendations. That isn't true. Dr. Fleharty does not feel dissatisfied. It's also untrue, however, that we ought to focus just on this year. I really think what's wrong is using those kinds of demands, whatever they may be, as articulated, in the future. That's what Paul (Dr. Gatschet) was bringing out.

Dr. Giese: I asked Dr. Bartholomew if he thought the focus was on numbers and teacher preparation and he said yes.

Dr. Frerer: It seems to me we need something more like a positive statement than a negative statement. We need to say something like "the Board of Regents has given this university a particular mission as a broad liberal arts institution." That is our main goal, and there are things happening that are endangering that mission and goal. Instead of saying something negative, we need to say we want to be what you always wanted us to be.

Dr. Giese: I asked Dr. Bartholomew what do we do, and he said something about our regionality was our best approach.

Dr. Hoernicke: In terms of the discussion relative to what the role of this university is, I think it's fine to say that it has a liberal arts role in Western Kansas, but it would be disasterous to assume that the only role of this university is liberal arts. Obviously I'm from education, so I'm talking about the need to provide services in education as well. I think when we begin to set out to look at the programs that we're under we can very easily say focus on one or the other and that it is not very conducive to focus on the entire role of the university. In that role I think teacher education does play a part. I think it would be disasterous to says that it doesn't. I'm not sure that we're a liberal arts university. I think that the role and the mission of this university is unique to the regionalization concept. It meets the needs of a variety of the public out there. If we begin to look at just one or the other (obviously I'm very concerned about all of the programs that are scheduled for cuts or what have you), I think we need to respond much more to that in a less fragmentary way and talk about the role of the university not as if we are only a liberal arts university which is the implication here, but in fact a university which meets the needs of western Kansas.

Dr. Shapiro: Am I correct that as part of the recently completed Role and Scope Statement we do specifically have a role as a liberal arts institution?

Dr. Frerer: Yes.

Dr. Caplan: Every written statement I've seen coming out of the University or the Board of Regents refers to us as a comprehensive liberal arts university. It doesn't exclude professional schools. That means we are not supposed to be a professional school exclusively. The thing we we really object to is two things, whether they're written into the criteria or not. (1) We object to recommendations which are based on numbers of majors and graduates independent of the quality of the end product. (2) We object to the emphasis on giving large amounts of support to departments that have a large educational involvement as opposed to those that don't. That's not saying that if you have a large involvement you're not any good.

Mr. Ison: Cited the incident several years ago in the English Department when they almost lost the MA program, so they combined the MA and MS programs. Historically, there have been several happenings that have to do with the Regents' application of the numbers game. Mr. Ison moved to table the motion, seconded by Dr. Miller. The motion to table failed.(14Y; 17N)

Dr. Frerer: Suggested that the Executive Committee act for the Senate on this motion.

Dr. Shapiro: Suggested substitution: "questions" rather than disagrees with.

Dr. Markley: Asked about production for the MFA.

Dr. Stevanov: They went on how many produced, so it was not on quality.

Dr. Giese: The problem is universal across the Regents institutions so we had better check into it fairly quickly. I believe we had better start digging something up on why we are different.

Dr. Gatschet: Suggested that perhaps if Dr. Faber would accept Dr. Caplan's motion which seems to be in agreement with what we are objecting to, we could perhaps withdraw your motion and have Dr. Caplan's motion.

Dr. Caplan: after the comma, "it disagrees with the apparent emphasis placed on involvement with teacher education and number of majors and graduates independent of the quality of the graduates."

Dr. Faber agreed to accept it as a friendly amendment. Seconded by Mr. Logan.

Dr. Klier asked if we should emphasize our role as a regional institution.

Dr. Klier moved that we add after quality of the graduates, "and which disregards the regional role of the institution" as a friendly amendment. Seconded by Mr. Ison.

There was additional discussion by Dr. Hoernicke and Dr. Caplan on the role of teacher education. For those departments which do not have a large service component for teacher education courses the credit hour production would be much less. Dr. Hoernicke suggested leaving out the reference to teacher education. Dr. Caplan did not accept a friendly amendment.

Dr. Daley moved that we eliminate "involvement with teacher education and" as an amendment, seconded by Dr. Horvath. Dr. Caplan said that would eliminate part of his objections. You can protect small programs if they are involved in teacher education, while a similar size department not involved in teacher education would be in trouble.

Dr. Gould felt that Dr. Caplan's motion serves the purpose. We have to respond to the recommendations.

There was a call for the question on the Daley amendment. Motion failed.

The Caplan amendment was reread.

There was further discussion on what the numbers mean by Dr. Rickman and others.

The question was called. The motion passed with three no votes.

The accepted motion passed as follows:

Although the Faculty Senate firmly supports the review of programs by the Board of Regents, it disagrees with recommendations that are apparently based on involvement with teacher education and number of majors and graduates independent of the quality of the graduates, and which disregards the regional role of the institution. Consistent application of these criteria in this and the next few years would eliminate programs essential to fulfilling our recognized role as the liberal arts university of western Kansas.

Dr. Giese said that at the November meeting we will break out into small groups led by the External Affairs Committee and go to work. Topics will be assigned and we will identify our resources and where we will go.

It was moved and seconded that we adjourn. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 4:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Rumpel, Secretary
Faculty Senate

3. Dr. Larry Gould was designated to author a brief proposal to be presented at the November meeting of the Board of Regents which would provide funding for the establishment of a microcomputer communications network designed to encourage enhanced interaction between Faculty Senate Presidents and among faculty at the seven Regents institutions. This communications network which would employ electronic mail, electronic bulletin boards, and conferencing and would be one component in a larger Regents campus interaction plan proposed by Kansas State Faculty Senate President David Schafer (August, 1981).

4. Individual State and Board statements designed to summarize the role and characteristics of each of the Regents institutions were presented at the October meeting of the Board of Regents. Presentations were made by the Chancellor, the five University Presidents, and the President of Kansas Technical Institute. The Regents' general response to the presentations focused on what the Board perceived as a lack of specificity in selected institutions' statements, continued duplication of efforts among the Regents institutions especially at the graduate level, proliferation of new programs, an inability on the part of University officials to attach costs to new and existing programs, and a failure to place adequate emphasis on research and "joint" ventures between and among the Regents institutions.