University Senate Archives

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

University Senate Academic year 1977-1978

Volume XIV

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 10, 1978

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at: http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15273

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE

AGENDA

Meeting Notice: April 10, 1978, 126 Clinton Hall, 3:30 p.m.

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements.

III. Approval of the Minutes for the meeting of February 27, 1978 (Vol. XIV, No. 10).

IV. Orders of the Day: None

V. Unfinished Business: None

VI. Committee Reports: Report of the Library Committee--Raymond Wiebe for the Committee (Attachment A).

VII. New Business: Revised Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Evaluate the General Education Curriculum--David Childs for the Committee (Attachment B).

Report and Recommendations regarding the inclusion of chairpersons in a potential bargaining unit--Allen Schuermann for the Faculty Welfare Committee (Attachment C).

Amendments to the Senate Constitution--William Perel for the Rules Committee (Attachment D).

VIII. Adjournment

Apr 10

ATTACHMENT A TO
SENATE AGENDA
April 10, 1978

Document #16

LIBRARY COMMITTEE PROGRESS REPORT
TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
April 3, 1978
Raymond F. Wiebe, Chairperson

1. Goals and Roles of the Library and Media Resources Committee.

The goals and roles of the Library Committee as based in the Amended University Senate Constitution are as follows. The composition of the committee shall be fourteen members: standard faculty composition - 10, students - 2, ex officio - 2. The standard selection procedures as provided by the University Senate shall be followed. The Library Committee is concerned with policies and related procedures affecting the operations of the University Library as it serves the University's students, faculty, and the public at large. Reports to the Senate, as required under the Standard Charge to all Policy Committees, shall include recommendations made to and actions taken by the Director of Libraries. The Standards for College Libraries, as published in October, 1975, in the College and Research Libraries News, Standard 7, Administration 7.3, is quoted as follows:

> "There shall be a standing advisory committee comprising students and members of the teaching faculty which shall serve as the main channel of formal communication between the library and its user community."

2. A Summary Description of the Ablah Library and the Media Resources Center.

2.1. The administration and staff of the Library/MRC receive their appointments, budget, and authority from the Central Administration.
2.2. Library employees number ~~over~~ 40 positions of professionals, Civil Service, and Student Assistants.
2.3. The annual budget is over $1.4 million.
2.4. The library is the conservator and service agency for ~~over~~ more than one million books, periodicals, documents, microforms, etc.
2.5. The physical structure contains over 100,000 square feet with an investment of $3 million.
2.6. The Media Resources Center owns a collection of 16 MM films, film strips, slides, phono discs, audio tapes, and video tapes. They help plan and produce a broad variety of media and instructional aid materials. Another important function is the loaning and/or operating various media equipment (projectors, tape recorders, the mobile video tape camera, and photographic cameras, etc.).

word deleted see minutes 4/10/78

3. Services to University Students.

The perception and understanding of the services available to students is related to their knowledge of library holdings, information search services, and borrowing

procedures and regulations. Some of our students come to us with only a meager previous experience in library use. The English Composition Library Instruction program is a major component of our dealing with this concern. The Freshman English Composition faculty and the Library Reference Department faculty have tried variations of methods and programs to achieve the above goals as related to our students. The present program consists of a "Library Week" unit during the English 101 semester. Two class periods of intensive instruction by one of the professional librarians (using films and the Library Book) are followed by the student self-guided tour and the unit knowledge test. Library professionals believe that this program has assisted significantly in the decrease in student directional or location questions and the corresponding increase in requests for reference information. Continuing a trend of recent years, material used within the building, but not checked out, also showed a 14% increase over the previous year.

4. Services to the Instructional and Research Programs of the Faculty.

The maintaining of a balance between the ideal goals of the Library Committee and the realities of management responsibilities by the Library Administration requires a continual review and evaluation of resources, plans and operations. The new Ablah Library building was dedicated on November 2, 1962. A news article of that date states that this new structure should meet the needs of Wichita University for a number of years. It describes their pride in the expanded 350,000 volume capacity and the research facilities such as the 24 faculty carrels. These facilities are now full and used above capacity. A summary of the spring 1977 faculty carrels report shows that three were used for special purposes (handicapped students, etc.), two carrels had one faculty member assigned, sixteen had two faculty members assigned, and three carrels had three people assigned to them, to total 46 persons. The assignment of study carrels is done by the Library Committee.

The present book circulation policies were developed by a joint student and faculty committee during an extended and extensive study. They are an attempt to balance an amount of fairness concerning student access to books and the more liberal check-out privileges desired by certain teaching and research faculty. The revision of these policies and related alternatives will continue to be studied by the committee.

5. Library Committee Studies the Library MRC Functional Departments.

One of the major functions or departments was studied and reviewed at each committee meeting. A broader understanding of the Library and Media Resources operating procedures and plans for the future was one of the year's goals. The proposed meeting agenda together with two or three pages of background material was mailed to the committee members about one week before each meeting. Finding a suitable time to meet was a continuous problem. Most of the absences were from "excused" absences such as attending professional meetings off campus. The following table presents the days of meeting, the major subjects, and other related information.

Date	Subject or Function	Library Department Representative	Attendance
October 11, '77	Planning for the Year and Library Study Environment	Jasper Schad, James Eller, Carol Holman	50%
November 4	Circulation Systems, by computer and manual	Marna Jo Young	82%
December 2	Books and Periodicals Collection Development	Marilyn S. Myers	82%
January 13, '78	Reference Department, Inter Library Loan	James B. Taylor	82%
February 1o	Media Resources Center, Production and Scheduling	Carol Holman	75%
March 10	Tour of facilities and demonstrations of automated circulation, computer card cataloging, and Data Base Information searches		84%
March 24 (special meeting on Good Friday)	Review of book check-out privileges by general public, students, and faculty, review of the "policy committee" concept and the "advisory committee" concept.		33%

The above attendance proportion is based on the net attendance possible excluding unfilled vacancies and Library personnel.

6. The Media Resources Center Services and Policies.

The Media Resources Center functions are more service and production oriented that the library as a whole. The library is an information retrieval and information repository institution. The Media Resources Center (MRC) has organized and published a new catalog of 16 MM film holdings according to department or subject areas. This document should make it easier to order and arrange for using these films in our classrooms. The title cards of over 700 film strips are in the main card catalog of Ablah Library. The faculty is making more use of the production of audio and visual materials and video tapes. The present limitations of personnel (nine in number) and facilities space is a concern of both the committee and the Library Administration. We understand that the recently approved Federal minimum wages for student assistants will pose another serious concern since the outlook for a proportional increase in budget funding is dim.

7. Conclusions, Suggestions, and Comments.

7.1. The goals and roles of this committee. The Standards for Library Committees, Commentary on Standard 7 contains the following:

> "Although the successful college library must strive for excellence in all of its communications, especially those of an informal nature, it must also have the benefit of an advisory committee representing its user community. This committee - of which the librarian should be an ex officio member - should serve as the main channel of formal communication between the library and its publics and should be used to convey both an awareness to the library of its patrons' concerns, perceptions, and needs, and an understanding to patrons of the library's capabilities and problems. The charge to the committee should be specific and it should be in writing."

The Senate Committee on Committees has begun a consideration of committee functions and relationships.

Comment. The role of faculty members on the Library Committee, in relation to the great increase in the total number of faculty at WSU; and the comparative increase in the Library/MRC staff and programs; may have changed

sufficiently from 1963 to 1978 that it is more advisory concerning plans and policies. The designation of Advisory-Policy Committee may be more satisfactory.

Suggestion. This change should receive additional study.

7.2. Comment. A few of the Library Committee members, in response to a questionnaire sent out by the chair, have stated that they are specifically interested in assisting with the long-term goals and needs of the library. This would seem appropriate since the present status of the library was studied this year.

7.3. Comment. The Library Committee reported to the Senate on January 30 on the protection of confidentiality of borrowers (both faculty and students). In addition, the Library Administration and the Computer Center staff have assured our committee that all safeguards are in operation so that book circulation information is just as confidential and secure as are our personal payroll records, etc.

7.4. Comment. The present student representation on the committee is hardly sufficiently large and diverse to speak to all of their concerns.

Suggestion. Double the student membership on the committee to four so that they can feel that they have a representative voice on the committee. Some faculty members on a committee tend to look upon themselves more as spokes-persons for faculty concerns.

7.5. Comment. This is a sincere word of recognition to the committee members who contributed their time and talents this year. The time, suggestions, and work put in by Mr. Schad, Ms. Holman, Mr. Eller, and the whole library staff is appreciated. A thank you is extended to Ms. Laura Potts for her composing the meeting minutes, typing them, and mailing them out (together with the meeting agendas and attachments) to the sixteen person mailing list.

Faculty approved as interim program through 5/15/78 '81-'82

AMENDED VERSION
Accepted by Senate
4/17/78

Document # 17

REVISED REPORT
OF THE
AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW AND EVALUATE THE GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM
REVISION COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP: David Childs, Glenn Miller, Henry Unruh

March 1978

Background of this committee

When the faculty voted to adopt the present General Education Requirements in 1973, it was stipulated that an Ad Hoc Committee of the Senate be appointed to review the program in about three years. Such a committee was appointed in November, 1976. It collected data and held hearings in the Spring of 1977, making its report to the Senate in November, 1977; that report was tabled. A new, smaller committee was set up to explore all issues afresh in the context of the current debate on relevant questions. The report of this committee follows.

A Point of Departure

"The curriculum is the major statement any institution makes about itself, about what it can contribute to the intellectual development of students, about what it thinks is important in its teaching service to society. It deserves more attention and merits less neglect than has been accorded it by most institutions of higher education in recent years. For at least a decade now, higher education has been more intent on responding to internal and external pressures on the curriculum--and they have been severe--than in developing coherent educational policies. We believe that attention to these policies is by now a high priority, that the curriculum of the future should be less the result of pressures and more the consequences of sustained thought, and that higher education should demonstrate that it can think about what is needed as well as respond to what is demanded."[1]

Definitions, History, and Issues

The undergraduate curriculum may be thought of in three relatively equal parts: general education, the major, and electives. This division implies a functional definition of general education as those aspects of the curriculum which are common to all students of an institution. In terms of function, one may subdivide general education itself into three parts: advanced learning skills, breadth or distribution requirements, and programs designed to interrelate or integrate various approaches to some common area of interest or problem.

Since the beginning of higher education in this country, when general education, liberal education, and the total curriculum were coextensive (and all taught by the President of Harvard) there has been a great movement away from general toward diversified and even individualized education. In place of the

---

[1]The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Missions of the College Curriculum: A Contemporary Review with Suggestions (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1977), p. 18.

old caricature of the university as an "ivory tower" we might well picture the modern university as an "academic shopping center."[2] A perusal of the catalog of a modern university often gives the impression that there is no general education program, since all graduation requirements may be listed in terms of specific programs or degrees, with very little commonality to be found among them.

This is not the case at Wichita State University, where we can trace the lineage of our current requirements back to a rather specific core of courses in Fairmount College. Catalogs of the early fifties show a compact list of courses including few options required of all university students except for engineering and fine arts majors, whose requirements were more specific. By the early sixties the exceptions were gone, but the list of courses had begun to swell with options. By the early seventies the list had grown to include all courses in many departments. The "old core" had in effect grown into a sort of distribution requirement. It was at that time that the Task Group on General Education formulated the present requirements.

The Task Group identified and responded to many of the same academic issues and concerns addressed in the Carnegie Report cited above. The first is a conviction that general education is a vital concern of the university as a whole which is not well served by the same departmentalization of faculty which serves the specialized disciplinary needs of the institution so well. This led the Task Group to such actions as the separation of budgets for the Communications Skills Programs from the general budgets of the English and Speech Departments, and to the creation of University-wide Advisory Committees in both of the Communications Programs and in the General Studies Program. Another conviction of the Task Group was that advanced learning skills are basic tools not only for functioning in a post-baccalaureate world, but also for the most efficient utilization of the educational opportunities which college offers. This led to the requirement that Composition and Speech be taken in the first year. A third concern of the Task Group was described in the Carnegie Report as follows: "To serve students who wish to satisfy distribution requirements, some departments simply encourage students to take the courses they designate as introductory for their own majors. Unfortunately, such courses seldom are broad enough to introduce students to an entire subject field or provide any understanding of the history and approach of the discipline itself."[3] This concern led to the creation of General Studies Courses. A related concern is that such courses, "when they are badly handled, . . . deteriorate into superficial 'appreciation' courses."[4] The Task Group responded to this by creating the semi-autonomous Director of General Studies, with the responsibility to monitor the quality of the courses.

---

[2]Ibid., p. 5.
[3]Ibid., p. 170.
[4]Ibid.

As this committee has listened to the arguments and rebuttals in the current debates, it has appeared to us that most of these same convictions and concerns are quite central to the discussion. An additional element of urgency has been added to the present debate by uncertainty resulting from enrollment shifts. Nationally, these shifts have been dramatic. In 1969, 27% of all undergraduates majored in humanities or social sciences, and 36% majored in professional areas. In 1976 those percentages were 13% and 58%, respectively. In 1969, humanities and social science faculty comprised 32% of the total, as did professional area faculty. In 1976 the faculty percentages were 31% for humanities and social sciences and 37% for professional areas.[5] This context makes an issue-oriented debate difficult to sustain; however, such debate is clearly preferable to a curriculum born on the battlefields of interdepartmental war.

Communications Programs

The report of the original review committee expressed basic agreement with the structure of these programs, including the "first-year" requirement. It recommended that the Advisory Boards for Oral and Written Communication be required to meet twice a semester rather than four times. This committee concurs in all of these matters. The original review committee recommended that the administration move toward full implementation of the staffing requirements of the Task Group Report, without defining what those were. The Task Group stipulated that the proportion of Teaching Assistants in the Composition Program and the proportion of part-time personnel in the Oral Communications Program "shall be significantly smaller than it has been in recent years." A comparison of the staffing patterns in 72 - 73 with those of 76 - 77 shows a complex picture. In Composition, the proportion of GTAs has indeed gone down, from 58% to 42%, but the proportion of lecturers has risen from 1% to 19%. At the same time, the commitment of regular faculty to the Composition Program increased by 25%. In spite of this effort the proportion of regular faculty in the program decreased from 41% to 37%. In Speech, the proportion of lecturers has risen from 10% to 15%, and the proportion of GTAs has risen from 48% to 49%. The proportion of regular faculty has fallen from 42% to 34%, and the commitment of regular faculty to the program has fallen by 2%. While it seems that improved training programs for GTAs and lecturers have combined with more rigorous standards in the courses to improve the overall quality of these programs, we would urge that the administration exercise vigilance lest the staffing patterns of these vital programs be allowed to deteriorate, as the evidence would suggest may have begun in the Speech Program.

The committee believes that the ability of our students to communicate effectively has been declining for many years consistent with national trends. Many enter the university with marked deficiencies in this area, and it is not always possible to correct these deficiencies in the normally allotted time for these courses. We believe that academic pressures may combine with

---

[5] Ibid., p. 103.

the other factors in the situation described to exert a depressive influence on standards in these skills. To counteract this influence we recommend that the Academic Standards and Practices Committee be charged to consider whether or not a mechanism should be devised whereby a student enrolled in a basic skills course could be continued through successive enrollments without normal grading, until the required competency level can be achieved.

Distribution Requirements

The original review committee took exception to the complexity of the current distribution formula and proposed a simplification of it. The present committee also proposes a simplified formula, but one which will preserve the flexibility of the current system. We recommend that the current catalog copy on p. 36 (II), 2, 3, 4, and 5 be replaced with:

2. Rules for the 32-hour distribution requirement are:
   a. None of the general education distribution hours may be taken within the student's major department.
   b. A minimum of six hours must be selected from each division.
   c. Courses must be taken in at least two departments in each division.
   d. The eight hours remaining after the distribution just specified may be taken in any division (s) except the division containing the student's major.
   e. At least eight of these distribution hours must be in General Studies courses, described in the next section.

The General Studies Program

Most of the debate of the recent past has revolved around the General Studies Program. We have identified a number of issues, among which are the following: 1) That General Studies is a "non-discipline" and that it is the occasion of unwarranted extra-departmental intrusion in departmental affairs. We believe that it is essential that general education transcend disciplinary boundaries in order to perform transdepartmental functions. If these aspects of the program are offensive, we encourage our colleagues to accept offense in exchange for coherency in general education. 2) That the General Studies requirement of 8 hours is dishonest, unfair to WSU students, and the cause of arbitrary distortions of enrollment patterns. In candor, we believe that some requirement of hours or courses is necessary to guarantee continuing interest in and vitality of the program. General education is almost by definition "nobody's business" unless the institution makes it somebody's business. We believe that the eight hour requirement, representing between 25% and 30% of the general education distribution is neither excessive nor questionable. We believe that the enrollment distortions which are attributable to General Studies are in fact part of the original intent; i.e., the incentive for development and maintenance of quality General Studies courses was to have been provided by the "carrot"

of credit hours to be produced by those courses. If the distortion is in fact arbitrary, and not related to legitimate general education functions, the problem lies with the conception of the particular courses involved and the solution should be sought at that level, not by attacking the essence of the program. 3) That the structure of the committee has too few controls and is subject to various forms of abuse. We concur, and recommend that the Senate initiate a process of rotating three-year terms for membership on the committee, and that short of invoking a standard membership formula, it should continue its efforts to insure that persons are appointed from a variety of disciplines throughout the university. In order to keep lines of communication open we recommend the adoption of policy that in the event of differing opinions between the General Studies Director and the proposing department (s) with respect to any decision of the former, the Director shall consult with the department chairperson (s) before final disposition. Another issue relative to the General Studies Program is the conflict between two of the functions of the general education distribution requirements. One function is to expose students to a variety of disciplines in order to broaden the students' choices in the selection of the major. Another function is to introduce the student to ways of knowing and disciplines different from those involved in the major. Our requirements presuppose that the student knows his or her major from the time college begins, in a sense. While a non-General Studies distribution course may be integrated within a major and a course in another department may then be substituted for the "lost" distribution course, the same is not possible for a "G" designated course. We recommend that more General Studies courses be offered at the upper division level to help avoid this situation for students who remain undecided about their major for significant periods of time. We also support the recommendation of the original review committee that the Director address the scheduling problems of these courses, with particular attention to the need for evening courses. Another issue which it would seem appropriate to address in this context is the matter of integrated, interdisciplinary ventures. Such courses came to and departed from this university in the sixties, and the Carnegie Report recommends that such experiences be a regular part of general education curricula. It would appear that the General Studies Program would provide an appropriate framework for the administration of such courses, should faculty wish to embark upon such a venture. We recommend that the General Studies Program be given explicit authorization to include interdisciplinary courses among courses given the G designation. Such suthorization would seem to contradict some of the language describing the program in the Task Group report, but to be implicit in other language of the same report. We would wish that explicit authorization would also be interpreted as encouragement for such undertakings.

Toward the Future

By a slowly developing curricular evolution, Wichita State University seems to have at present a general education program in structure and at least potentially in substance which embodies many of the features which the Carnegie Group is recommending to institutions which have moved more strongly

towards diversity in the past. We should keep what we have, but general education review should be a more regularized process. It may be that the distribution formula is too inexplicit for the student's welfare. Two examples: 1) The Carnegie Report suggests that the Advanced Learning Skills component (which we limit to Communications Skills) should include specific quantitative skills, perhaps with reference to the influence of computers in modern society, and yet Mathematics is under a common umbrella with Natural Science in our formula. 2) The Carnegie Report recommends that involvement with the creative arts be a part of every student's experience (to include arts such as music, creative writing, dance, theatre, and the other fine arts), and yet our formula has a single category for Humanities and Fine Arts, while many of the creative arts are concealed in the Professional Studies division. These and other examples have come to our attention which call for continued review of our curriculum, so that we may be able to respond to opportunities before they become problems. To this end, we recommend that item 3 of the Senate Charge to the Curriculum and Academic Planning Committee be made much less explicit. We believe that the committee should be charged with a continuing review of the general education program, including all aspects of the distribution requirements. As adequate as our general education program may seem to be at the present time, it should not be carved in stone.

Document 17 (a)
Distributed at Meeting
5/1/78

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To John Dreifort, Senate President Date 24 April 1978

From David Childs

Subject General Studies Director

The following description of qualifications and duties of the Director of General Studies is based upon the Task Group Report, Recommendations of the Review Committee, and actual practice.

The Qualifications for the Director of General Studies shall include:

1. A terminal degree in a standard and basic academic field,

2. Extensive university teaching experience in an institution of established quality, and

3. Scholarly accomplishment in his or her field.

The Duties of the Director of General Studies shall be:

1. To review all proposals for General Studies courses, including the particulars of scheduling and staffing, and with the advice of the committee to approve or to disapprove the "G" designation of each proposed course,

2. To monitor and review each previously approved General Studies course being offered each semester,

3. To withdraw the "G" designation from any course which fails in practice to satisfy the requirements for that designation, after appropriate consultation and with the concurrence of the University Committee for General Studies,

4. To consult with department chairperson(s) before final disposition of any matter in which the opinion of the proposing department(s) differs from that of the Director, and

5. To work with department chairpersons in the scheduling of General Studies courses to ascertain that sufficient offerings are made available at upper division levels and in evening hours.

The Director of General Studies, in his/her function as Director, shall be independent of any department or college, and shall be responsible to the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Distributed at Meeting 4/10/78

ADDITIONAL DATA ON THE BASIC ORAL COMMUNICATION PROGRAM (BOCP)

The Revised Report (dated March 1978) of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Evaluate the General Education Curriculum (chaired by Dr. David Childs)--hereafter referred to simply as the Revised Report--presents some data about the staffing patterns in the BOCP in the two academic years of 1972/73 and 1976/77. Those figures were derived from teaching load reports. To present a more complete picture of how staffing patterns evolved in the BOCP from year to year between 1972/73 and the present, the following figures (derived directly from official class list records of regular credit BOCP course sections) may be helpful; the figures represent the percentage of such BOCP sections taught each year by various types of faculty.

Type of faculty	1972/73	1973/74	1974/75	1975/76	1976/77
Regular faculty	43%	34%	47%	43%	42%
G T A	48%	59%	53%	52%	49%
Lecturer	9%	7%	0%	5%	9%

These figures indicate that, despite some year-to-year fluctuation, the proportion of sections taught by each type of faculty was essentially the same in 1976/77 as it was in 1972/73. Hence, no deterioration in staffing is evident.

The above figures take the following factors into account:

1. Sections taught by GTAs or regular faculty but funded on lecturer monies are counted as being taught not by lecturers but by GTAs or regular faculty (which they actually were). Only lecturers who were not GTAs or regular faculty are counted as lecturers.
2. Summer session sections are excluded, to provide data parallel to that in the Revised Report. (Summer session sections are almost always taught exclusively by regular faculty).
3. The official class lists (from which the figures in this document were derived) provide a more comprehensive and detailed picture of BOCP sections, year by year, than do the teaching load reports (on which the Revised Report relies). Class lists were compared with other records to determine category of faculty, etc.

These factors help account for discrepancies between figures in this document and those in the Revised Report.

The Revised Report says that the commitment of regular faculty to the BOCP (expressed as the percentage of regular faculty teaching BOCP courses each year) has fallen by 2%. While such a percentage (if accurate) is not significant in and of itself, it certainly does not represent the actual commitment of <u>appropriate</u> regular faculty in Speech Communication to the BOCP. The only regular faculty who can be appropriately included in this comparison are those who are members of the rhetoric and communication division of the Dept. of Speech Communication. Only the faculty in this division are qualified by training and experience to teach BOCP courses. Faculty in other divisions of the Dept. of Speech Communication (such as Theatre, Radio-TV-Film, etc.) are not specifically trained to teach public speaking or interpersonal communication. Given this definition of regular faculty as rhetoric and communication division members, the commitment of regular faculty to the BOCP each year (from 1972/73 through 1976/77) has remained at 100%; all rhetoric and communication faculty teach in the BOCP each year. The commitment appears to have declined slightly only when <u>all</u> Speech Communication faculty are included as regular faculty--which they should not be.

(over)

The Revised Report rightly recognizes that the overall quality of the BOCP has improved since 1972/73. For example, training programs for BOCP faculty have improved through the establishment of an annual two-week summer workshop in teaching BOCP courses, which is required of all new G T A s, as are weekly staff meetings on teaching the basic courses, conducted by the program director. Furthermore, only persons who are academically qualified to teach BOCP courses (with an appropriate Masters or with prior completion of the workshop and concurrent GTA status) are hired as lecturers. The primary goal of the training program for BOCP faculty is to assure the highest possible quality of instruction, regardless of the type of staffing.

Dr. L. Keith Williamson
Director, BOCP

ATTACHMENT C TO AGENDA
April 10, 1978

Document # 18
Replaced by substitute
Motion 4/24/78

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To John Dreifort, University Senate President Date March 21, 1978

From Allen Schuermann, Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee

Subject Report and recommendations regarding the issue of inclusion of chairpersons in a potential bargaining unit.

According to the Senate Agenda Committee request, the Welfare Committee has:

1. re-polled the chairpersons to determine their current viewpoint on this issue;

2. reviewed appropriate documents and reconsidered their implications;

3. formulated a final recommendation for the Senate's consideration.

Section I

Summary and Interpretation of Findings

The Welfare Committee has again compared the perceptions of the chairperson role held by chairpersons and the Administration at Wichita State University and weighed these perceptions in the context of legislation on collective bargaining and institutional policies and practices. We believe this summary provides an adequate perspective on the issue and justifies the nature of the recommendation in Section II.

At the time of the Committee's initial questionnaire in October, 1976, there was not a consistency of viewpoint among the chairpersons or between the chairpersons and the Administration. This lack of uniformity kept the Committee from any attempt at arguing for or against inclusion of the chairpersons in a potential bargaining unit. However, a marked change in viewpoint has occurred since the first chairpersons' survey was conducted. In the initial survey, only 26% considered themselves to be "supervisory employees". The survey of February, 1978, indicates that 76% now consider themselves to be "supervisory employees". In addition, in the initial survey, only 9% felt that the chairperson should be excluded from a potential bargaining unit. The survey of February, 1978, indicated that 57% now believe the chairperson should be excluded from a potential bargaining unit. Based upon the comments of the chairpersons, these significant changes in opinion were largely due to the President's and Vice President's presentations at the Kellogg Workshop and Senate meeting.

The Committee was able to obtain only very limited information from Pittsburg State. There does not appear to be an adversary situation at Pittsburg State even though chairpersons are excluded from the bargaining unit. However, this conclusion is based upon the fact that there does not appear to be any detailed involvement of the chairpersons in any bargaining unit negotiations. In practice, any negotiations are conducted at a level above the department.

The strongest concern which still exists in the minds of the chairpersons is the concept of collegiality. The Committee's belief is that the exclusion of chairpersons from a potential bargaining unit would not affect the collegiality to the extent that some chairpersons believe. In fact, the Committee believes that irrespective of whether or not a Faculty Bargaining Unit ever becomes a reality, the clarification of the role of the chairperson has resulted in an improvement in the manner in which chairpersons and faculty view this important university position.

Section II

Recommendation

In the Welfare Committee document of November, 1976, the Committee could not realistically attempt to argue for or against inclusion of chairpersons in the potential bargaining unit. The role of chairpersons was not uniformly construed and/or interpreted by the involved parties. However, the fulfillment of the Committee's recommendations of November, 1976, has resulted in a clarification of the issues and principles involved. The Welfare Committee therefore provides the following recommendation to the University Senate:

In view of (a) the fact that three years of on-campus discussion of the issue has ocurred; (b) the PERB hearings and action relative to the University of Kansas collective bargaining petition; (c) the limited experience with collective bargaining at Pittsburg Kansas State University; and (d) the Committee's belief that there is significant advantage to retaining all supervisory authority possible at the departmental or individual unit level as has been discussed during the several reviews of collective bargaining previously held on-campus, the Welfare Committee recommends that action be taken by the Senate to endorse the exclusion of chairpersons from any collective bargaining unit that might be legally adopted at Wichita State University.

Attachment A

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN TO ALLEN SCHUERMANN, BOX #35 (EXT. 3425) BY FEBRUARY 24

(ATTACH ADDITIONAL PAGES IF NECESSARY)

1. *K. S. A. 1974 Supp. 75-4322 (b) provides:*

   "Supervisory employee" means any individual who normally performs different work from his subordinates, having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, lay off, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibly to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend a preponderance of such actions, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but requires the use of independent judgment.

   Given this definition, do you consider yourself to be a "supervisory employee"?

   YES _____

   NO _____

2. *Do you think that chairpersons should be included in a potential bargaining unit at Wichita State University?*

   YES _____

   NO _____

3. *If you participated in the chairperson's survey of October, 1976, have your views been altered by information you obtained from various sources, e.g., Chairperson's Workshop?*

   YES _____

   NO _____

   I DID NOT PARTICIPATE _____

4. *If chairpersons are not included in the definition of a bargaining unit at Wichita State University, what effect, if any, do you think this will have on a person's willingness to serve as chairperson?*

_____ _____

Date *Name*

Attachment B

On February 15, 1978, a questionnaire was sent to 52 persons identified as "Department Chairpersons" on a list provided by Vice President Breazeale's Office. Thirty-seven (71%) responded to this request which slightly exceeds the response to the October, 1976 questionnaire.

I. Response to "Do you consider yourself to be a "supervisory employee?":

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	28	76
No	8	22
Undecided	1	2

II. Response to "Do you think that chairpersons should be included in a potential bargaining unit?":

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	13	35
No	21	57
Undecided	3	8

III. Response to "Have your views been altered since the chairperson's survey of October, 1976?":

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	9	24
No	15	41
Not Applicable	13	35

IV. Cross-tabulation of responses to the above 3 questions:

SUPERVISORY POSITION?	ALTERED VIEW?	INCLUSION IN BARGAINING UNIT? Yes	No	Undecided	
Yes	Yes	0	9	0	
	No	4	6	0	28 (76%)
	N/A	3	4	2	
No	Yes	0	0	0	
	No	2	2	1	8 (22%)
	N/A	3	0	0	
Undecided	Yes	0	0	0	
	No	0	0	0	1 (2%)
	N/A	1	0	0	
		13	21	3	37
		(35%)	(57%)	(8%)	

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To Vice President Breazeale Date April 26, 1978

From John Dreifort, University Senate President

Subject Role of chairpersons in a potential bargaining unit

Charged by the University Senate to make a recommendation relative to the role of chairpersons in a potential bargaining unit, the Welfare Committee brought to the Senate at its meeting of April 17, 1978, the following recommendation:

> "The Welfare Committee recommends that action be taken by the Senate to endorse the exclusion of chairpersons from any collective bargaining unit that might be legally adopted at Wichita State University."

In the course of the discussion concerning this recommendation, the following substitute motion was made:

> "The Senate votes to decide not to decide whether chairpersons should be included in a potential bargaining unit."

At its meeting of April 24, the Senate adopted the substitute motion. The effect of the Senate's action is to defer considering the role of chairpersons until such time as a bargaining unit is under active consideration.

Would you place this item on the agenda for final consideration by the faculty at its meeting of May 15. I include for your information the final report and recommendation of the Welfare Committee.

Attachment D1
4/10/78

Wichita State University

INTER-DEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE

To ALL SENATORS Date April 11, 1978

From Bryan Hay, University Senate Secretary

Subject

The attached 3 pages of amendments to the Senate Constitution proposed by the Rules Committee were inadvertantly omitted from ATTACHMENT D to the Agenda for the Senate meeting of April 10, 1978.

As the Senate did not act upon any of ATTACHMENT D at that meeting, the discussion and action on these issues will arise under Old Business at the upcoming meeting of April 17. Please add these pages to ATTACHMENT D of the April 10 agenda and bring it to the April 17 meeting.

Remember too, to bring ATTACHMENTS B and C from the April 10 agenda to the meeting of the 17th as these also deal with Old Business remaining to be acted upon.

Document #19

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE WSU SENATE CONSTITUTION

1. Amend Article I, Section 1, which reads as follows:

Section 1. It shall be composed of the president, the academic vice-president, the operations vice-president, the dean of students, the deans of the degree granting schools and colleges and the dean of the University College (ex-officio), and elected members of the instructional staff distributed as follows: (Amended by Amendments 1, 4, 12).

(a) For purposes of representation the University faculty is divided into the following divisions: Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Health Related Professions, Fine Arts, University College and Unassigned, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. (The three preceding divisions being constituencies of the Fairmount College of Liberal Arts and Sciences). The Senate representation of each of these divisions is to be determined in accordance with the following formula: When the number of faculty members in a division is between 2 and 25, it is to have two representatives; between 26 and 50 it is to have three representatives; between 101 and 150 it is to have five representatives; between 151 and 200 it is to have six representatives; and so on. The number of members of each division at the time of the Senate election will determine the number for any given year. It is the responsibility of the college election committees or similar agencies to confirm these figures to the President of the Senate prior to the selection. (Amended by Amendment 14).

(b) Six members at large.

(c) There shall be eight student representatives who shall be the President of the Student Government Association and seven other students designated by the SGA. (Amended by Amendment 14).

by replacing it by:

Section 1. It shall be composed of the President, the Academic Vice-President, and the Vice-President for Student Affairs, as ex officio members; elected members of the instructional staff as described under paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) below; and students as described under paragraph (d) below.

(a) For purposes of representation the University Faculty and Administration are divided into the following divisions: Business Administration, Education, Engineering, Health Related Professions, Fine Arts, the three divisions of Fairmount College (Humanities, Social Sciences, Mathematics and Natural Sciences), University Administration, and Academic Services. The Senate representation of each of these divisions is to be determined in accordance with the following formula: When the number of members of a division falls between 2 and 25, it is to have two representatives; between 26 and 50, three representatives; between 51 and 100, four; between 101 and 150 five; between 151

and 200 six, and so on. The number of members of each division at the time of the Senate election will determine the number of representatives for any given year. It is the responsibility of the Senate Rules Committee, in consultation with appropriate administrative officials, to determine the number of representatives from each division, prior to the election.

The College and divisional categories defined above shall include all faculty assigned to those units on a half time or greater basis. The administrative category shall include all those persons who hold the title Vice-President, Assistant Vice-President, Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Director of Libraries, Director of the Computer Center, Director of Planning, Registrar, and Director of Admissions. The Academic Services category includes those persons holding faculty appointment with the rank of instructor or higher, not otherwise included in any other category.

(b) No more than two members of any one department may be elected in any of the categories described in (a) above.

(c) Six members at large, but not more than four from any one college and not more than two from any one department. However, this regulation is not intended to preclude the election of senators from a department to represent one of the categories described above, in addition to at large senators from that department.

(d) There shall be eight student representatives who shall be the president of the Student Government Association and seven other students designated by the SGA (NO CHANGE).

The proposed change decreases the number of ex officio members from eleven to three, and the number of administrators from eleven to six, given the present size of the administrative category. The number of ex officio members has been increased in the past by the addition of degree granting colleges and by amendment. Deans and Directors not included as ex officio members under the present constitution have requested representation. There seems to be no valid reason for including some and excluding other persons. For example, at the present time, some deans are included and some excluded from the list of ex officio members. To increase the number of ex officio members so that all positions with some reasonable claim are included would lead to a larger percentage of administrative members than the Rules Committee deems reasonable.

Therefore, we propose to decrease the number of ex officio members, while at the same time creating an administrative category which can elect its own representation. As new administrative positions are created, they can be added to this category without further constitutional amendment. Furthermore, this category can serve as a pool from which administrative representation on committees can be drawn. There is presently no well defined pool of this type.

The other proposed changes are intended to prevent the domination of a single department in the representation accorded to a category or the domination of one college or department in the at large election.

2. Article III, Section 4 now reads as follows:

Section 4. The Senate shall create and delete faculty standing committees and shall select their membership. Senate actions under the authority of this section shall be final, unless appealed by one member of the Senate to the University Faculty.

PROPOSED CHANGE: (CHANGES UNDERLINED)

Section 4. The Senate shall create and delete faculty standing committees and shall select their membership. Senate actions under the authority of this section shall be final, unless appealed by one third of the members of the Senate, present and voting, to the University Faculty.

REASON FOR CHANGE:

In the past, when Senate action was appealed to the University Faculty by a single senator, the Senate action was not reversed and was, in fact, approved without debate. It seems a waste of the Faculty's time to have such matters sent to it on the request of a single Senator.

(REVISED)
ATTACHMENT D TO AGENDA
April 10, 1978

AMENDMENTS TO SENATE CONSTITUTION

Article V of the Senate Constitution now reads as follows:

ARTICLE V
Amendments

Section 1. Amendments may be made to this instrument by vote of the faculty. An amendment proposed by at least twelve members of the faculty shall be placed on the agenda of the next faculty meeting for action.

We propose to replace Article V by:

ARTICLE V
Amendments

Section 1. An amendment to this instrument can be proposed by any member of the Senate or by any faculty member. If proposed by no fewer than twelve faculty members, the Agenda Committee must place the proposed amendment on the agenda of one of the next two Senate meetings.

Section 2. If the Senate approves the amendment, it shall be placed on the agenda of the next faculty meeting. If the Amendment was proposed by a member of the Senate or by a Senate Committee, a negative Senate vote is final. If, however, the Amendment was proposed by no fewer than twelve faculty members, the proposed amendment together with the Senate recommendation shall be placed on the Agenda of the next faculty meeting, even if the Senate vote is negative.

REASON FOR CHANGE: The present constitution would allow an amendment to the Senate constitution to reach the Faculty without any discussion on the part of the Senate.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE SENATE RULES

Rule 8 currently reads as follows:

8. The Senate established that the use of proxies would be illegitimate in Senate elections.

Rule 27 currently reads as follows:

27. Proxy votes are illegitimate in Senate meetings.

We propose to strike both Rule 8 and Rule 27 and replace them by Rule 8, as follows:

8. Proxy votes will not be permitted, either in Senate elections or Senate meetings.

Reason for change: One rule is better than two, and we feel that the use of the work "illegitimate" is illegitimate in the present context.

Rule 14 now reads as follows:

14. Unless there is unanimous consent to the contrary, the Senate shall not allow its proceedings to be tape-recorded.

We propose to amend Rule 14, so that it reads as follows: (change underlined)

14. Unless there is unanimous consent to the contrary, the Senate shall not allow ~~its proceedings to be tape-recorded or video-taped~~ any audio or video recordings of its proceedings.

Amended and passed 5/1/78

Rule 16 currently reads as follows:

16. The Order of Business of the Senate shall be as follows:

    a. Calling the meeting to order.

    b. Informal proposals and statements.

    c. Reading and approval of the Minutes

    d. Orders of the Day

        (1) Special Orders

        (2) General Orders

    e. Unfinished Business

    f. Reports of Committees

    g. New Business

    h. Adjournment

We propose to simplify Rule 16 by changing it to read as follows:

16. The Order of Business of the Senate shall be as follows:

a. Calling the meeting to order.

b. Informal proposals and statements.

c. Reading and approval of the Minutes.

The order of business after the above three items will be determined in advance by the Agenda Committee, and submitted to the Senate membership prior to the meeting.

Reason for Change: We do not seem to have "Orders of the Day." It may be more courteous to the membership of a committee making a report to allow some flexibility in scheduling committee reports.

Rule 18 now reads as follows:

18. A motion to create a special order may be introduced by any member of the Senate and shall be considered adopted if a majority of Senators vote in the affirmative. The motion shall be in order only after action has been taken on all items of the agenda.

We propose to strike Rule 18, and replace it by:

18. A motion to create a special order may be introduced by any member of the Senate, in accordance with Roberts Rules of Order.

We propose to strike Rule 27, in view of the proposed amendment to Rule 8.

If the earlier amendments pass, changing the name of the Unassigned Category to Academic Services, we propose that the phrase Unassigned be changed to Academic Services, wherever it appears. (E.G., see I, C, 2, on Page 8 of the Constitution).

UNIVERSITY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of April 10, 1978. (Vol. XIV, No. 11).

Members Present: Ahlberg, Blazicek, Breazeale, Brewer, Bugg, Chaffee, Chopra, Duell, Gladhart, Gridley, Hammond, Hay, Houston, Kasten, D. Knight, Konek, Kukral, Matson, May, McBride, McFarland, Melgren, G. Miller, Millett, Nance, Palmer, Perel, Rhatigan, Shanmugam, Sharp, Shawver, Terrell, Terwilliger, Thomann, Throckmorton, B. Welsbacher, R. Welsbacher, Zoller, President Dreifort.
Members Absent: Adamson, Benningfield, Borresen, Christ, Graham, Harnsberger, Herman, Hoyer, Huston, Jakowatz, Kane, J. Knight, Lang, Magelli, Mathis, Mays, R. Miller, Myers, Rodenberg, Salyer, Sowards, Tilford.
Guests: J.G. Schad, Carol Weaver, Raymond F. Wiebe, Allen Schuermann.

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Dreifort called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS & STATEMENTS

President Dreifort noted that Senate meetings would be weekly from now on including one next Monday, April 17, and he added that senators would be receiving agendas for these meetings as soon as possible before the meetings but that it would be impossible to have agendas in senator's hands a week before each meeting. Upcoming Kellogg proposals in addition to end of year committee reports account for the crowded scheduling.

ACADEMIC ADVISING

President Dreifort announced that at a meeting of President Ahlberg, Vice President Breazeale, Dean McFarland and himself, it was decided to turn the issue of academic advising and the recommendations of the Task Force on Academic Advising back to the college deans in the hope of avoiding an ungainly bureaucracy being created to meet the Task Force recommendations.

EARLY RETIREMENT

Reporting on the status of the Early Retirement Proposal, President Dreifort noted that the Council of Senate Presidents met with the Council of Presidents of State Institutions and found the latter to have a very positive view of the proposal. The Council of Presidents plans to move ahead on the proposal but will want continued assurance of faculty support for the proposed plan.

BUDGET

President Ahlberg gave a brief account of legislative action on the educational appropriations bills. They were passed by the legislature on April 7, 1978 with faculty salary money and O.O.E. funds left unchanged. The special one year capital equipment request also passed. Conference committees also restored about half the money necessary to bring student pay to minimum wage level and money for some tuition waivers for graduate teaching assistants. Cuts in the money for nursing and for the Community Health request and for cable TV for WSU were not restored. The University got the right of full occupancy for Health Science Building and will receive money for working drawings of the Physical Education Building.

Senator Zoller proposed an expression of thanks to all who were involved in the successful work on getting the budget through the legislature this year.

President Ahlberg suggested that the fact this is an election year may have accounted for most of the success.

NATE ECTIONS

President Dreifort noted that Senate elections are currently in process and urged a maximum participation in the voting by all faculty.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Minutes for the meeting of February 27, 1978 (Vol. XIV, No. 10) were approved as circulated.

VI. COMMITTEE REPORTS

REPORT OF LIBRARY COMMITTEE

Raymond Wiebe, who chaired the committee, presented the report of the Library Committee to the Senate. He added a few pieces of information and corrections to the report as distributed (Attachment A to today's agenda): Delete the word "over" from page 1, section 2, sub section 2.4. He added that the spring '78 data on faculty carrel assignments is little changed (down by 4 faculty members) from the 1977 data cited in page 2, section 4 of the report.

He clarified the intent of the comment in sub section 7.3 on page 5 of the report, stating that he knew that payroll data was a matter of public record, but that book circulation information was as confidential as the itemized business details of individual payroll records.

Mr. Wiebe then thanked Dharam Chopra for his work on faculty carrel assignments and his service as vice chairperson of the committee, and he called for questions on the report.

Senator Duell, noting two suggestions contained on page 5 of the report, asked how to proceed on these. If the Senate accepts the report does that signify support for the suggestions?

Mr. Wiebe responded that details of these suggestions had not yet been thrashed out and the matter was still in committee.

President Dreifort proposed that the Senate might "record and file" the report rather than "approve" it. The Senate could then later review motions based on such suggestions.

MOTION TO "RECEIVE & FILE" REPORT

Senator Hammond then moved that the Senate "receive and file the report."

VOTE

The motion was approved unanimously.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

REVISED REPORT-AD HOC COMM. TO REVIEW & EVALUATE GEN. ED. CURRICULUM

The first item of new business was the revised report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review and Evaluate the General Education Curriculum.

President Dreifort outlined the history of the committee and its charge (see page 1 of Attachment B to today's agenda) and introduced David Childs who chaired the Ad Hoc Committee.

Mr. Childs immediately invited comments and questions on the report.

Senator Nance, recalling the problems raised regarding the impact on professional colleges of the change in distribution requirements recommended in the first report last November, asked what was done about that issue in this report.

Mr. Childs pointed out that section 2d of those distribution requirements (page 4 of Attachment B) had been changed from allowing the last eight hours "without respect to division" to the present wording.

There followed a discussion of the effects of this change on CHRP.

Carol Weaver, present as a guest, indicated that the change helped but still left 2 CHRP programs requiring 12 extra hours and 2 others requiring 6 extra hours.

Senator May asked for clarification on the degree of commitment of faculty discussed on page 3 of the report. The concern was about the proportion of regular faculty to GTA's in the communications program.

This led to Keith Williamson, Director of BOCP, bringing forward and distributing to those present an updated data sheet on the proportions of GTA's, lecturers, and regular faculty in the Oral Communications Program. The new data, based on actual class lists, varied slightly from data in the Ad Hoc Committee's report. The primary figures showed that by 1976/77 the proportions of these kinds of staffing in the BOCP was back to almost exactly what it was in 1972/73 before the General Education Curriculum was introduced.

Mr. Williamson explained the remaining information on his data sheet describing facets of the oral communications program, the structure of the Speech department, and the updating of teacher-training for GTA's in the BOCP. He explained that the claim of 100% commitment of regular faculty in the program did not mean all that faculty taught four sections each. Rather it means that each regular faculty member teaches in the program at least once each year.

Senator May then asked, regarding the recommendation on a charge to the Academic Standards and Practices Committee (underlined wording at top of p.4, Attachment B), 1. Did the committee check to determine what other universities do? 2. Did they have ideas as to how to implement the continuation of such students through successive enrollments?

This led to prolonged discussion involving Mr. Childs and Senator Zoller (Director of English Composition) on:
1. the use of the I grade to allow continuous enrollments in communications courses until competency was achieved.
2. the ASPC's opposition to this practice as an abuse of the "Incomplete" grade's purposes. Though the ASPC agreed some device was needed to solve the continuous enrollment need.
3. the extent of the problem. Senator Zoller estimated that if those requiring the continuous enrollment procedure were added to those urged to take "W" because they were failing, the numbers would represent about 20% of our enrollment.
4. the ineffectiveness of non-credit preparatory courses in open admissions schools like WSU.

Senator Hammond added to the discussion that in the past WSU had used a grade of "E" to indicate that retaking a course was required. She further noted that past experience with, and research on the results of, remedial composition courses indicated that such courses made little difference in student achievement in composition.

Senator Duell, noting that the Senate would be remiss in its duty if it did not face the issue, recalled the proposal to abolish General Studies course requirement that was discussed at the General Faculty meeting in December, 1977 and was tabled to await Senate action on the revised Ad Hoc Committee report. The faculty idea seemed to be to permit General Studies (GS) courses to continue as options. Adding that she was not certain she would finally vote for her own motion, but believing it necessary that the issue be discussed, Senator Duell moved to "strike section 2e from the distribution requirements proposed on page 4 of the report."

MOTION TO STRIKE 2e, P.4, ATTACHMENT B

President Dreifort noted the need to formally place the entire report on the floor for approval prior to entertaining motions to amend.

A discussion followed on whether the motion on the document should be "to accept" or "to receive" the report. The decision was that a motion "to accept the report" was the more appropriate one.

MOTION TO ACCEPT REPORT

Senator Matson moved to accept the report and Senator Blazicek seconded.

Senator Duell then repeated her motion to amend (above) and Senator Matson seconded.

The discussion that followed first focused on the effect of the amendment on the availability of GS courses.
--did students take such courses because they were required or because they were good courses, or because they were easier?
--would departments still offer their GS courses if they were not required?
--would the nature of the GS courses change if they were optional? Senator Hammond guessed the GS courses would not survive if they were optional and felt that the amendment struck at the heart of the concept in the whole document.

Vice President Breazeale took much the same view. He noted that while disagreement exists regarding what General Education should be, most studies suggest it has three components: 1 skills, 2 distribution requirements, and 3 exposure to courses created for General Education. It is impossible, he suggested, to remove the third component and do justice to General Education by skills and distribution requirements only. Departmental priorities tend to be oriented toward disciplinary requirements and the original task group had seen the need for incentives to bring the GS courses into being. If made elective, GS courses would be unlikely to survive.

Senator Gladhart then raised the issue of the difficulty in advising transfer students late in their major that they need GS courses.

Senator McFarland wondered if this were not an advising problem rather than a programmatic one.

Senator Gridley said that as a student he felt GS courses did not uphold their purpose and were redundant in leading students away from specialization which he felt they need today more than ever. He thus supported the amendment.

Senator McFarland then referred to past studies showing most students holding a preference for GS courses.

Senator Duell then observed that she still was awaiting a rationale for defeating her amendment. She referred to an LAS straw vote opposing the GS course requirement.

There was then a brief discussion of whether LAS and Business colleges had taken positions against the GS courses.

Senator Zoller then observed that while we may not like the administration of the GS program we have, the program itself is quite parallel to what the Harvard Committee on Curriculum is calling for. Their proposal would require special courses and a director and committee to evaluate and accept or reject them. He sympathized with the problems in the professional colleges but felt the need for GS courses in the BA and BS degrees.

Senator Millett, returning to the issue of a rationale for rejecting the proposed amendment, suggested that the original document establishing the General Education curriculum offered a good statement on the value of GS courses as did the committee report before us. While appreciating problems in advising in the professional areas regarding GS courses, she said the issue finally is one of education versus training and on that one she favored education. Most attacks on GS courses were not, she observed, directed at the courses or their rationale but seemed, in fact, to be provoked by questions of personnel and administration. She then suggested that it might be better to take the issue back to our colleagues to determine whether transferring the functions of the GS committee to the CAPC or some other committee might not resolve the problem.

At this point Senator Terrell motioned for adjournment, noting that a quorum did not seem to be present.

VIII
ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.