



University Senate Archives

University Senate

Academic year 1966-1967

Volume III

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 24, 1967

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:
<https://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15233>

UNIVERSITY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

NOTICE OF MEETING

DATE : MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1967

PLACE: EAST BALLROOM, CAMPUS ACTIVITIES CENTER

TIME : 3:30 P.M.

AGENDA

- I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF APRIL 10, 1967
- II. ANNOUNCEMENT CONCERNING ELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS TO THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
- III. CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION OF POLICY REGARDING DEPOSIT OF THE UNIVERSITY BUDGET IN ABLAN LIBRARY
- IV. REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON PREVENTING CONFLICTS OF INTEREST IN RESEARCH -- MR. SNYDER
(COPIES OF THE REPORT WERE DISTRIBUTED TO MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE TOGETHER WITH THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MARCH 13, 1967.)
- V. REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES -- MR. HARDER

APPOINTMENT OF TRAFFIC COMMISSION
- VI. REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER A STUDENT COURT OF APPEALS -- MR. FARNSWORTH
- VII. AS MAY ARISE

UNIVERSITY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF APRIL 24, 1967

Time: 3:30 P.M., Monday, April 24, 1967
Place: East Ballroom, Campus Activities Center
Presiding: Mr. Cowgill

As recorded on the attendance sheet, those present were: Miss Boardman, Miss Sherman, Messrs. Berg, Breazeale, Bubieniec, Chrisman, Comstock, Cowgill, Cress, Cutler, Dralle, Dunn, Genova, Graham, Hanson, Harder, Herman, Jakowatz, Kenyon, Killian, Lindquist, Miller, Missal, Mood, Nicholson, Nickel, Powell, Reif, Savaiano, Snyder, Sowards, Taggart, Terflinger, Terwilliger. Not present were: Miss Burgess, Messrs. Armstrong, Ceasar, Dent, Duerksen, Fullerton, Jabara, Johnson, Paulson, Richardson, Spomer, Voth, Woodard.

- I. Hearing no objection, Mr. Cowgill stated that the minutes of the meeting of April 10, 1967, be considered approved as circulated.
- II. The Secretary announced that divisional elections of new members of the 1967-68 Senate were being held and that the election of Members-At-Large will be completed by the time of the last meeting of the 1966-67 Senate, May 22, 1967.
- III. The next item on the agenda was continuation of discussion of the policy regarding deposit of the University Budget in Ablah Library. Mr. Harder announced that he had polled his constituents in the Political Science Department and found that six were opposed to making the Budget available to the faculty and two were in favor. He stated that although an individual's right to privacy must be considered, in the matter at hand in two respects the Senate had no choice. The University Budget is a public record, and if the University did not make it available to the faculty, the State A.A.U.P. had already announced that it would. Mr. Harder expressed the opinion that the faculty needs to have budget information if it is to participate meaningfully in policy making.

Mr. Cutler reported results of the poll he and Mr. Mood had made of the faculty of the English Department - of fifteen responses received, twelve were in favor, two were opposed and there was one "no opinion." Mr. Cutler said that the University is growing rapidly and that problems which will arise will force creation of structures and practices which have not been considered. In support of the motion that the University Budget be placed in the library, he concluded by saying, "In search for truth, we must be guided by the truth."

Mr. Lindquist amplified a statement in the first paragraph on page four of the minutes of the meeting of April 10, 1967. The A.A.U.P. Chapter at the University of Kansas had in the past obtained from the state office in Topeka information concerning faculty salaries. At present, this information is provided to that chapter by the Vice-Chancellor of Finance at K.U. The information includes ranks and salaries but not names. Similiar information has been given to the W.S.U. Chapter of the A.A.U. P. by the President's Office for several years. At no time has the Chancellor or Vice-Chancellor of K.U. given a copy of the line budget of K.U. to the K.U. Chapter of the A.A.U.P. Mr. Lindquist added that recently the Advisory Committee of the K.U. Senate recommended to the K.U. Senate that the K.U. Budget not be placed in its library.

Mr. Jakowatz stated that aggregate statistics (e.g., ranges and means at the various ranks in the various departments) would be more meaningful to the faculty than would individual salaries. Mr. Miller agreed.

A question was raised of the legality of restricting access to the Budget to the faculty. The restriction was proposed in an amending motion made by Mr. Missal at the April 10, 1967, meeting. Mr. Missal was of the opinion that since the Budget is a public record in Topeka, making it more accessible to one group would not be illegal.

Miss Boardman suggested that inking-out of individual names in the line budget would lead to a greater degree of anonymity. Mr. Missal changed the amending motion he made on April 10, 1967. The amending motion as changed was to ink-out the names of individuals in the line-budget and to restrict access to the WSU Budget to WSU faculty members. Mr. Savaiano seconded the amending motion as changed. The amending motion carried but not unanimously.

Mr. Savaiano suggested that the entire Faculty of the University be given an opportunity to vote on the policy under discussion. Mr. Miller agreed. Mr. Lindquist stated that he was inclined to have the matter brought before the entire Faculty because of the obvious divided feeling on the issue.

The motion, made by Mr. Kenyon on April 10, 1967, as amended by Mr. Missal and the Senate at this meeting reads as follows: The University Senate recommends to President Lindquist that the WSU Budget, with the names of individuals inked-out (made illegible) be placed in Ablah Library and access to it be restricted to WSU faculty members. The motion passed unanimously.

- IV. Mr. Snyder, Chairman of the ad hoc Committee on Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Research, presented that Committee's report. Members of the Committee were Mr. Snyder, Mr. Breazeale, Mr. Christenson, Mr. Cotter and Mr. McBride. Copies of the report together with the December, 1964, joint statement of the Council of the American Association of University Professors and The American Council on Education entitled, "On Preventing Conflicts of Interest in Government - Sponsored Research at Universities" had been distributed to members of the Senate earlier.

Mr. Snyder moved and Mr. Mood seconded that the report be accepted, that it be included in the Faculty Handbook and that a copy of the report be sent each faculty member. After the discussion, recorded below, the motion was unanimously approved.

Most of the discussion concerned the question of faculty members accepting grants or contracts for research of a restricted nature the results of which might be classified information. Mr. Sudermann stated that an annual report of all grants and contracts accepted by the University is made in the minutes of the Research and Publications Committee and that these minutes are made available to the Secretary of the Senate. Thus the grants and contracts accepted can be periodically received by the members of the Senate.

- V. Mr. Cowgill requested permission to consider next the report of the ad hoc Committee on a Student Court of Appeals. The Committee was comprised of Mr. Cutler, Mr. Rhatigan, Mr. Sowards, Mr. Terflinger and Mr. Farnsworth, the Chairman. The essential features of the report are reproduced here.

The ad hoc Committee on a Student Court of Appeals was charged with the responsibility of providing a procedure to adjudicate disputes arising between students and faculty. The jurisdiction of this court was regarded as including appeals from students who felt they had been treated unfairly either as to the grade they received or charges of cheating, plagiarism, etc. that an instructor had levied against the student. In general the jurisdiction of the court was regarded as that of resolving difficulties between faculty and students that could not be settled within the framework of the student-faculty classroom relationship.

The committee has deliberately not provided specific lines to be used by the student-faculty court in resolving disputes. The committee felt that such guide-lines would have to be provided by the court and would be a natural outgrowth of the disputes that come before it.

The committee fully recognizes that the establishment of a student-faculty court challenges the concept that the faculty member is absolute monarch in his own classroom. In effect this absolutist position has never existed in that students could take their disputes to their respective dean or the appropriate departmental chairman. The hope of this committee is that some procedural arrangements can be established that will bring the dispute to the student-faculty court if other means of resolving the complaint cannot be found.

The procedure outlined by the committee is as follows: A form will be made up and housed in the Dean of Students' Office. This form can be picked up by the student who feels he has a complaint. By use of this form the student can request a change of grade or other action he feels necessary to satisfy his request. The student must state in writing the complaint he is making against a member of the faculty. The procedure by which this form can be acted upon will begin with the appropriate departmental chairman. The dispute, of course, can be resolved at this level and if the student does not wish to take it further it can end here. If, however, the student wishes to carry the dispute further the departmental chairman should attach his recommendation and then the dispute would go to the dean of the appropriate college. Again, the student can drop his complaint at this level but if he wishes to continue the dean can attach his recommendation and the dispute would then go to the student-faculty court for final decision.

There are two characteristics about this recommendation that should be pointed out. The first is that the initiative for carrying out the procedure will in each instance rest with the student. It was felt by the committee that this was necessary in order to keep the number of disputes to a minimum and to avoid the petty harassment of faculty members. Secondly, the court would be used as the final arbiter in the dispute. The committee considered using the court as one of original jurisdiction, that is the dispute would go directly from the classroom to the court. After exploring this possibility the committee felt it might be inviting a number of cases that

could be resolved in a less formal atmosphere with the chairman or dean. By following the above procedure the court will have a record upon which to base its recommendations.

The committee felt that students should be represented on the court but not in a majority. A suggested number would be three faculty members and two students to serve as court justices.

Mr. Farnsworth moved the adoption of the report and Mr. Cutler seconded.

Mr. Genova asked if the Court could refuse to hear a case and Mr. Farnsworth answered in the affirmative. Mr. Rhatigan asked how the faculty member would present his side of the case. Mr. Farnsworth replied that the faculty member could appear before the Court. Mr. Farnsworth also stated that the Committee had not ventured to suggest how the student justices of the Court are to be selected. Mr. Sowards said that he, as a member of the Committee, wished to underscore the fact that the recommended procedure would invade the classroom as the decision of the Court would be final.

The Senate adopted the report with approximately two-thirds of the members present favoring it.

Mr. Herman then moved and Mr. Nickel seconded that the report, with the Senate's firm approval, be presented to the entire faculty. Mr. Cowgill stated that as it was a matter of general faculty concern, it would be presented to the Faculty.

VI. Mr. Dralle, speaking for Mr. Harder who had to leave, moved that the Committee on Committees' report on the appointment of a Traffic Commission be postponed until the next meeting. The motion was seconded by Miss Boardman.

Mr. Lindquist requested that this item, if it were postponed, be placed first on the agenda of the next meeting. Mr. Malone pointed out that the last meeting of the Traffic Committee will have taken place before the next Senate meeting and that a report of paid and unpaid traffic tickets will be made at that time.

Mr. Dralle's motion to postpone carried.

The University Senate meeting of April 24, 1967, was then adjourned.

Donald O. Cowgill, Chairman

Date Approved

E. J. Bubieniec, Secretary

Carroll 92