



# University Senate Archives

---

University Senate

Academic year 1976-1977

---

## Volume XIII

### Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of February 7, 1977

---

**Additional information:** Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at:  
<http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/15272>

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY SENATE

AGENDA

Special Meeting: February 7, 1977, 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 Minutes for the meeting of January 24, 1977  
(Vol. XIII, No. 7).
- IV. Orders of the Day: None
- V. Committee Reports: None
- VI. New Business: Report from Kellogg Project Task Force on  
Communications--Mr. Richard Reidenbaugh.  
  
Report from the International Communications  
Association regarding the internal communications  
audit at W.S.U.--Dr. Robert Smith, Dr. Gerald  
Goldhaber, Dr. Gary Richetto.  
  
Report from Kellogg Project Task Force on  
Administrative Development--Mr. Roger Lowe.
- VII. Old Business: As may arise from the Senate meeting of January  
24, 1977.
- VIII. Adjournment.

SPECIAL SENATE MEETING  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1977  
126 CLINTON, 3:30 P.M.

THE SENATE AGENDA COMMITTEE IS CALLING A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE SENATE FOR NEXT MONDAY IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FROM PRESIDENT AHLBERG.

THE MEETING IS PURELY FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES TO INFORM THE SENATE AND FACULTY REGARDING THE RECENT EROTIC FILM SOCIETY INCIDENT.

SENATE MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY.

Following is a copy of a letter signed by 61 members of the Wichita State University faculty and delivered to Dr. Ahlberg's office on Friday, February 18, 1977:

Dear Dr. Ahlberg:

Your statements to the press last Friday about the seizure of The Devil in Miss Jones have created considerable surprise and consternation among many members of the WSU faculty. We feel that the issue of academic freedom is at the heart of the matter. The Erotic Art Society is an SGA-recognized and funded society. Its intentions have been stated and have been approved by the University Community. This is not because the Community particularly likes the films it has shown, but because the Community appreciates the society's right to explore ideas, in this case an idea about art. This is no clearcut case of lawbreaking. It is, on the other hand, a clearcut case of the local District Attorney telling the University which ideas it can explore and which it cannot. If this incident is allowed to pass with no protest, we come under a shadow of fear and repression. Will the bookstore be next? The library? The class in human sexuality? The Ulrich gallery?

As long as its members are in no clear violation of the law, the University Community has exercised its responsibility to society to police itself and should thus defend itself from attack by those who would destroy its freedom. We hold a privileged position granted, like the British Constitution, by history and tradition. This privilege is academic freedom. You, as primary spokesman for the University Community, are primary spokesman for academic freedom.

We urge you, therefore, to reconsider your statements of last Friday. If it is true that the students were forewarned of the consequences and made their choice, it is equally true that the District Attorney is doing all in his power to see that there are consequences to suffer. Must we double their punishment? We urge you to make a public statement deploring the entry of local law enforcement officials into a meeting of a University-recognized club functioning as it has been doing for many months, and stating that you will do all in your power to see that no one's academic freedom is violated.

Sincerely yours,

February 21, 1977

This letter was passed around to Senate members but it was not on the agenda nor was it discussed by the Senate.

The Pres

Keller vs New York

~~Florida State vs~~

vs Florida State

---

Security at W S U has authority limited to the campus

UNIVERSITY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of February 7, 1977. (Vol. XIII, No. 8).

*Corrected at meeting of 2/28/77 to show Senators present.*  
Members Present: Adamson, Armer, Barrier, Breazeale, Brewer, Bugg, Caracciolo, Chaffee, Chopra, Cleland, Crawford, Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Graham, Hammond, Hay, Houston, Hoyer, Humphrey, Kasten, Knight, Konek, Kraft, Mathis, Matson, May, McBride, Miller, Palmer, Petree, Rodenberg, Snyder, Stephens, Terwilliger, Webb, B. Welsbacher, Zandler, Zoller.

Members Absent: Ahlberg, Benningfield, Berman, Greenberg, Harnsberger, Herman, Jakowatz, Kane, Koppenhaver, Krehbiel, Magelli, Mays, McFarland, Millett, Rhatigan, Rubalcaba, Shanmugam, Sharp, Terrell, Weaver, R. Welsbacher.

Guests: Roger Lowe, Don Christenson, Carla Lee, Phyllis Burgess.

I. CALL TO ORDER

President Duell called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS

President Duell made the following announcements:

- a) Volume II of the North Central Accreditation Review report is now on file in the Senate office (006 Morrison) and available to interested senators.
- b) The 1976 annual report of the Affirmative Action Program for Unclassified Personnel is also available in the Senate office. The last two pages (71-2) list the report's eleven key recommendations.
- c) Senators should update their copies of the Senate Constitution based upon the actions taken at the Senate meeting of January 24, 1977, adding:
  - 1) the definition of alternate Senate Committee members on pages 9 and 18,
  - 2) alternate members to the Court of Academic Appeals on page 22,
  - 3) the rule regarding proxy voting in Senate meetings on page 7.For details see attachments A and B to the agenda for the meeting of January 24, 1977 together with the minutes of that same meeting.
- d) As an item brought recently before the Dean's Council regarding how to avoid any actions that might discourage prospective students--a committee on Financial Aids and Admissions of Students has been formed composed of Bruce Cutler (Chair), Ralph Bontrager from Education, Nancy Scriven from Fine Arts, Mel Snyder from Engineering, Rosa Lee Ireland from CHRP, Bob Knapp from Liberal Arts, and Dean Vickery from Business. President Ahlberg has charged that committee to review all existing policies and procedures relating to financial aid or admissions for all types of students in order
  - "1. To determine how to improve the targeting of our financial aid so as to attract and retain the maximum number of students consistent with achieving other objectives of the financial aid program deemed to be of equivalent importance.
  2. To recommend changes in or new policies and procedures designed to maximize the benefit of financial aid to enrollment at WSU.

3. To review the philosophy, policies, procedures and standards which govern our present practice with respect to recruitment and admission of all levels and all types of students and to recommend changes which seem desirable and likely to stabilize or improve our enrollment."

The committee is due to report on its recommendations by early March.

- e) Dean's Council also heard a report on January 27, 1977 from the Committee on Class Starting Times (members: William Wynne, Martin Reif, Mary Herrin, Steve Brady, and Eric Davis). That committee recommends that Monday, Wednesday, Friday classes continue to start on the half hour as at present, but that Tuesday and Thursday classes should be changed from the present two period/one period split to two equal time formats of 75 minutes each. These Tuesday-Thursday classes would be scheduled as follows: 8 am - 9:15 am; 9:30 am - 10:45 am; 11 am - 12:15 pm; 12:30 pm - 1:45 pm. These changes will go into effect next fall.
- f) Copies of a memo passed around the senators present provide an update on eight items of the higher education budget, indicating the Governor's recommendations on each item and adding the addresses of three key members of the House and Senate Ways and Means Committees. President Duell again urged writing to legislators, indicated that the letters need not be long in that the legislators were possibly more concerned with a count of the numbers of percentages of constituents voicing opinions for or against particular budget items. Students who met with legislators recently report that the latter wonder why they do not hear from faculty members on these budgetary matters.
- g) As today's Senate meeting is a special one, there will be no regular Senate meeting on Monday, February 14. The next Senate meeting will probably be on February 28, 1977.

III.  
APPROVAL OF  
MINUTES

The minutes of the Senate meeting of January 24, 1977 (Vol. XIII, No. 7) were approved as circulated.

VII.  
NEW  
BUSINESS

The first item of new business was a report by Mr. Richard Reidenbaugh, speaking as chairperson of the Kellogg Task Force on the Communication Program.

REPORT ON  
KELLOGG TASK  
FORCE ON  
COMMUNI-  
CATIONS

Mr. Reidenbaugh first identified the other members of his Task Force--Gordon Terwilliger, Gerald Graham, Cleve Mathews, Robert Smith and Anthony Neville--and observed that the mailing to senators from Don Christenson's office describing the activities of the Kellogg Task Forces, provided a very appropriate summary of the report of the Communications Task Force. Mr. Reidenbaugh indicated therefore he would limit his report to a brief summary of the background considerations behind the report's emphasis on external and internal communications audits.

He indicated that the Task Force had addressed itself to

1. identifying the levels of knowledge about and perceptions of the communications process at WSU as seen by faculty and administration,
2. identifying and analysing problems of information flow,
3. identifying current channels of and barriers to communication, and
4. presenting the communication program.

In its work the Task Force had operated on the following theses:

- a) A fact communicated in time saves a lot of explaining,
- b) People don't like being taken by surprise,
- c) People resent not being informed, and
- d) No communication system works if people aren't listening.

The Task Force concluded that there was no shortage of communications channels at WSU, but that questions regarding those channels remain, such as:

1. were the lines of communication going through and to the right people?
2. was the information level adequate or satiating?
3. was the horizontal communication system as good as the vertical one?
4. were the communications appropriate, void, or timely?
5. what were the respective views of the institution held by the students, the alumni, the news media, etc.?

Mr. Reidenbaugh concluded his report by observing that WSU would be the first university to undergo a complete external communications audit. He expressed the university's gratitude to Mr. Frank Carney for funding the costs of the audit and related studies and he expressed the need for everyone's cooperation and assistance to complete the audit.

When no questions followed his presentation, Mr. Reidenbaugh turned the meeting over to Bob Smith the coordinator of the audit at WSU. Mr. Smith, speaking both as a faculty member and a member of ICA, the International Communication Association, explained the background to WSU's consulting with that organization to draw on ICA's experience in conducting internal organization audits. As part of the university's cooperative arrangements with ICA, a Liaison Committee, representative of the WSU constituents has been set up to work with the ICA team. A partial list of the membership was announced.

Mr. Smith then introduced Dr. Gerald Goldhaber, an Associate Professor from SUNY Buffalo and former vice-president of ICA and Dr. Gary Richetto, the current vice-president of ICA and corporate manager of organizational development with the Williams Companies of Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Dr. Goldhaber began the ICA presentation by outlining the background of ICA and its involvement in communications audits. ICA, the second largest communications organization in the U.S., began the project in 1971, developed and tested its instruments for six years, and has applied them in actual audits over the last two years on such institutions as banks, hospitals, school systems, a small component of a large university, several businesses, etc. He explained how ICA works with liaison committees of personnel from the organizations being audited to help make ICA methods and findings most useful to the institution under study. The audit itself is accomplished by means of

1. a questionnaire to get people's perceptions of communications audits
2. asking for examples of the most effective and ineffective communications
3. in depth interviewing done in two rounds--the first one written with a

- second, follow-up, oral interview 1½ months later
4. a network analysis of the communications data the institution provides plotting the actual traffic flow in comparison with what the institution believes is its operative communications flow.

Dr. Richetto then explained the logistics of the communications audit reinforcing the non-profit nature of ICA, its research orientation, and indicating that only costs directly associated with the audit will be charged. Further, he stressed that all instruments employed in the audit guarantee anonymity and confidentiality. The audit is not a witch-hunt, nor designed to air gripes, but is aimed at looking for the communications problems that all organizations face. Dr. Richetto concluded his remarks by indicating that the audit would be completed by the delivery of two reports, one oral, one written presently scheduled for mid-July. He reiterated the need for faculty cooperation and stressed the unique aspect of the ICA audit--that at the conclusion of the study ICA would leave behind the instruments and techniques for WSU to conduct a later audit on its own; ICA is not in the "audit business."

Focusing on this last issue, Senator May asked where the computer processing for the audit was done and was informed that the program was at SUNY at Buffalo. Senator May then inquired about access to that program for a later "independent" WSU audit. Dr. Goldhaber answered that the program could be handled through the Buffalo computer by mail or a computer programmer from there could help program the WSU computer.

Senator Zoller then asked if the audit information would be broken down to the level of departments or individual committees to determine how small unit communications are functioning. Dr. Goldhaber replied that the details of the data breakdown had not yet been decided by the Liaison Committee but that there could be problems of protecting confidentiality where the breakdown concerned too small a unit.

Senator Zoller then asked if data might be forthcoming on communication problems in major committees--as, for example, in the Promotion and Tenure Committee's apparent variations regarding a sense of standards.

Dr. Goldhaber replied that such a matter can be an issue and that if people identified a particular problem it could be included in the audit.

Senator Graham then asked if only formalized lines of communication were to be studied or if informal processes such as the grapevine or gossip would be included. Dr. Richetto indicated that the system's analysis would also check the grapevine.

Senator Hammond asked if the audit was designed to find where our communications breakdown or don't exist and if we were then left to find the cure. She was answered that the audit surveys strengths and weaknesses but then, through the Liaison Committee, seeks to determine ways of implementing the ICA recommendations.

Senator Barrier next asked if there would be any foreseeable effects of the audit for students.

Dr. Goldhaber replied that in this audit students are seen as the consumers of the university's "product"; that any improvement in faculty-administration communications cannot avoid helping students. Further, he noted, a later Carney-funded study focused on students was planned.

Senator Armer asked if past audits of other organizations had led to progressive changes and improvements in their communications.

Dr. Goldhaber responded that ICA in its research keeps up to date on changes implemented at audited institutions and that such records indicate progressive improvements.

Senator Armer then asked if the WSU audit was patterned on other audits and Dr. Richetto responded that the relationship of ICA to WSU was not a doctor-patient one. The audit was to aid WSU examine its own system and compare it with other institutions.

Senator Carraciolo asked if the WSU study was to be a base for later audits at other universities.

Dr. Richetto replied that there was a need for data from similar types of organizations to develop "norms."

Senator Webb asked what criteria were used to indicate that better communications were needed.

Dr. Richetto answered that WSU was not like a bank or hospital. The audit team will not make specific recommendations without the liaison committee. The team could offer tentative, general recommendations from their experience, but these will be made through the Liaison Committee.

Senator Zoller then asked about the planned distribution of the report, and was informed that one oral and two written reports were planned

1. a generally distributed written report.
2. a second, written report including 2-300 pages of data--for limited distribution to Liaison Committee, Kellogg Group and appropriate administrators.
3. an oral, in-depth report of the six members of the audit team to the Liaison Committee and other interested parties.

This last one could be shared with the Senate; the details on its circulation are not final as yet.

It was then asked if the audit would be based upon samplings or on 100% census. Dr. Goldhaber responded that the aim is for 100% involvement but that the interview procedures will be conducted in three rounds sampling 60 people per round.

The final question concerned what the Senate might do to assure full communication of the audit's results and full cooperation in the audit. Dr. Goldhaber replied that this was a problem but repeated that maximum cooperation would be necessary.

This brought to a close the question and answer session with the ICA representatives.

KELLOGG RE-  
P  
ADMINISTRATIVE  
DEVELOPMENT  
AND  
INTERNSHIP

The last item of business was the final task force report on the Kellogg Project-- that on Administrative Development and Internship, delivered by the task force chairperson, Mr. Lowe. He identified the other members of his task force as Robert Alley, John Belt, Leonard Chaffee, Jacqueline Snyder, Melvin Snyder, Phyllis Burgess and Don Christenson. The committee has been meeting since last August to develop a program for

- a) Administrative Internships (Department Chairpersons, Deans, V.P. etc.)
- b) Administrative Development Programs involving training programs and workshops for university administrators
- c) a plan for Administrative Evaluation.

Regarding the Administrative Internships--the Task Force's report specified (1) a time schedule; (2) the goals of the program; (3) the relation of the program to the University's Affirmative Action Plan; (4) a statement relating to both the person's individual needs as well as the institutional needs; (5) the recommending of an Internship Coordinator and an Advisory Committee; (6) the responsibility of the Coordinator and Advisory Committee to determine the offices in which interns will be placed; (7) an identification of the lines of communication; (8) an identification of problem areas to alert the Coordinator to; (9) a consideration of the potential of other internships beyond those of the Kellogg grant; (10) the process for recruitment and selection; (11) the criteria for selecting interns; (12) the evaluation of interns; (13) the evaluation of the Internship Program; (14) an assessment of the program's feasibility after the Kellogg grant is discontinued; (15) other miscellaneous, pertinent items.

The bulk of the work on the internships was done by a Task Force sub-committee on internships composed of Drs. Alley, Belt, and Chaffee. Vice President Lowe emphasized the Task Force's view that it was imperative that interns fully understand that their selection as interns is in no way a commitment on the University's part to place that person in an assignment if such a position becomes available. The intern may apply at his or her own option to be evaluated along with other interested applicants. This is in keeping with the University's Affirmative Action Plan.

The Internship Program is thus aimed at giving interns an initial experience in administration to help them determine whether or not they wish to pursue an administrative role.

The second part of the program--that on Administrative Development--addressed the training programs and workshops for administrative personnel. The six major workshop areas under this plan will be for

1. Central administration and deans
2. Associate and assistant deans
3. Chairpersons and directors who function as chairpersons
4. Graduate Coordinators
5. Classified personnel who serve in the departments of the first four groups
6. A combined workshop to interlink training and development of people in the specific workshops

The workshop development is scheduled to begin in March and be completed by the end of the spring semester.

The bulk of the work of the Task Force in the Administrative Development area was carried out by a sub-committee of Drs. Jacqueline Snyder and Mel Snyder. Current scheduling plans a review of the program with President Ahlberg in October, 1977.

In addition to the above, the Kellogg grant provides for eight mini (one week) internships for people to visit other campuses in an effort to improve administrative practices.

Concluding his report Vice President Lowe observed that it was not provided for in the Kellogg grant, the Task Force now included in its charge a program of evaluation of administrative personnel and that a package in this area was in preparation.

In opening the questioning on this report Senator Dreifort noted that the selection of interns had bearing on the future leadership of the university and indicated his concern for the selection process to be open. He noted the assurances that interns need not be the future leaders, but observed that the internship gives them "a leg up." He asked whether just faculty would be interns or if civil service personnel might also qualify.

In response Mr. Lowe repeated the Task Force's concern over these issues and asserted that the selective process would be fair with the Internship Advisory Committee composed of varied representation including as it does: one from Delta Project, one from Council of Deans, one from Administration, two from faculty at large with one to represent minority groups, one representative of Senate.

Regarding classified personnel as interns, he noted that the Task Force had favored permitting them to seek internships, but that in the light of the limited numbers of internships the Kellogg Leadership Team had decided that classified personnel shouldn't be involved.

Senator Zoller then asked if any group for other minority parties' rights (other than Project Delta to protect women's rights) would be involved in the Advisory Committee. Was there an understanding that one of the two faculty people selected would be from a minority? Mr. Lowe answered "Yes."

Senator Humphrey indicated that the Affirmative Action office needed to be given more information on the internship selections. Mr. Lowe replied that the document, as filed, was not yet in final form, but that he certainly knew of no objection to Affirmative Action seeing it.

Senator Humphrey returned to the question of faculty involvement in the eight mini internships. Could faculty with administrative positions qualify for these mini internships.

Mr. Lowe noted that the eight week program was not tied into the faculty per se. He then observed that the Kellogg internship program was intended to provide an avenue for minority and women to get into administration if they wanted to.

Senator Zoller asked if this was truly the purpose behind the program and Mr. Lowe said yes, that was in the original plan.

Senator Chaffee then offered an interpretation of this last response stating

that the internships were to afford access to learn about the administrative situation, not to gain a position necessarily.

Mr. Lowe agreed and added that the program was not exclusively for women and minorities.

Senator Davis then asked about the manner of choosing the selection committee.

Mr. Lowe responded by quoting the document on recruitment and selection of the committee and also stressed the Internship Coordinator's role.

Senator Davis asked the identity of the Coordinator and Don Christenson who was present said that Phyllis Burgess was the Coordinator.

Senator Hammond then observed that she was bothered by the repeated references to the program being "only a learning process." She said it was surely not just a way to learn and then to have interns go back to what they were doing before.

Mr. Lowe said he didn't wish to leave that misconception, the program intended to train leaders.

Senator Brewer asked if the Affirmative Action Officer would be a member of the selection team, to which Mr. Lowe replied, "No, but the Affirmative Action Officer would be involved.

Senator Brewer asked if that officer was presently being consulted and was told the selection of interns would be by the Advisory Committee and the Affirmative Action Officer.

Senator Armer asked about the specific requirements for Internship candidates.

The Internship Coordinator, Phyllis Burgess, then explained the selection process as follows:

All faculty members will receive invitations by mail to participate in the selections.

Each applicant must have been employed on campus at least two years. Each must furnish three letters of recommendation from fellow faculty members, one of which must be from an administrator under whom the person has served.

Ms. Burgess noted that while materials on the above have been prepared for distribution they have yet to be approved by the Advisory Committee--hence this, at present, is perhaps premature.

Mr. Lowe added that the Task Force had discussed these criteria too.

Senator Hammond asked for further clarification on the omission of classified personnel completely from the Internship Program, and Mr. Lowe repeated that there had been differences of opinion on this between the Task Force and the Leadership Team and that the final factor had been the limited number of internships available. Personally, he felt people in the classified area might try for internships and if some colleges could release someone the program might involve others.

Senator Humphrey returned to her concern for minority needs. She said she could not see how the second part of the program concerned with administrators could serve minorities. Further, she added, it was difficult to give an Affirmative Action review from the outside of the process; a different kind of input was possible if one was inside the selection process.

Mr. Lowe concluded the discussion in repeating that one of the faculty on the selection committee would certainly be a minority representative.

VIII.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

