



University Senate Archives

University Senate

Academic year 1976-1977

Volume XIII

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of April 18, 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

Meeting Notice: April 18, 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 the Minutes of the meeting of March 21, 1977
(Vol. XIII, No. 12).
- IV. Orders of the Day: None
- V. Unfinished Business: None
- VI. Committee Reports: Report of the Honors Committee--John Poe,
Chair (Attachment A)

Report of Academic Standards and Practices
Committee--Carol Weaver, Chair
(Attachment B)
- VII. New Business: Proposed change in Probation and Dismissal
Standards--Carol Weaver, Chair, Academic
Standards and Practices Committee
(Attachment C)

Proposed Rule Change to create a new standing
committee: The Rules Committee--Jeneva Brewer,
Chair, Committee on Committees
(Attachment D)

Election of student senator to replace Michael
Caracciolo who has resigned. (Name to be
announced)
- VIII. Adjournment

HONORS COMMITTEE

Document 24 Annual Report to the Senate, 1977

When the Coordinator of the Honors Program was interviewed for the position in spring, 1976, he made the following statements: ". . . I look upon the Honors Program as a catalytic element within the learning community. I would hope that the Honors Committee would work continually and frankly with the Coordinator, not only in problem areas, but also in new areas of the program within the University."

Accordingly, The University Honors Committee, comprised of Faculty and two Honors student members, have met with the Coordinator ~~three separate times~~ to discuss the Honors Program. More sessions are planned. A sample of questions discussed follows: Ideally, what is the purpose of an honors program? How do the goals of an honors program differ from the goals of higher education? How are the goals of an honors program related to the goals of a university? Do these need to be compatible? What kind of program do we have at Wichita State? What are the goals and objectives of the Wichita State Program? What would be the ideal program at Wichita State? Is the program we have the best we can offer? Is it realistic to assume that the Honors mechanism will survive possible declining enrollments and budgetary slashes? Are there any steps that should be taken to ensure the life of the program, or can we rely upon the good graces of departments and the administration and leave things as they are?

Discussion of these and other questions have been useful and appropriate in at least several ways. They have led to suggestions that might be useful and appropriate for implementation in the future, they have reaffirmed the need for an honors program at Wichita State, and they have suggested that a public relations problem exists because many in the University know little about the contributions of the Honors Program to the life of the University.

Other problems of concern to the committee and coordinator were the impact of the possible decline of enrollments on the Program, and the concomitant action of some departments to discontinue offering Honors sections. At least two departments that offered Honors courses regularly have indicated they will not do so in the near future, and several others that have offered courses in the past quite regularly are noncommittal about the future. These actions came after low enrollments in courses.

The University Honors Committee plans to meet with Vice President John Breazeale and one or more Deans of the University to discuss the problems of the Honors Program and ways of rectifying them.

The evaluation of the Honors Program initiated last year has been continued. Several of the questions were modified for this year's survey. (See attached questionnaire.) In addition to the survey of student views and attitudes, the Honors office is beginning a study of Honors students

24 for the past several years. Data will be gathered to determine who enters the Honors Program, and what happens to Honors students after admission to the program. Do they complete their education in four years? How many Honors courses do they take? From where do they come? Useful but probably not readily available is where Honors students go after their undergraduate work. Plans are to complete the survey this summer.

Some preliminary data on the profile of Honors students enrolled in the University in spring, 1977, are offered.

Distribution of Honors Students by College and Class

	Fr	So	Jr	Sr	Gr	Sp	TOTAL
Liberal Arts	8	36	33	60	0	1	138
Business Admin.	1	10	7	4	0	0	22
Education	1	4	7	7	0	0	19
Engineering	8	10	12	8	0	0	38
Fine Arts	2	12	9	22	0	0	45
Health Related	1	9	8	5	0	0	23
University Coll.	94	4	0	0	0	3	101
Continuing Educ.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Graduate School	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Totals	115	85	76	106	5	4	391
Per Cent	29.41	21.74	19.44	27.11	1.28	1.02	100.00

Semester Hours Carried - 5,862

AVERAGE - 14.99

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
FULL - TIME: STUDENTS	164	195	359
CREDIT HOURS	2,586	3,023	5,609
PART - TIME: STUDENTS	14	18	32
CREDIT HOURS	112	141	253
EVENING ONLY STUDENTS	0	0	0
DAY/EVENING STUDENTS	0	0	0
DAY ONLY STUDENTS	178	213	391
MARRIED	8	23	31
SINGLE	170	190	360
FOREIGN STUDENTS	1	0	1
ETHNIC ORIGIN:			
AFRO-AMERICAN	3	1	4
ORIENTAL-AMERICAN	2	0	2
MEXICAN-AMERICAN	0	2	2
LATIN-AMERICAN	0	0	0
AMERICAN-INDIAN	0	1	1
AGES 16-21	138	167	305
AGES 22-34	40	44	84
AGES 35 AND UP	0	2	2

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
VETERAN STUDENTS	4	0	4
Work 40 HOURS/WEEK	10	11	21
Work 20-39 HOURS/WEEK	41	54	95
Work 10-19 HOURS/WEEK	49	66	115
Work Less than 10 HOURS/WEEK	78	82	160
LIVE IN RESIDENCE HALL/FRAT	45	53	98
LIVE WITH PARENTS	81	99	180
OTHER LIVING ARRANGEMENTS	52	61	113

The data suggest that the Honors Program has a favorable impact on the University in terms of number of students enrolled, total full-time equivalents and their rate of retention. There were 433 students enrolled in the Honors Program in autumn, 1976. Seventeen were graduated from the University in December. Twenty-three were dropped from the Program because they failed to maintain the 3.1 grade-point average, and eleven new students were admitted to the Program during the fall semester.

Three hundred ninety-one Honors students enrolled in the University in spring, 1977. Of these, three hundred fifty-nine are full-time students. The average number of semester hours carried by the 391 is 14.99. It is also significant that Honors students are in the "day only students" category, and none has a combination day-night or evening only schedule. Of the current Honors students, 275 work fewer than twenty hours each week. The data show that the overwhelming majority of Honors students are full-time students and that nearly 100 percent of those enrolled in the fall semester, and who did not graduate or were not dropped from the Honors Program, enrolled in spring, 1977. As a group Honors students carry a much higher average course load than the University average and their rate of retention is higher than the University average. Without doubt there are numerous other ways in which the Program has an impact on the University and the student body at Wichita State University. Data are not available to pinpoint reasons Honors students enter WSU. Was the Program itself the decisive reason? At the same time, we suspect that vigorous efforts by the Honors Office were a major contributing factor.

The Spring, 1977, enrollment distribution is compared with the Spring, 1976, distribution as follows (1976 listed first):

<u>Class</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>		<u>Percent of Total</u>	
	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>	<u>1976</u>	<u>1977</u>
Freshman	122	115	27.48	29.41
Sophomore	123	85	27.70	21.74
Junior	80	76	18.02	19.44
Senior	113	106	25.45	27.11
Graduate	4	5	0.90	1.28
Continuing Education	2	0	0.05	1.02
Special	0	4	0.00	1.02
TOTAL	<u>444</u>	<u>391</u>	<u>99.60</u>	<u>100.00</u>

College

Business Admin	25	22	5.69	5.63
Education	25	19	5.69	4.86
Engineering	45	38	10.25	9.72
Fine Arts	49	45	11.16	11.51
Health Related Pro	20	23	4.56	5.88
Liberal Arts and Sci	154	138	35.08	35.29
University College	121	101	27.56	25.83

Sex

Male	213	178	47.97	45.52
Female	231	213	52.03	54.48

24 The following are the Honors courses offered in the 1976-77 academic year:

Fall 1976

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Instructor</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>
Honors 301	Paradise Regained: The Utopian Vision	R.R. Meyers	15	45
Honors 400	Transactional Analysis	M. Dennis	8	24
Anthropology 202H	Cultural Anthropology	W.L. Parris	12	36
Art History 124H	Survey of Western Art: Modern	J.C. Moore	6	18
Chemistry 111H	General Chemistry Lab-Rec	J.R. Simons	16	80
Econ 203H	Honors Principles of Economics	R.C. McKibbin	6	24
English 101H	College English I	G.J. Broadhead	20	60
English 102H	College English II	G.J. Broadhead	20	60
English 101H	College English I	W.F. Woods	20	60
English 102H	College English II	W.F. Woods	10	30
History 131H	History of the United States	W.E. Unrau	6	24
Math 242H	Introductory Analysis I	J.J. Brewer	30	150
Math 344H	Introductory Analysis III	R.C. Wheritt	12	36
Psychology 111H	General Psychology	P.D. Ackerman	12	36
Sociology 211H	Introduction to Sociology	J. Hartman	7	21
Spanish 111H	Elementary Spanish	A.J. Cardenas	6	30
Spanish 112H	Elementary Spanish	A.J. Cardenas	8	40
Speech 111H	Basic Public Speaking	J. Schunk	13	39
Speech 112H	Basic Interpersonal Communication	R. Smith	23 230	69 882
			$\bar{x}=12.78$	$\bar{x}=49$
Honors 410	Independent Study	Arranged	18	52

24

Spring 1977

<u>Course Number</u>	<u>Course Title</u>	<u>Instructor</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Credit Hours</u>
Biology 114H	Introductory Biology II	W.M. Langley	3	20
Chemistry 112H	General Chemistry	J.R. Simons	5	30
Instructional Services 452H	Special Studies Seminar in Education	J.M. Nickel	3	6
English 102H	College English II	R.M. Kidder	13	39
English 301H	Radical Affirmation: The Anti-Hero in 20th Century Literature	J.W. Poe	10	30
English 400H	Satire & Comedy	B.S. Hay	13	39
French 111H and 112H	Elementary French	L. Bryant	6	30
Logopedics 400H	Jr-Sr Honors Sem	K.W. Burk	7	14
Math 243H	Introductory Analysis II	J.J. Brewer	29	145
Nursing 560H	Nursing Research	B.A. Haag	7	21
Speech 111H	Basic Public Speaking	J.F. Schunk	10	30
			<u>106</u>	<u>404</u>
			$\bar{x}=9.64$	$\bar{x}=36.73$
Honors 410	Independent Study	Arranged	34	92

24
 Honors Students enrolled in the University and in Honors Courses, Spring
 1973-Spring 1977:

<u>TERM</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Total in Honors Courses</u>	<u>NUMBER ENROLLED IN UNIVERSITY</u>
Spring	1973	140	538
Fall	1973	215	590
Spring	1974	147	
Fall	1974	342	503
Spring	1975	233	
Fall	1975	320	
Spring	1976	175	444
Fall	1976	250	432
Spring	1977	106	391

The figures readily available for each of these semesters reflect a high of 590 Honors students enrolled in the University for fall, 1973, to a low of 391 enrolled in the University in Spring, 1977.

The following reflects enrollment in Honors 410, Independent Study, since Fall, 1973:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>Number of Students enrolled</u>	<u>Credit Hours Total</u>
Fall 1973	10	32
Spring 1974	22	66
Fall 1974	23	61
Spring 1975	43	103
Fall 1975	28	76
Spring 1976	44	89
Fall 1976	18	52
Spring 1977	34	92

24
 The Honors Option, which was instituted several years ago to assist Honors students in completing their Honors requirements with upper division courses, had seven students selecting one course in the fall and 24 selecting one in the spring.

One change was made in the Honors Program format. The University Honors Committee voted to permit an Honors student to count one upper division General Studies course designated for the Honors Option toward the Honors Program graduation requirement.

Other aspects of the Honors Program implemented in the past were continued by the new Coordinator. Seven interview sessions for prospective students for the academic year 1977-78 were held through February. One more is planned. One session was held in Kansas City, one in Salina, and one in Dodge City. One hundred fifty-four students have been interviewed, and 143 high school seniors admitted to the Honors Program. The total number of parents attending these sessions is approximately 195. The number of students interviewed compares favorably with last year's number and it seems that this year's total will nearly equal or perhaps exceed the number interviewed last year. Sixty-nine students and their parents were present for the Honors Program presentation on February 18, the night before the Distinguished Scholarship Competition on campus. This is more than twice the number for the same event in preceding years.

In March the Honors Program moved to a new suite in 218 Liberal Arts and Sciences I. In the past concern has been expressed about a lack of community among Honors students. The new Honors lounge may work to overcome this problem. In addition, the new facilities also have a study room with four study carrels. We have noticed a significant increase in the use of the new facilities. Honors students have continued to organize faculty-student colloquia and these are conducted in the Honors lounge. An open house is planned in April for Honors students and faculty who have taught Honors courses within the last three or four years.

The Honors Counselor, Mario Dennis, is leaving in August. Interviews for the position will be conducted in late spring or early summer.

Document 25 Annual Report To The Senate By The
1976-1977 Committee On Academic Standards And Practices

During the 1976-1977 academic year, Carol Weaver, CHRP, has served as Chairperson of this Committee and Don Foster, Natural Sciences, has served as Secretary of the Committee. To date the Committee has met 17 times and plans at least two more meetings before the end of the semester. Items which have been handled by this Committee during the academic year include the following:

1. The Committee reaffirmed a policy that each college has the responsibility for evaluating a student's compliance with the General Education requirements. This evaluation should be completed at the time of the student's transfer into the college.
2. The Committee granted continued approval of the courses in the Nursing Department which have been approved for Graded Credit by Examination for the fall, 1976 and spring, 1977 semesters. These courses will be reviewed again prior to the fall, 1977 semester for Graded Credit by Examination.
3. On November 15, the Committee met with student record clerks and staff of the Admissions Office in an attempt to answer questions regarding the evaluation of transcripts in accordance with University policy.
4. As a result of the meeting with the student record clerks, the Committee reworded some portions of the present catalog in order to provide clarification of University policies. Because these clarifications did not involve any changes in policy or procedures, it was not necessary to bring these to the ~~Committee~~ ^{Senate} for approval. I will be glad to furnish a copy of these to anyone who requests them.
5. After careful consideration and examination of the General Studies policies approved by the faculty on 1973, the Committee determined that it was the intent of that document that the Director of General Studies would have the authority to approve instructors for General Studies courses.
 - A. It is the ruling of the Committee on Academic Standards and Practices that the Director of General Studies, in consultation with the General Studies Committee, has the authority to approve or disapprove both course content and instructors for General Studies courses.
 - B. In the case of impass between the Director and the Department, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall rule on the issue after consultation with the parties involved.
6. Mr. John Tatlock, Director of Testing and a member of the Committee, initiated a review of the Credit by Examination policies of the University. However, no final action was taken on any revisions of the policies due to Mr. Tatlock's resignation from the University. The Committee will again review this matter when a new Director of Testing is appointed for the University.

- 25
7. In response to a request from Mr. William Wynne, Registrar, the Committee considered the consistency of requirements for a student being placed on the Dean's Honor Roll. ^{It was} With the decision of the Committee that this should be determined by each Dean's office and was not within the jurisdiction of this Committee. However, the Committee did bring to the attention of each Dean that the Dean's Honor Roll is to be published each semester in accordance with the Buckley Amendment.
 8. The Committee suggested adding more printed information on incomplete grades to the grade reports received by all students. Dean Wentworth has taken this under consideration.
 9. After consideration, investigation, and discussion, the Committee revised the present Probation and Dismissal Standards of the University and these will be recommended to the Senate as soon as the item can be scheduled by the Agenda Committee. The revision involves students in University College and the Division of Continuing Education and requires that a student have attempted at least 12 hours of college work before being placed on probation. The former policy placed a student on probation at the end of the first semester in which his grade point average was below 2.0, regardless of the number of hours attempted.
 10. Presently under consideration by the Committee are revisions to the Open Admission policy of the University. Any revisions in this policy suggested by the Committee will be brought to the Senate at a later date.

Numerous other items were discussed by the Committee and a great deal of information and advice was exchanged between members. This has been a very enjoyable and informative experience for me and I wish to take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation to the faithful attendees at our frequent gatherings.

CJW:dm

Carol Weaver, Chairman, CHRP
David McFarland, Administration
Alice Hosticka, Education
Albert Gossman, Engineering
Susan Zwinger, Fine Arts
Carol Konek, Humanities
Don Foster, Secretary, Natural Sciences
Robert Borreson, Social Sciences
Helen Crockett, Continuing Education
James Rhatigan, Admissions and Exceptions
Dean Vickery, Curriculum and Academic Planning
Douglas Barker, Assistant Director of Testing
Russell Wentworth, Dean of Admissions
Eric Davis, Student Government
Ray Zachary, Student Government
Leo Poland, Business

Specific regulations governing probation and dismissal standards are established by each college at Wichita State and are given in the introductory statements in the individual college and Division of Continuing Education sections of the Catalog. Students should consult the appropriate section of the Catalog for these standards.

Since 2.00 (a grade of C) is the minimum grade point average required for graduation from Wichita State, students are formally placed (or continued) on probation at the conclusion of every semester in which their overall grade point average falls below 2.00 except as noted below. If the college in which students are enrolled has a higher graduation requirement, students may be placed on probation whenever their overall grade point average falls below the college's specified level. Students admitted in good standing will not be placed on probation regardless of their grade point average until they have attempted twelve credit hours after admission to Wichita State University. Attempted hours are defined to be all hours appearing on the transcript with a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, W, CR, NCR, I, S, and/or U. The Transition Semester counts toward the number of hours attempted but does not count in the calculation of the grade point average used to assess probation or dismissal.

Transfer students admitted on probation must complete at least 12 semester hours at Wichita State with a 2.00 average before probation may be removed. In addition, the Wichita State probation standards apply to both their Wichita State grade point average and their overall grade point average.

A student on academic probation is limited to a maximum load of 12 semester hours in the fall and spring semesters.

Dismissal standards are set by the various colleges and the Division of Continuing Education of Wichita State University in conformance with the following policy:

Students will not be dismissed if either their overall grade point average or their last semester's grade point average equals the minimum graduation level of their college. They will remain on probation as long as their overall grade point average is below the minimum University or college graduation standard and their semester grade point average meets the minimum college or division standard.

Students will be dismissed at the end of the semester in which they accumulate twelve attempted credit hours with a semester and overall grade point average below the minimum required after being placed on probation. Students are not academically dismissed at the end of a semester unless they began that semester on academic probation.

Current catalog rules on Academic Probation and Dismissal Standards: (Pgs. 33-34).

The next few paragraphs state the University's minimum probation and dismissal standards. Other specific regulations governing probation and dismissal standards are established by each college at Wichita State and are given in the introductory statements in the individual college sections of the Catalog. Students should consult the appropriate section of the Catalog for these standards.

Since 2.00 (a grade of C) is the minimum grade point average required for graduation from Wichita State, students are formally placed (or continued) on probation at the conclusion of every semester in which their overall grade point average falls below 2.00. If the college in which students are enrolled has a higher graduation requirement, students may be placed on probation whenever their overall grade point average falls below the college's specified level.

Students will not be dismissed if either their overall grade point average or their last semester's grade point average equals the minimum graduation level of their college. They will remain on probation as long as their overall grade point average is below the minimum University or college graduation standard and their semester grade point average meets the minimum University or college standard.

Transfer students admitted on probation must complete at least 12 semester hours at Wichita State with a 2.00 average before probation may be lifted. In addition, for transfer students, the Wichita State probation standards apply to both their Wichita State grade point average and their overall grade point average.

A student on academic probation is limited to a 12 semester-hour load.

Dismissal standards are set by the various colleges of Wichita State in conformance with the following policy:

Students are not academically dismissed at the end of a semester unless they began that semester on academic probation. Moreover, students on probation because of a deficient cumulative grade point average, may not be academically dismissed for failure to raise their average until they accumulate 12 or more hours after being placed on probation.

Document 27

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

TO: Senate Agenda Committee

DATE: April 1, 1977

FROM: Jeneva J. Brewer, Chair of
Committee on Committees

TOPIC: Proposed rule change in the Senate Constitution to create a new standing committee entitled, The Rules Committee.

The Committee on Committees recommends the creation of a new standing committee entitled, the Rules Committee, in response to a request from the Senate Agenda Committee. The proposed committee will not only serve the needs of the Senate but also remove some of the responsibilities attached to the office of Senate Secretary.

The Committee on Committees recommends that the proposed committee be included as a standing Technical and Advisory Committee of the Senate.

(Proposal)

RULES COMMITTEE

a. Composition (10)

Standard composition (7)

Students (2)

Ex-Officio (1): President Elect of Senate, Chair

b. Selection: Faculty representatives are selected according to standard procedures. Students are appointed by the SGA.c. Charge: The rules committee

- 1) recommends Senate rules and changes in Senate rules
- 2) updates the Senate Constitution to reflect the changes approved by the Senate
- 3) reviews and recommends changes in Faculty rules of procedure (Article III, Section 5, Univ. Senate Constitution)
- 4) acts as a Senate Election Commission by recommending rules or rule changes to facilitate election procedures, setting election dates, defining the electorate and its categories, conducting the elections, resolving Senate election disputes, and such related matters that may arise
- 5) hears appeals ~~for~~^{of} disputes involving rules of the Senate

END

OF

ATTACHMENTS

TO AGENDA OF

APRIL 18, 1977

UNIVERSITY SENATE

WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Minutes of the Meeting of April 18, 1977. (Vol. XIII, No. 14).

Correct to show present Members Present: Adamson, Barrier, Breazeale, Brewer, Bugg, Chaffee, Chopra, Cleland, Crawford, Davis, Dreifort, Duell, Hay, Herman, Houston, Hoyer, *Humphrey*, Kasten, Knight, Konek, Mathis, May, McBride, McFarland, Miller, Millett, Petree, Rhatigan, Rubalcaba, Shanmugam, Snyder, Stephens, Weaver, Webb, B. Welsbacher, R. Welsbacher, Zandler, Zoller.

Members Absent: Ahlberg, Benningfield, Berman, Graham, Greenberg, Hammond, Harnsberger, Humphrey, Jakowatz, Kane, Koppenhaver, Kraft, Krehbiel, Magelli, Matson, Mays, Myers, Palmer, Rodenberg, Sharp, Terrell, Terwilliger.

Guests: Carla A. Lee.

I. CALL TO ORDER

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

II. INFORMAL PROPOSALS & STATEMENTS

President Duell announced:

a) The Weekend University Ad Hoc Committee has been disbanded and its charge has been sent to the new Community Education Committee.

b) The conclusion of the Senate elections--the election of "At Large" senators --must await the results of college elections to the Senate, not all of which have been completed to date.

c) One more Senate meeting in May should complete Senate business for this academic year. A later organizational meeting for next year's Senate will also be held but must await the completion of Senate elections.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

As there were no alterations requested in the minutes of the meeting of March 21, 1977 (Vol. XIII, No. 12), those minutes were approved as circulated.

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Report of the Honors Committee--John Poe, chair.

Mr. Poe indicated the committee had had a busy year and indicated he would highlight only the main elements of the committee's long report. He indicated that much time in committee meetings had been devoted to problems in the Honors Program related to budgetary matters and declining enrollments, and said the committee had meetings scheduled this week with both Vice President Breazeale and Dean Magelli. Referring to the last paragraph of page 3 of the report (see attachment A to today's agenda) he pointed out the "full-time" nature of most Honors students, their higher than average credit-hour load, their high rate of retention at WSU and their general classification as "day only students." He then drew attention to the Honors Program recruiting and interviewing activities for this year as outlined in paragraph 3, page 8, attachment A. He then concluded his report, noting the forthcoming loss of Honors Counsellor Mario Dennis, commending Mr. Dennis' work, and stressing the Honors Committee's endorsement and commendation of Professor Ciboski as Honors Coordinator. He then moved the adoption of the report.

MOTION TO ADOPT

Senator Dreifort inquired about the effects of declining enrollments on the program.

Mr. Poe said the figures show the Honors Program as being above the university average in withstanding these declines.

Senator Dreifort asked about the problem of departments not feeling able to afford Honors courses and inquired whether there might not be more students in the program if more courses were offered.

Mr. Poe responded that some consideration was needed on "weighting" credit hours in Honors courses relative to hours in other courses.

Senator Miller asked whether there were any kinds of recruiting conducted at the junior and senior level.

Mr. Poe indicated that not enough was done at the upper levels; that higher level recruiting was done mainly by word of mouth. When good students are identified, he said, they should be encouraged to come to the Honors office.

Senator Konek asked if there was some way of alerting students returning to college work after some years to their eligibility for Honors work.

Mr. Poe indicated that notice regarding the Honors Program would be in the enrollment packet for such students, but perhaps not as much is done as should be in this area.

Vice President Breazeale asked about the policy of requiring Honors students to enroll in an Honors course at least once per year.

Mr. Poe responded that the requirement had been relaxed somewhat.

The Vice President then inquired about the disparity between the figures of 391 Honors students this spring and the active enrollment in Honors courses this spring of only 106 students.

Mr. Poe conceded that there were difficulties in fitting the offerings in any semester to the students' interests and needs.

Senator Zoller inquired if there was interest within the committee in either an Honors College or something like the lower division integrated humanities program at K.U.

Mr. Poe said there had been discussion of this, but no decision on it, and there seemed to be no real sense of need for such a program.

Senator Dreifort, noting the "day-only" nature of the Honors students, asked if this represented the type of student or the nature of the Honors class offerings as day offerings only.

Mr. Poe agreed there was a problem in getting instructors to teach at night which tends to limit the scheduling.

Senator Dreifort suggested that this situation makes the program seem more traditional in nature and less representative of WSU.

Vice President Breazeale, consulting the data on page 7 of the report, noted the apparent peaking of the Honors enrollments in the fall of 1974.

Mr. Poe said there were fewer course offerings now than then, presumably because of budgetary problems.

The Vice President pursued the issue further saying that the situation that concerned him was the 9.64 average enrollment per class this semester where in past years the enrollments were in the 14-15 students per class range. He noted that the ability to sustain an Honors Program depends on enrolling a certain minimum number of students per class. "Weighting" credit hours in budgetary procedures will not help in this case. The enrollment standing at about half of what it was 2 years ago raises issues about sustaining such a program.

Mr. Poe indicated the committee will look again at these statistics before its meeting with the Vice President.

Senator McBride asked if the "weighting" mentioned earlier was to be sought at the level of the legislature or Board of Regents.

Senator Zoller said he assumed that what was wanted was to have the school internally "weight" the Honors enrollments.

Mr. Poe said he felt the administration had been supportive of the Honors Program and that the report was in no way a criticism of the administration. He added that the committee was pleased with Professor Ciboski's first year as Coordinator of Honors, but said the problem of providing quality education remains, and it cannot be resolved solely by counting numbers of students.

Senator Barrier asked about the statistics on page 3 of the report. With 75% of the Honors students living either at home or in the residence halls, the program did not seem to represent the University pattern as a whole. Did this indicate that the program solicits only freshmen or was it because older students did not make as high grades?

Mr. Poe said it was certainly not the latter cause. The program, he said, did not seek to be elitist in nature, but it was difficult to get the older, regular student with a job and family, involved.

Dean Rhatigan asked a related question on veterans in the program. Though veterans represent 10% of the University's enrollment, only 1% of Honors students are veterans. Was this also a recruiting phenomenon?

Mr. Poe agreed such problems exist. He added that minority students were also poorly represented in the program and said he was quite sensitive to the problem.

The question was called for, and the report was accepted unanimously.

Report of the Academic Standards and Practices Committee--Carol Weaver, chair. Senator Weaver noted two corrections necessary on the printed report:

1. In paragraph #4, page 1 of the report (attachment B to today's agenda) the word "Committee" in the second last line should be replaced with "Senate."
2. In paragraph #7 on page 2 of the report, the second sentence, beginning "With the decision..." should read "It was with the decision...."

VOTE

Senator Weaver indicated she would review the report, commenting upon its major sections, and noted that in its 17 meetings to date the Committee had:

1. Reaffirmed the policy of each college being responsible for evaluating each student's compliance with General Education requirements.
2. Continued approval of certain courses in Nursing for graded credit by examination. No requests for additional credit by examination had been received so far.
3. Consulted with admissions and student records staff on transcript evaluations and related problems.
4. Reworded and clarified some catalogue entries.
5. Interpreted the intent of the General Studies document as granting the Director of General Studies the authority to approve course content and instructors in that program, and that, in the case of an impasse on such matters an appeal process should be available.
6. Postponed most of the work on Credit by Examination until next year.
7. Worked on the problem of inconsistencies in Honor Roll standards, left this matter to the individual Deans with the reminder that the lists should be published and should adhere to stipulations of the Buckley Amendment.
8. Considered action on increasing information on incomplete grades.
9. Revised Probation and Dismissal Standards--to be discussed later as "New Business."
10. Considered Open Admission problems--with concern for such policies that affect more than one college.

MOTION TO
ADOPT

Senator Weaver concluded her summary by moving the adoption of the report.

Senator Zoller indicated his concern about the Committee not considering the Open Admissions problem if it affected only one college. He suggested that the final effect of open admissions in University College or Continuing Education could touch all other colleges.

Senator Weaver said she had not seen the report on Open Admissions yet and could not comment on its position in this matter.

Senator Zoller said the problems will arise when the student admitted under "Open Admission" transfers to another college.

Senator Weaver replied that such a student would have to meet the second college's admission standards at the time of transfer.

Senator Zoller said he feared chaos will result if the Academic Standards and Practices Committee does not look into such admission standards. It is better to have uniform admissions standards than to permit one college to take in a student who could not get into a degree granting college later.

Dean Petree said Senator Zoller's point was well taken, but we in fact have such an open admissions policy. He outlined the various conditions for students to be accepted under such a policy and indicated that a large number of part time students have taken advantage of that policy. Data indicate that large number of these students transfer to degree granting colleges and are acceptable. Indeed, LAS takes in the largest number of these students. There is no sense that such students are deceived in their admission. They face a check point after 15 hours to decide to become a regular, Continuing Education, non-degree student, or to seek a degree in a degree-granting college. He applauded WSU for having the foresight to adopt this program.

Senator Zoller said he personally favored such a program but felt the need to be certain that a University-level committee has the prerogative to over-see admissions policy. Such overseeing need not jeopardize open admissions.

Dean Rhatigan said perhaps the problem was being exaggerated here. The issue was one of how to handle such open admissions students. Do you, for example, put a 65 year old returning student on "probation"?

Senator Konek said the problem may lie in the connotations of open admission. There were, in fact, standards in this issue and it was not really "open."

President Duell observed that this matter would be raised again in the next item on the agenda, and urged a return to the overall consideration of the committee report.

Senator Dreifort said he felt the issue raised by Senator Zoller was a jurisdictional one. He noted that the Committee's charge does not keep it from reviewing these matters and urged that it not act as a "shrinking violet."

VOTE

The question on the report was called and the report was accepted by voice vote.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

The first item of new business was a proposed change in Probation and Dismissal Standards presented by Carol Weaver as chair of the Academic Standards and Practices Committee (attachment C).

Senator Weaver explained that the aim was to avoid having students placed on probation until they had completed at least 12 hours of course work. At present a student may be put on probation after only 3 hours. The main effect of the change would be felt by Continuing Education and University College students.

MOTION TO ADOPT

She then moved the adoption of this change.

Senator Zoller, referring to the top two lines of page 2 of attachment C, asked if the committee had discussed guidelines for the amount of work or employment a student on probation should carry or would this infringe on the student's private affairs.

Senator Weaver indicated the committee had not considered this complex situation.

Senator Konek, speaking for Helen Crockett, said the latter had commented on a number of instances of 3 hour students being lost to the university because of the too early probation, and added that many of the students affected by these rulings tend to relate "probation" to "criminal" matters.

She was pleading, she said, not to treat Continuing Education students as second class citizens. There was a need to make learning a positive experience for returning adult students. Thus she supported the proposed change.

VOTE

The question on the proposal was called and the issue was passed by voice vote.

The second item of new business was the proposal from the Committee on Committees to establish a Rules Committee for the Senate. Jeneva Brewer, speaking as chair of the Committee on Committees, explained that the Agenda Committee had faced a number of issues this year that would best be handled by a Rules Committee. She cited the issues of proxy voting in the Senate and the change in election dates. She pointed out that many other areas remained in need of an appropriate body to handle them and cited as examples-- the updating of the Constitution; changes in Senate rules; the running of the Senate elections which the Senate Secretary currently handles by some unspecified tradition. The Rules Committee could also hear appeals on disputes regarding rules. Senator Brewer pointed out the appropriateness of having the President-elect of the Senate gain mastery of the rules in serving as chair for this committee. She then moved the adoption of this proposal.

Senator Snyder observed that he had earlier been delighted with the disbanding of the Weekend University Committee and that he opposes the continual proliferation of committees and committee duties for the faculty. He indicated he would therefore oppose the proposal.

Senator Brewer, in reply, said that should this committee not be formed, the problems it could handle would still remain and would require the creation of more committees of an ad hoc nature.

Dean McFarland said he shared Senator Snyder's feelings about adding committees, but as someone allocated to the "unassigned" category in the Senate with experience of the multiple problems that arise in that area he would support this measure. He did not foresee this committee having many meetings, but it would constitute a place to take these often petty but bothersome problems to have them resolved.

Senator Weaver said that from her experience on the Committee on Committees involved in the process of finding people for committee assignments she realized how nebulous the Senate Constitution is and how it requires clarification on intentions.

Senator McBride pointed out a necessary correction on item 5 of the new committee's charge changing "hears appeals for disputes..." to "hears appeals of disputes...."

VOTE

The question was called for and the proposal passed by voice vote.

NOMINATION

The final item of new business was the election of a student senator to replace Michael Caracciolo. The students proposed Tammy Salyer as the replacement. No additional nominations were forthcoming and President Duell indicated that she would interpret this as a unanimous ballot of support for the nominee and instruct the secretary to so record it.

OTE

VIII.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.

5/
2/
77