



**WICHITA STATE
UNIVERSITY**

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

1966-09-19 University Senate meeting

Item Type	Administrative document
Authors	University Senate
Citation	University Senate. Agenda and minutes of the meeting of September 19, 1966. -- University Senate Meetings, 1966-1967, v.3
Publisher	Wichita State University
Download date	2026-05-11 12:47:07
Link to Item	https://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/21711



University Senate Archives

University Senate

Academic year 1966-1967

Volume III

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of September 19, 1966

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, September 19, 1966
Time: 3 p.m.
Place: East Ballroom, Campus Activities Center

AGENDA

1. Approval of the Minutes of the previous meeting
2. Remarks of the outgoing Chairman
3. Election of officers

For the convenience of Senate members, the following is the most recent membership list:

Mr. Dralle		Mr. Hanson	
Mr. Genova		Mr. Byers	<u>Engineering</u>
Mr. Mood	<u>Humanities</u>	Mr. Dunn	
Mr. Cutler		Mr. Snyder	
Mr. Cowgill		Mr. Chrisman	
Mr. Armstrong	<u>Social</u>	Mr. Taggart	<u>Unassigned</u>
Mr. Harder	<u>Sciences</u>	Mr. Comstock	
Mr. Kenyon		Miss Burgess	
Mr. Killian		Mr. Cress	
Mr. Richardson	<u>Sciences</u>	Mr. Herman	<u>At Large</u>
Mr. Bubieniec		Mr. Savaiano	
Mr. Johnson		Mr. Terwilliger	
Mr. Voth		Mr. Lindquist	
Mr. Terflinger	<u>Business</u>	Mr. Powell	
Mr. Woodard		Mr. Easterling	
Mr. Dent		Mr. Breazeale	
Mr. Missal		Mr. Sowards	<u>Ex Officio</u>
Miss Boardman	<u>Fine</u>	Mr. Jabara	
Mr. Ceasar	<u>Arts</u>	Mr. Duerksen	
Mr. Nicholson		Mr. Fullerton	
Miss Sherman	<u>Education</u>	Mr. Jakowatz	
Mr. Nickel		Mr. Berg	

Common Bd.

Shawha ✓

Rhatigan ✓

Sawarde ✓

Williams ✓

Campbell ✓

Rounds ✓

Lopez ✓

Common Carr

Topic	Status
CAC	
Image of Univ.	
Diocesan Advisors.	Became to Pres.
Sabbatical	Complete
Parking	
Student Membership	appointed
Hammond	
Shillett	
Howitt	
Moore	
space	
P2. Requirement	Tabled
Student Faculty Ct	
Policy on Speakers	Adopted
Data Center	Report.
Committees	
Our committees	
Acad Freedom.	
Handbook	
Ch. Publications	
athletic	
United Fund	
Salary	
Friend Relations	

AN APPRAISAL AND A PROGRAM

Presented by Marvin Harder
Chairman, University Faculty Senate
September 19, 1966

More than two and one-half years have elapsed since the Faculty ratified the proposal to create an instrumentality called the University Faculty Senate. This period of time may be too short to permit a delineation of its status and role in the decision-making processes of this University, but some preliminary judgments are in order. At least, my colleagues on the agenda committee of the Senate think so, and I am persuaded that it may be useful to the Senate to begin the practice of having every outgoing chairman make an appraisal of the Senate based upon his experiences as the Senate's most active agent.

An appraisal implies expectations. What is it that Members of the Faculty hoped to accomplish by creating the Senate? Article III formalized some of their goals by specifying (1) that "the chairman will consult with the president as to the need for faculty meetings and as to appropriate times for such meetings," (2) that "the Senate may deliberate and recommend on all matters committed to the faculty and on any matter of an internal faculty nature," (3) that the standing committee members shall be selected by the Senate subject to ratification by the faculty, (4) that all standing committees shall report to the Senate and to the faculty through the Senate, and (5) that the Senate may recommend changes in the organization of the faculty.

The record indicates that all of these functions were performed by the Senate during the preceding year. But if the appraisal stopped here, it would be superficial to say the least. No formal statement of purposes in a constitution

or by-laws ever conveys fully the aspirations of those who participate in an organization. Moreover, since many institutions come to fulfill unintended as well as intended functions, it is imperative that criteria additional to those formally expressed be identified in an evaluation.

On the basis of conversations with members of the Faculty over a period of years, I venture to suggest that the following objectives are generally shared by those who are interested in the governance of this university: (1) The Senate should serve as an instrument through which the attitudes and beliefs of rank and file members of the faculty can be discovered and communicated to those who make the principal allocations of values within the University. (2) The Senate should be a major participant in the formation of academic policies, not merely an interest group making demands upon those who have official responsibilities. (3) The posture of the Senate should be cooperative, but the Senate should also guard its independence, and thereby its integrity, so that, to quote a senior member of our Faculty, "it can lean on the administration" when no other way of getting attention to faculty concerns appears to be available. (4) The Senate ought to stimulate and encourage thought about new ways of upgrading the quality of teaching, research and other activities relevant to the mission of a college or a university in America.

These goals, though not articulated in the Senate's Constitution, animate those who give vitality to the Senate and the Faculty it represents. Whether or not the Senate has been effective as a vehicle of communications,

as a maker of academic policies, as a source of restraint, or as a stimulator of creative proposals is very difficult to answer. Its very newness complicates the task of evaluating the Senate according to these objectives. We shall not know, for example, whether the Senate has integrity until such time as a serious difference of opinion between the Senate and one or more administrators arises. Such a difference did not develop last year. Relationships between the President and Deans on the one hand, and the Senate on the other hand, were characteristically friendly and cooperative.

It is somewhat easier to identify some of the unintended functions performed by the Senate last year. For example, the Senate contributed to the North Central Association's decision to renew Wichita State's accreditation. Two members of the visiting team told me, after their meeting with about a dozen members of the Senate, how favorably impressed they were with the candor, competence and morale of the Faculty they interviewed. It seems apparent that if they had thought that the Senate was merely a pawn of the Administration, they would not have entertained our judgments as creditable. I doubt that anyone who was active in urging adoption of the Senate as a form of Faculty organization anticipated at the time that the Senate would one day serve the University in this way.

A somewhat less tangible unintended consequence of the Senate's existence is its role in encouraging members of the Faculty to know members outside their own department and in colleges other than their own. It takes no great

imagination to see the value of this function, particularly at a time when the University is growing rapidly. The existence of a Senate militates against feelings of alienation and tendencies to disciplinary isolation. Given the importance of interdisciplinary efforts in the background of intellectual achievements, this function of bringing some of the faculty together at regular intervals is one of no mean importance.

Perhaps our task of reflecting about the status and role of the University Faculty Senate at Wichita State University will be enhanced by taking note of the report of the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada and the Canadian Association of University Teachers which examined the structure of university government in Canada, a study which was fully supported by the Ford Foundation. The specific concerns which led 35 Canadian Universities to support the study were specified as follows: "(1) Universities are becoming so large, so complex, and so dependent on public funds that scholars no longer initiate or even influence their own policy. (2) A new and rapidly growing class of administrators is assuming control. (3) The gulf of misunderstanding is widening between the academic staff and the administrative personnel, with grave damage to the functioning of both."

The report ought to be read in its entirety. I shall quote only passages which directly pertain to university senates:

THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Although in theory the senate at most universities is in complete charge of educational policy, in practice it often defers to the board for leadership in university expansion and

development and to strictly internal bodies for approval of curricular matters. We were frequently told that the senate is chiefly a rubber stamp for approving relatively minor decisions.

The board-senate system can work well only if the senate is both able and willing to play its full part. It should be a responsible voice representing the whole academic community on all questions of university policy. The greatness of a university depends not mainly on its size or on its wealth, but on the quality of its faculty and the measure of their collective wisdom. A president can and should give a lead to the faculty. But unless the senate is rightly composed and rightly organized for the work it has to do, even the best of presidents will fail to make the university's full potential a reality.

All too few of the universities that we visited have really effective senates, and this weakness seems to be the major cause of the tension and disharmony that exists today in far too many Canadian universities.

Some senates are unable to fulfill their function as the voice of the faculty because they are too large or too heavily diluted with nonacademic members, or because too few (and sometimes none) of their members are elected by the faculty.

We were told that even some senates which have a sizable elected academic membership fail to debate educational policy in a meaningful way. When asked why, most critics said, in effect, that the "senate has the power, but lacks the guts to use it." It seems that the president and the ex officio administrative group (vice-presidents, deans, and occasionally department heads) have come to dominate senate business, and that they tend to speak with one voice and appear to discourage real discussions of policy. Executive committees, agenda, and committee nominations have often come under the control of this group, sometimes by default, and even conscientious elected members mention their heavy dependence on presidential reporting for news of relative board actions.

Later in the report the commissioners make recommendations and express judgments that ought to be of particular interest to us:

It is so crucial for the senate to become the central educational forum of the university that we venture to recommend that all nonacademic members be removed, with two exceptions: a

student representative (this proposal is examined in greater detail in our section on students) and representatives from the board of governors. If senate members are to sit on the board, board members should be equally welcome on the senate. Evidence from institutions which have adopted this practice suggests that the presence of a few board members does not constrain the academics' free and frank discussion of controversial issues and in fact proves educative to the board members who attend.

The size of a senate often determines its effectiveness. It should be a deliberative body, not a mass meeting. That sets an upper limit of about fifty. If the senate is larger, it is likely that its executive committee will be the real decision-making body. On the other hand, if the senate is to feel uninhibited, it must be large enough so that the administrative group (vice-presidents and deans) is a distinct minority. Some faculty groups want to solve this problem by reducing sharply the size of the administrative delegation; but in our view senior administrators can bring information and valuable experience to senate deliberations. Furthermore, if they are excluded from the senate, the president will be under stronger pressure to bypass this body and turn instead to his council of deans for policy advice.

How is the academic majority to be constituted? We recommend against the practice common at some universities of seating all full professors *ex officio*. This sets up a "gerontocracy," a government by the elderly. Automatic tenure in a seat until retiring age is simply too long a period. We suggest that the majority of the senate be elected by the faculty from the faculty, for staggered three-year terms, with rotation considered as normal but re-election not ruled out.

SENATE FUNCTIONS

To avoid all doubt about senate powers, we propose that they should include specifically the power to make recommendations to the board on any matter of interest to the university. This should not in any way diminish the board's ultimate control. Indeed, a wise senate will exercise this power with restraint, concentrating on the "commanding heights" of educational policy and leaving the day-to-day administration to the president and his associates.

With these provocative comments I conclude the general part of my statement. I should like now to make a few, specific recommendations for future

agenda items. These will be presented in brief:

(1) I recommend a change in the status of the Research and Publications Committee, making this committee a standing policy committee of the Faculty, and giving the committee full jurisdiction over the faculty publications called Bulletins. I have been informed that some such recommendation may be forthcoming shortly from the Dean of the Graduate Faculties; but if not, the Committee on Committees ought to initiate a study of the status of the Research and Publications Committee.

(2) I recommend a change in the composition of the Faculty Senate's Agenda Committee to include as an ex officio member the Chairman of the Senate's Committee on Committees. This would both enlarge the agenda committee and facilitate internal communications.

(3) I recommend that the Senate request that the Senate's chairman be made an ex officio member of the Administrative Council. If it facilitates communications, and consequently tension reduction, by having the President, Vice President and Deans as ex officio members of the Senate, it surely ought to work as well the other way. Please note that last year the Senate asked for representation on the Board of Directors of the Campus Activities Center, a request which is still pending and which ought not to be forgotten.

(4) I recommend a change in the composition of the Senate to make the President of the Student Government Association an ex officio member of the University Faculty Senate. I think this action should be taken as soon as possible. At the least, it would be evidence of the Senate's good faith in author-

izing a committee to explore the question of student participation on standing committees.

(5) I recommend the formation of a Senate standing committee, with the Vice President for Academic Affairs an ex officio member, and instructed to canvass ways and means of improving curriculum, teaching, and the other scholarly purposes for which the University came into being and which remain its principal reasons for existence. Such a committee should consider, among other ideas, a plan for faculty interdisciplinary seminars to broaden the perspectives of faculty personnel.

(6) I recommend that the Senate consider establishing a Board of Appeals for the purpose of providing students a kind of court which will insure due process in a case in which a student alleges arbitrary treatment on the part of a professor or administrator.

(7) I recommend that the Senate discuss and interpret the Board of Regents policy statement with respect to the political activity of professors. This policy, widely characterized as a landmark decision at the time of its pronouncement, may achieve its promise only if there is a shared understanding of its meaning.

(8) I recommend that the Senate's standing committee on academic freedom examine the objectives and tactics of the ACLU and the AAUP with respect to the loyalty oath, and that the committee then advise the Senate of the merits of these activities. If the committee and the Senate find them worthy, then I think the Senate should consider a resolution of endorsement. The time has

come to bring to an end the tendency of some of the Faculty to regard the AAUP as a suspect organization. It is an established American interest group concerned with specific and legitimate interests of the Faculty. Its historic contributions have been significant and it must be kept strong and viable. The local chapter of the AAUP is not a competitor of the Senate. Their goals are both different and overlap. Active cooperation between these faculty groups ought to nurture continually.

(9) I recommend that the Senate interest itself in the problems of student housing. Far from being a meddling action, concern with student housing is an obligation of the Senate. If housing conditions are not conducive to study, housing developments impair the very goals the faculty seeks to enhance. I note that the Faculty of Kansas University have developed a housing program designed to keep students in groups of a limited size, in effect, adopting a feature of the Oxford-Cambridge system. We are now confronted with large dormitory complexes. What we need to discover is whether we are stuck with them if they prove to be academically unsatisfactory.

(10) Finally, the strong Presidential support of the program of bringing visiting scholars to the Campus last year should be matched by equally interested efforts on the part of the Senate to assist in maximizing the effectiveness of such a program. I understand that President Lindquist has delegated responsibility in this matter to the Vice President of Academic Affairs. I urge the newly elected officers to offer Dr. Powell whatever assistance the Senate can provide.

When a question of Senate involvement with an administrative activity arises, the question is best resolved by asking how the activity affects the quality of our teaching-learning goals. One may illustrate this principle by suggesting that juke boxes in the snack area adjoining the cafeteria militate against conversations students and faculty might otherwise carry on. If the Senate believes that the music boxes tend to deter faculty members from conversing with students and students with students, then the Senate ought to insist that this value not be sacrificed for the sake of profit or because a few students might wish the snack bar to be a fair representation of a pizza parlor.

Most of these suggestions are organizational and procedural in character, but I believe that if implemented, they would further the constructive role which the Faculty expects from its Senate.

Gerard J. 52

UNIVERSITY SENATE
WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1966

Time: 3 p.m., Monday, September 19, 1966
Place: East Ballroom, Campus Activities Center
Presiding: Mr. Harder followed by Mr. Cowgill

As recorded at the taking of the role, those present were: Miss Boardman, Miss Burgess, Miss Sherman, Messrs. Dralle, Genova, Mood, Cutler, Cowgill, Armstrong, Harder, Kenyon, Bubieniec, Voth, Terflinger, Woodward, Dent, Missal, Ceasar, Nicholson, Hanson, Dunn, Moorehouse, Chrisman, Taggart, Comstock, Cress, Herman, Terwilliger, Powell, Breazeale, Sowards, Duerksen and Jakowatz. Not present were: Messrs. Killian, Richardson, Johnson, Nickel, Snyder, Saviano, Lindquist, Easterling, Jabara, Berg. (Individuals who were absent for reason of resignation or leave are not recorded as absent)

- I. Mr. Harder called the meeting to order and asked the secretary to read the role of the new Senate, after which a quorum was declared and the minutes of the meeting of May 23, 1966 were approved as circulated (with the reservation that corrections would still be accepted at the next meeting of the Senate).
- II. Mr. Harder then called attention to the fact that several names on the 1966-1967 Senate membership list will have to be replaced because of resignation, leave of absence or transfer to another constituency of the University. The responsibility for nominating replacements generally belongs to the Committee on Committees, and the usual mechanism is for the remaining members of the division in which the replacement occurs to constitute a nominating committee for the replacement. These nominations should be available at the next meeting of the Senate.
- III. Then followed the remarks of the outgoing chairman, Mr. Harder. They were entitled "An Appraisal and a Program" and will be distributed in the near future. These remarks also include Mr. Harder's specific recommendations for future agenda items.
- IV. The next item of business was the election of new officers for the University Senate, and Mr. Harder called for nominations from the floor.
 - A. Mr. Cowgill's name was placed in nomination by Mr. Kenyon for Chairman of the University Senate. Mr. Taggart moved that nominations cease, and Mr. Cowgill was elected by acclamation. Mr. Cowgill then assumed the duties of the chairman and presided at the remainder of the meeting.
 - B. Miss Dorothy Sherman's name was placed in nomination by Mr. Dralle for Vice-Chairman of the University Senate. Mr. Nicholson moved that nominations cease, and Miss Sherman was elected by acclamation

- C. Mr. Genova's name was placed in nomination by Mr. Moorehouse for a second term as Secretary to the University Senate. Mr. Genova declined the nomination on the ground that two successive years as secretary would adversely affect his ability to meet his other academic, administrative and research responsibilities. Mr. Bubieniec's name was placed in nomination by Mr. Herman. Miss Burgess moved that nominations cease and Mr. Bubieniec was elected by acclamation.
- V. Mr. Cowgill then asked the membership whether the next Senate meeting should be scheduled for Monday, September 26 or delayed until the second Monday in October. It was agreed to schedule a meeting for Monday, September 26 at either 3 PM or 3:30 PM depending upon the scheduling situation of the Senate members in the division of the sciences.
- VI. Dean Powell then requested that the Senate consider an unannounced agenda item concerning the reorganization of the University Forum Committee. The Senate agreed and Dean Powell presented his report and recommendations.

Dean Powell reported that last spring the University Forum had sent a memo to the President recommending its own reorganization within the framework of a single committee including student and faculty. The Administrative Council agreed that some single agency should be responsible for clearing prospective campus guests and speakers, and also recognized that several constituencies were legitimately involved. The Council reorganized the Forum so that this agency would consist of two sub-committees -- one consisting of students named by the SGA who would recommend campus guests of interest to students; the other consisting of faculty named by the University Senate who would recommend visiting scholars of interest to the faculty and the departments of the University. These two committees could consult with each other if they desire, and student choices will be reviewed with the faculty group, who will not only help supervise student selections but also be able to operate independently in the selection of professional scholars. Dean Powell reviewed some of the problems which the University experienced with the prior organizations of the Forum, and pointed out that the Council's reorganization in effect returned the student fee portion of the budgeting of campus visitors to the students themselves, while providing additional funds to the faculty sub-committee, so that less popular but highly competent professionals can also be invited. Dean Powell moved that the University Senate consent to taking the responsibility for naming the sub-committee consisting of faculty in the new University Forum agency. Mr. Harder seconded.

Mr. Moorehouse objected to the new organization of the Forum primarily on the ground that it was needlessly complicated and would result in problems. He argued that a single committee with a single chairman would be more appropriate. He suggested that the Administrative Council lacked understanding of the specific activities and problems the Forum encounters in its day-to-day activities, and

recommended that the Senate recommend to the Administrative Council that a Committee consisting of a Senate member, a Council member and a member of the Forum Board be constituted with the purpose of examining all the variables involved and achieving a clear-cut, unambiguous conclusion.

Other members of the Senate, including Mr. Kenyon, Mr. Rhatigan, Mr. Sowards asked questions and spoke to the issue. Dean Sowards, for example, suggested that Dean Powell's motion be implemented with a view to seeing how well it worked, followed by whatever action (if any) the Senate may deem appropriate in the future.

Finally, the vote was taken and Dean Powell's motion carried. The University Senate then adjourned.

Donald D. Cowgill, Chairman

Date Approved

Ernest J. Bubieniec, Secretary

(The minutes for this September 19 meeting were written by A. C. Genova -- outgoing secretary)

Ernest J. Bubieniec