

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

Archives Online

3-7-1977

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 7, 1977

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 7, 1977" (1977). *Faculty Senate*. 664.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/664

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

March 7, 1977

The President of the Faculty Senate, Dr. Votaw, called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M. in the Santa Fe Room of the Memorial Union.

The secretary called the Senate roll and the following members were present: Dr. Clifford Edwards, Mr. Mike Walker, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Charles Votaw, Ms. Ellen Veed, Dr. Stanley Robertson, Dr. John Watson, Mr. Dale Peier, Ms. Vera Thomas, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Allan Busch, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Ron Smith, Dr. Billy Daley, Ms. Donna Harsh, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Ms. June Krebs, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Ms. Esta Lou Riley, Ms. Rose Brungardt.

Those members absent were: Mr. Frank Nichols, Dr. Steven Tramel, Dr. Sue Trauth, Dr. Wallace Harris; Mr. Keith Campbell, Dr. Louis Fillinger, Mr. Donald Jacobs.

Also present were: Mr. Gary Hennerberg (College Leader), Ramsey Stecklein (College Leader), Ms. Malissa Brack (Student Senate), Ms. Sandy Johnson (Student Body President), Mr. John Williams, Ms. Doris Coppach, Mr. Fred Smokoski and Mr. Eugene Holdsworth (all of the Teacher Certification Team).

Dr. Votaw called for any additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting. There being one, he directed that the minutes stand approved as distributed.

Dr. Votaw distributed the Senate President's Announcements to the members.

Announcements

1. The President has indicated that full professorships will be granted only to those holding the terminal degree, unless there are strong extenuating circumstances.
2. The sabbatical policy will be sent to the President for approval essentially as it was presented at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The wording regarding the purposes of sabbaticals will not be changed, but it is understood that advanced study may include work toward an advanced degree and that creative activity such as writing books, composing musical works, etc., may be included in research or professional experience. The preference to those applying for a full year over those applying for one semester is to be applied only if "all other things are equal."
3. Some criteria for the appointment of new tenure-track faculty have been considered by the Council of Deans. The criteria are much the same as those in the tenure policy recently adopted, and are intended as guides for the compiling of a list of criteria for a given position by the appropriate supervisor or committee.
4. The Regents Institutions Coordinating Council has recommended that the Board of Regents consider fee waivers for graduate teaching assistants.
5. The Faculty Senate Presidents met with the College and University Presidents last month for a very worthwhile discussion of fringe benefit proposals. As a

result of this, the proposal concerning inducements for voluntary early retirement will probably be reactivated. An increase in the state's TIAA-CREF contribution to 10% was the overwhelming major priority item of most of the faculties, and this was discussed at some length with the Presidents.

6. A report from the legislative post-audit division has indicated that many of the Regents institutions' requests are not justified. This has apparently done great damage to our request for a new classroom building. Among other things, the report claims that we now have 240% more classroom space than we will need by 1980.

7. Our head-count for this spring is 4559, compared with 4532 last year. On campus headcount is up 84, while Continuing Education is down 57. However, our total credit hours are down 1193, or 49 FTE. Applications for next fall include 545 freshmen, up 11 from last year, and 85 transfers, up 7.

8. Darrell McGinnis, Charles Wilhelm and Dan Kauffman have been appointed to the Union Director Search Committee. Tore Lydersen, Helmut Schmeller and Billy Daley have been appointed to the Library Allocations Study Committee. I now need suggestions for the Torch Award Committee.

9. The three regents universities are proposing to COCAO the recognition of a Tri-University Center of Latin American Studies which would coordinate activities at the universities pertaining to Latin American Studies.

10. Data for freshmen at FHS indicate that the average ACT scores for all areas except natural science have declined since 1968, but that high school averages have increased.

11. The Center for Great Plains Studies at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln will accept proposals for papers for a symposium on ethnicity on the Great Plains to be held April 6-7, 1978. Expenses will be covered for those whose proposals are accepted. Proposals should be sent to Professor Frederick Luebke, Department of History, 603 Oldfather Hall, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska 68588.

12. From an Institutional Research report:

24% of FHS' 260 faculty members are women.

70% of the men and 58% of the women are tenured.

52% of the men and 13% of the women hold doctorates.

45% of the bachelors degrees awarded last year were to women.

40% of the graduate degrees awarded last year were to women.

(there is more.)

13. I would like to encourage you to write letters to state senators and representatives, supporting the Regents' budget requests. Letters to our federal legislators would also be appropriate, opposing cuts in the federal budget for education. If the budgets proposed by President Ford, and reportedly being

supported by President Carter, are adopted, it will drastically affect student financial support.

14. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be Tuesday, April 5, 1977, at 3:30 p.m. in the Santa Fe Room of the Union.

Dr. Votaw then made some additions to the Announcements. To No. 8, he added that suggestions are also needed for the Personnel Committee and the Ft. Hays Studies Committee. The latter will be activated with six members. The Personnel Committee will be reconstituted with one member from each of the divisions and Nursing.

Dr. Frerer asked what the Personnel Committee will do?

Dr. Votaw replied that the Personnel Committee will attempt to determine the allocation of personnel and the reallocation of personnel. This year the committee will probably help to determine the priority of the requests in the budget for FY79. He added that the Ft. Hays Studies Committee will probably attempt to re-establish "The Studies" series, locate funding and screen contributions for publication.

Dr. Smith questioned why the Sabbatical Policy was sent to the President before the Faculty Senate could consider the document?

Dr. Votaw said that he could certainly request that the Senate have that opportunity. However, he had the impression there was nothing particularly objectionable when it was reviewed by the College Affairs Committee.

Dr. Votaw called for Committee Reports.

Dr. Zakrzewski reported for the Academic Affairs Committee. The members had received the several proposals of the committee by campus mail. The first proposal was that concerning Pass-No Credit courses, and is as follows:

1. Any individual may enroll in a class for Pass/No Credit.
2. Undergraduate students may apply a maximum of 24 Pass/No Credit hours, excluding HPER credit, toward their degree.
3. The courses the student elects to meet his General Education requirements and courses required by the students major including cognates may not be taken Pass/No Credit. (Physical education courses taken to satisfy the physical education requirements for graduation, however, may be taken Pass/No Credit and do not count against the maximum of 24 hours.)
4. After a student has enrolled in a course under the Pass/No Credit option that individual may not subsequently change to a graded basis in that course; nor can the student who has enrolled for a grade subsequently change to a Pass/No Credit option.
5. The student must fill out a card for each course taken for Pass/No Credit at the time of enrollment except for those courses that are only taught under that option.

6. It is the prerogative of the instructor to determine what constitutes a particular letter grade. The instructor will report a letter grade on the grade roster for the student at the end of the semester. Data Processing will convert the letter grade to a Pass or No Credit. A grade of D or above will be converted to a grade of Pass. A grade of U will be converted to No Credit. The Pass or No Credit grade will be recorded on the student's transcript.
7. Under Pass/No Credit a grade of Pass is not used in computation of the student's G.P.A.

Dr. Zakrzewski explained that the rationale for the policy is two-fold. (1) Anyone (including freshman) may now enroll for P-NC courses. Primarily, however, the policy is designed for the non-traditional student. In the past such students would have audited; under the proposed policy they could enroll for P-NC. (2) The committee chose to raise the maximum hours of P-NC to be applied toward a degree from eighteen to twenty-four, not including HPER credit. There are no restrictions on the number of hours taken in a term or the total P-NC hours at FHS; the only restriction is the number of hours applied to a degree.

Dr. Zakrzewski moved the committee's proposal be adopted by the Senate. Mr. McNeil seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion.

Ms. Veed asked if there is any restriction on the number of P-NC hours for graduate students; and, if not, should such restriction be in the proposal?

Dr. Zakrzewski answered that he understood the Graduate Council did not allow graduate students to enroll for P-NC. However, he would accept a friendly amendment on the matter.

Dr. Votaw called for further discussion and there being none, he put the question. The motion carried.

Dr. Zakrzewski continued his report by moving that the following proposal of the committee concerning the FHS Audit Policy be accepted by the Senate:

An auditor is one who is permitted to "listen in" on a course but who takes no part in the discussion, takes no tests or examinations, and receives no credit. Permission to audit a course is granted by the instructor of the course. An auditor may be withdrawn from a course at the option of the instructor. Such courses as swimming, typing and cabinet making cannot be audited.

Any full time student, staff or faculty, and persons 65 years of age or older may audit a class under the conditions listed above. A fee of \$ per credit hour is charged (fee waived for persons 65 years of age and over). Upon completion of the class Audit is recorded on the individual's transcript.

At the instructor's discretion, a student may also audit a course without having any record made on his transcript. In this case, there will be no fee assessed.

He added that the committee believed there should be both a formal and an informal audit. The formal audit would be at the discretion of the instructor but would require a fee and would be recorded on the transcript. The informal audit would be at the discretion of the instructor but with no fee and no record maintained of the audit.

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion.

Dr. Miller suggested that the issue should not be whether the student has something recorded on the transcript but whether FHS is giving away information.

Dr. Robertson and Ms. Thomas stated that it was at the instructor's discretion whether information was given away through audit.

Dr. Votaw stated that if auditing became widespread it would become a problem. However, there seems to be no problem at this time.

Dr. Votaw called for further discussion. There being none, he put the question and it carried.

Dr. Zakrzewski then introduced the third proposal of the committee. He announced that the proposal on the FHS Withdrawal Policy is the same proposal adopted by the Senate last year. He moved its acceptance by the Senate.

The last day to withdraw from a regular class during a regular semester is to be 6 weeks prior to the last day of examinations. Summer term and short-term course withdrawals to be determined on a proportional basis. After the 20th day of classes a grade of W will be recorded on the student's transcript.

(It should be noted that this action represents a re-endorsement of the same withdrawal policy which was last passed by the Faculty Senate and approved by the President. President Tomanek had requested that the Faculty Senate attempt to reconcile its differences with the Student Senate, which had objected to the proposal and favored the status quo.)

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion.

Mr. Hennerberg, a student and editorial editor of the College Leader, spoke against the proposal. He stated that all other colleges listed in the committee's supporting statement have a withdrawal policy which did not set a final date for withdrawal. He believed there would be detrimental effects from such a policy. Students would panic and withdraw too early from a course or else remain in a course and fail.

Dr. Zakrzewski replied that the major difference between the proposal and the other college withdrawal policies is that the others have a later date for withdrawal; however, those withdrawals are accompanied by a grade, e.g., WP or WF. The present proposal would in fact be more lenient in that the only grade recorded would be a W.

Dr. Frerer said that he was in support of Mr. Hennerberg's statement.

Dr. Watson said that Mr. Hennerberg mininterpreted the report on other college withdrawal policies. In most cases, such as KU, after four weeks withdrawal is possible only if the student is passing the course and a W is recorded. If the student withdraws and is not passing, a grade of F is recorded.

Ms. Johnson, Student Body President, spoke against the proposal. She said that most other colleges have an appeals process for those situations arising after the final withdrawal date, even for the day before finals begin, possibly. She also apologized to the Senate for the actions of some students, in or out of the Student Government Association, who may have offended the faculty over the withdrawal policy matter. She hoped that the faculty would not assume that their views were those of the Student Body and that the Faculty Senate would not vote for the proposal on the basis of some students' views and actions. Furthermore, she stated that FHS should not adopt a policy simply because others have it or to have one that is more restrictive than others. FHS should have the policy which is best for the college. She also believed that a shorter time in which to withdraw would produce premature withdrawals. She further requested that the faculty assure accurate mid-term grades to accompany the proposed withdrawal policy. She added that Emporia just adopted a policy similar to the present proposal and their Data Center broke down.

Dr. Robertson asked the students present if there is a withdrawal date they found acceptable in place of the proposal? He suggested that there may well be a compromise date after which withdrawals would be accompanied by a recorded grade. Perhaps a date early in the term for withdrawals, followed by withdrawals which had a grade recorded would be more acceptable?

Ms. Johnson did not feel that such a policy would solve the problem. The loafers would continue to loaf and no one could prevent that. Unfortunately, the conscientious student would suffer as a result of the proposed policy.

Dr. Zakrzewski said that the intent of the committee was that there not be a final date to withdraw from a course only that after a certain date a grade be recorded. Also there is an appeals system at FHS which can accommodate any academic appeal, even withdrawals from courses. As for the Data Center handling the load, they should be able to handle anything considering what they have processed before; 2,450 withdrawals in the fall of 1971, and 1,076 at mid-term; last fall 1,443 dropped at mid-term and 989 in the last week of classes. He also mentioned that Dr. Robertson's suggestion was one that the committee had considered. He felt the faculty would approve of such a policy.

Ms. Johnson replied that while the faculty does not regard the proposal as punitive and she believed the faculty does have the best interests of the students at heart, that, nevertheless, to shorten the withdrawal time and then to add the recorded grades to the withdrawal would be punitive.

Dr. Miller said there had been much discussion of the status quo, but he reminded the members that the college had not always had the present policy. There was once another status quo. Perhaps the members should reflect on why the present policy was adopted.

Dr. Zakrzewski stated that there is some question about students withdrawing from classes simply because they are not receiving an A grade. It would seem that any grade less than A is punitive.

Dr. Votaw suggested that if Ms. Johnson's views on recording grades after a certain date is punitive than the proposed policy, which does not call for the recording of grades, is more lenient than those of the other colleges mentioned.

Dr. Frerer addressed his remarks to Dr. Miller's question on why the present policy was adopted. He was on the committee that recommended the change to the present policy. The change had nothing to do with student unrest. The committee decided that the WP or WU were punitive and not productive. He saw no reason to change that policy now.

Mr. McNeil asked what the students feel is an acceptable date for withdrawal?

Ms. Johnson replied that the present policy is acceptable.

Ms. Harsh asked if the main purpose of the present policy is to give the students a way not to have a grade recorded which they do not want in a particular course?

Dr. Votaw answered that he did not know that answer. His opinion was that the students' reason for wanting to maintain the present policy is to give a reasonable time to decide how well they are doing in a course and to withdraw if they do not feel they are doing well enough.

Ms. Harsh asked if she might assume then that the main purpose of the present policy is to guarantee the student being able to get the grade wanted from the course?

Dr. Votaw replied that he would not wish to go so far as "guarantee" but certainly to allow ample time to determine whether they will receive the desired grade.

Dr. Smith stated that he thought there is an interest on the part of some faculty to "clean out" the class at the earliest reasonable time, to eliminate those students who are not serious and who, therefore, waste the students' efforts, the instructor's efforts and the college's resources, particularly in lab courses.

Ms. Johnson asked that since, according to President Visser (Emporia), it does not matter how many students are in the class, it must go on, why would an instructor want to "weed out" the class?

Dr. Votaw pointed out that the faculty are asking the students to make a commitment earlier in the course. If the student can wait until the third week before the end of the semester to make a commitment, the student is not likely to get much out of the class.

Dr. Frerer moved to call the question.

Dr. Votaw put Dr. Frerer's motion for the question and it carried. He then put the question on Dr. Zakrzewski's motion and it carried.

Dr. Zakrzewski ended his report by announcing that after consideration the Academic Affairs Committee decided that mid-term grades should be retained.

Mr. Ginther reported for the By-laws and Standing Rules Committee. The committee was asked by the Senate President to discuss whether representation in the Faculty Senate, according to Article I, s. 3, of the By-laws, was based on: (1) tenths of faculty time accumulated in each department, or (2) by head count of each department. The committee unanimously decided that the wording of the representation section of the By-laws mandates a Faculty Senate representation based strictly on headcount of each department.

Dr. Votaw stated that the committee's report will be the method of determination unless someone disagrees.

Dr. Busch stated that he felt the report should be adopted as a standing rule. At this moment in the Senate that is the interpretation, but how will the Senate view it at the next meeting or next year. He moved the committee's report be adopted as a standing rule.

Mr. Heil seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion.

Dr. Miller said that perhaps the By-laws Committee should perform more of a judicial function on such matters than a legislative. It is an interpretation of the By-laws, much as the Supreme Court interprets.

Dr. Votaw said that is so unless the Senate adopts the standing rule.

Dr. Busch said that unless everyone looks at representation in the same way the Senate could decide and departments could decide differently tomorrow.

Dr. Votaw said that was so.

Mr. Ginther presented the committee's reasoning behind its interpretation of Article I, which states that representation in the Senate shall be based on full time appointments. Administrative positions with less than four-tenths time teaching are excluded. In section three, it is stated that "representation is determined by the following ratio, one representative for every ten members of the department who qualify as teaching faculty or fraction thereof." There is no mention of determining tenths of time for purposes of representation.

Dr. Busch reiterated that leaving the matter open to interpretation, which it obviously is, will settle nothing.

Dr. Smith asked if Mr. Ginther believed there is good reason to misinterpret the By-laws in this matter?

Mr. Ginther answered there is not. He did not see how it could be misinterpreted when there is no mention of determining representation by tenths of time teaching and only by full time appointment.

Dr. Votaw interjected that actually such was not the case. There are some full time appointments, e.g., Dr. Zakrzewski, who is also curator of the museum, but

not administration nor full time teaching. Tenths of time could make a difference in those situations. However, he agreed that it probably would not be misinterpreted.

Dr. Busch stated he would withdraw his motion for a standing rule if the chair would state that no departments are presently represented in the Senate on the basis of tenths of time rather than headcount.

Dr. Votaw said he had no way of knowing how departments are represented at this time. They have been allotted a certain number of representatives on some basis, but he is trying now to find out what that basis is.

Mr. Ginther said that when notices are sent out soon to the departments to elect new senators, the notification will include a statement on determination by headcount.

Dr. Zakrzewski said the question is how were the departments assigned representation in the first place? There could be under and over-representation.

Dr. Votaw replied that the departments may not agree with the By-laws Committee's interpretation, but a statement in the Senate Minutes would probably suffice. As to Dr. Zakrzewski's question, he did not know how it was assigned in the past. If one goes by the Institutional Research listing by tenths of time and then compares the number of representatives from each department, one department is over-represented. If one goes by headcount, one department is under-represented.

Dr. Zakrzewski said he thought Dr. Votaw's statement demonstrated that departments were interpreting the matter differently.

Dr. Votaw replied that may be true, but he had no way of knowing what caused the difference, their interpretation or one given them by someone else.

Dr. Zakrzewski said that Dr. Busch's motion would clarify the matter for everyone.

Dr. Votaw called for further discussion. There being none, he put the question on Dr. Busch's motion for a standing rule incorporating the By-laws Committee's report on representation. The rule was adopted by a vote of twenty to one, fulfilling the two-thirds majority requirement for standing rules.

Dr. Robertson reported for the College Affairs Committee. He reported there was no business to introduce; however, he would report on the Financial Exigency Policy proposal currently under consideration by COD. The proposal contains a suggested composition for the Personnel Committee, which will serve as the faculty reduction committee for the campus should reduction be required. The Board of Regents has requested such a policy from each institution. The membership of the proposed Personnel Committee is: Dean of Education, Dean of Nursing, Dean of Arts and Sciences, one faculty member from each Faculty (to be appointed by the Faculty Senate President), the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate President. The suggested procedures of the committee are for and in the case of financial exigency. Continuous review of faculty position allocations will be conducted to determine areas and departments

to be reduced. There will be a procedure for appeals. Reduction of personnel would take place in departmental meetings and a vote recorded on which parts of the program would be affected. A report will be made to the VP for Academic Affairs and the Personnel Committee. The action would be approved or disapproved and a recommendation made to the President. If a terminated faculty member appeals, and appeals committee established by the President, the Academic Affairs Committee and the Senate would hear the appeal.

Dr. Robertson said that the committee had some reservations about the policy proposal. Those reservations were submitted directly to COD as they worked on the document. The committee suggested that the procedure for hearing appeals which President Tomanek approved last fall is adequate for the appeals procedure. That portion will probably be rewritten now. The criteria employed when FHS had to reduce faculty earlier were attached to the policy and they seemed adequate. The committee did recommend a change in the composition of the Personnel Committee. The changes were: (1) that faculty members from only the School of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences be appointed, and not from Nursing; (2) that the Student Body President be added to the committee. The rationale for these recommendations was as follows: (1) that the Student Body President would be valuable to such a committee in seeking student input and to help with appeals to the Regents and the legislature; (2) the current composition of the Faculties indicated that the interests of the Nursing School could be adequately maintained by the Dean; and (3) the desire to keep the committee small enough to be manageable. There was some discussion of adding representation from the staff but the committee felt that the deans and the Academic VP could probably represent the staff as they are not peculiar to a given academic area. The College Affairs Committee has requested that the document be sent to the Faculty Senate before the President gives it a final approval.

Dr. Robertson further stated that the "regulations" have at this time no other status than "consideration" by COD. Presumably, they will produce a final document for the President, and hopefully, the Faculty Senate will be able to review the document.

Dr. Votaw said he must correct his earlier announcement (No. 8) on the Personnel Committee. He stated representatives would come from the "Divisions" instead of from the "Faculties." Also, he suggested that any appeals committee should come from the College Affairs Committee, not the Academic Affairs Committee, as originally suggested, because appeals are normally the concern of the College Affairs Committee. His suggestion was accepted by COD.

Dr. Miller asked if the inclusion of the Student Body President was tied to the exclusion of the faculty member from the School of Nursing?

Dr. Robertson replied that they were not tied but were independent recommendations.

Dr. Smith asked what happened to the idea that the Personnel Committee be concerned with both addition and reduction of faculty?

Dr. Robertson replied that the first part of the proposal was a recommendation for the composition of the Personnel Committee and an outline of its functions which would include making recommendations on all appointments, terminations

and allocations of personnel on campus.

Dr. Votaw added that FHS already has such a policy for a Personnel Committee but the Board of Regents wanted a comprehensive statement on financial exigency from the institutions. That request produced the current work on a comprehensive report and policy.

Mr. McNeil asked if the proposed policy could be distributed to the faculty?

Dr. Votaw replied that he had considered doing so but felt it still premature. COD will produce a document which will go to the President and then, hopefully, the Senate will be allowed to consider it.

Mr. McNeil said that it would be very important to have the Senate review the policy because when it came time to "cut the squad," it could get tough if faculty and departments had been left out of the determination process.

Dr. Votaw said that the Personnel Committee would be awkward if it contained a member from each department. However, the point is in general well taken, and the Faculty Senate, acting for the whole faculty, should see the document for review before the final approval.

No report from the Student Affairs Committee. Dr. Votaw reported that the new constitution of the Student Government contains a proposal that faculty positions on the Student-Faculty Court will be three year, staggered terms. That is a departure from the present court. Presently, the court contains four students, three faculty and one of the four students is the chief justice. The court meets when it has appropriate business. The only difference he found is that faculty members will be appointed for staggered three year terms rather than for one year terms. The new proposal would lend an element of continuity to the body.

Dr. Robertson asked if it would be correct to say that now they only stagger through one year terms? (Laughter)

Dr. Votaw called for Old Business. There was none.

Dr. Votaw called for New Business. There was none.

Dr. Votaw, with no objections, adjourned the meeting at 5:19 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan Busch, Secretary