

2-6-1978

## Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, February 6, 1978

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all)

---

### Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, February 6, 1978" (1978).  
*Faculty Senate*. 675.  
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/675](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/675)

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](mailto:ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu).

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

February 6, 1978

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Veed, Faculty Senate President, 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: Ms. Joanne Harwick, Dr. Clifford Edwards, Dr. Sam Warfel, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Suzanne Trauth, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Charles Votaw, Ms. Ellen Veed, Dr. Louis Caplan, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. Robert Meier, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Allan Busch, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Louis Fillinger, Ms. Donna Harsh, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Ms. Sandria (Godwin) Lindsay, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Mr. Mac Reed, Ms. Calvin Thomas.

Those members absent were: Mr. Mike Meade, Dr. Steven Tramel, Mr. Thaine Clark, Dr. Ron Smith, Dr. Keith Campbell, Dr. Billy Daley, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Mr. Donald Jacobs.

Also present were: Dr. Robert Adams for Smith.

Guests that were present: Vice-president Eickhoff and Dean Huffman.

Vice-president Eickhoff: Today I want to make a brief comment on the whole question of off-campus offerings and their importance to the campus. I think most of you are aware of the important role that our off-campus enrollment has to the vitality and well being of FHSU. For the past several years on-campus enrollment has shown a steady decline---not a large decline but the trend has been downward. The traditional college age youth are simply not coming to the campus in the numbers that they did in the past. FHSU has continued to maintain its enrollment in the last two (2) years through the credit hour production generated by continuing education. I want to discuss with you what I perceive to be the realities of the situation. Afterward, I will answer questions you might have about my perception of these realities.

My first introduction to continuing education among the regents institutions occurred at my second Council of Chief Academic Officers (COCAO) meeting, which consists of the Vice-president from each of the regents institutions. In that meeting I learned how each of the big Universities handled their continuing education programs. I asked KU how they encouraged their faculty to carry their courses out to where the market is: The reply was that they persuaded the faculty at the department level to take courses to KC and the departments were made aware of the fact if the department experienced enrollment decrease, it would become necessary to cut positions in that department.

It is obvious from that reply that there was a bit of "idealism" as well as a club which convinced the departments to offer off-campus courses. I discovered that there were no monetary compensations made to KU faculty who took courses off-campus. The department sees off-campus offerings as a matter of self-interest. As I thought about the KU plan, I began to contemplate how FHSU might implement a similar plan. I began to see special problems which sets our situation apart from the workable solution for KU. One of these problems is the more favorable teaching load which KU faculty have (9 hours or less) because of more generous funding. Another advantage KU has is the proximity of a large population. A fifty mile drive or less reaches a larger market than can be reached by the FHSU faculty in driving several times that distance. I began to ask myself questions, what is fair to our faculty? How can we make allowances for the extra demands placed on our faculty in terms of their heavier teaching loads as well as the greater distances which FHSU faculty must travel to off-campus course sites? I then suggested in COCAO that in order to provide incentive to our faculty to offer off-campus courses that we needed extra funding from the Regents. Needless to say, this proposal was not accepted.

I returned to the FHSU Campus and began to talk to people about other ways which would provide incentives to offer off-campus courses. Two years ago money was set aside to reward people who took courses off-campus. That plan had a weakness in that it gave a faculty member more money if the course was offered as a nonbase count course. This plan discouraged faculty from taking courses off-campus that would count in the base count enrollment. This year the decision was made to reserve sufficient funding to reward faculty to teach off-campus courses that will be counted in the base count. The funds will come from the unclassified salary budget. Many people on campus are aware that I feel when the salary budget is changed, great care must be exercised to assure fairness.

Dr. Caplan: Since the pay for an off-campus course comes from the succeeding year's unclassified salary budget, what will be done if the legislature should provide for a 1% salary increase.

Vice-president Eickhoff: I think if the legislature should give us a 1% salary increase, I would be the first to recommend to the President that we fairly distribute this salary between those faculty who teach an off-campus course and faculty who teach on campus. I do not think we want to get locked into a fixed amount of money given as a reward for teaching off-campus courses. If the legislature were to give only a small amount of funding for salary increase or if we were to receive less money for salary it would be necessary for us to review the whole salary structure. We want to develop an incentive program for faculty who offer off-campus courses. It is necessary to keep in mind that these off-campus courses require more effort.

Dr. Frerer: Are there faculty who were hired to teach purely off-campus courses?

Vice-president Eickhoff: Not to my knowledge. I do not know anyone in the last year and a half who has taken more than two courses off-campus. Even so, taking two courses off-campus is rare.

Dr. Frerer: I thought that we have had faculty who have two or three courses on campus and three courses off-campus?

Vice-president Eickhoff: I am aware of one faculty member who did have last semester three one (1) hour courses off-campus. Even so, I do not think that kind of schedule is desirable. In this particular case, it is the nature of that faculty member's discipline which made it necessary to offer three separate one (1) hour courses. It does not make good sense to have a faculty member teaching more than one (1) course per semester off-campus.

Dr. Caplan: How much incentive pay will be for off-campus courses?

Vice-president Eickhoff: It boils down to \$200 per undergraduate credit hour, and \$250 per graduate credit hour.

In summary we are trying to develop systematic field work which will determine what the market is for off-campus offerings. We are in the process of contacting the public school systems since they are near the citizens of their respective communities to find out what they view are the needs of their community. This systematic approach of contacting school systems will serve only as a starting point. We plan to develop more methods for determining specifically what the market is for off-campus courses. Our survey will require a lot of work since we have 120 school systems in the area which we serve. This information will be collected administratively by me, the Deans, and some department chairpersons. I believe there is a developing big market for Science, Math, and English with the back to basic movements.

Mr. Rupp: I think it is a good idea to inventory the educational needs of each community that we serve. There are some serious constraints to the liberal arts area. Most of the larger population centers have Junior Colleges which would compete with us in an attempt to satisfy the market which may be developing in getting back to the basics. My understanding is that we cannot offer courses within a 25 mile radius of a Junior College campus. In a specialized area such as education, the Junior Colleges are not staffed to offer education courses. The Department of Education has a built in advantage in offering their courses and receiving incentive pay. Junior Colleges will compete with liberal arts departments at FHSU outside the 25 mile radius in basic course offerings. Therefore, I view this as a very serious salary problem.

Vice-president Eickhoff: It is true we are prohibited from offering lower division courses outside a 25 mile radius of the University.

Mr. Rupp: In doing the survey it is worth keeping in mind that upper level Liberal Arts courses require prerequisites which would make for a smaller demand for those courses.

Vice-president Eickhoff: That may be true but I think we still need a survey to help assess the market.

Dr. Miller: I agree with another faculty member's assessment of merit pay. Merit raises increase the base for the next year. I realize my idea runs contrary to the Board of Regents policy but I think merit should be awarded on a one-year basis instead of adding into the base all the time. There should be cost of living increases given, however, to make the system fair. My suggestion is that teaching off-campus courses should be used with all of the other criteria, not as a separate category, to determine the merit increase in a given year.

Vice-president Eickhoff: Base salary does not bother me until merit increase is figured as a percentage of that base. That is when the problems develop. In the short time I have been here, faculty members have approached me having received a 6.2% increase in salary when the overall salary increase was to be 7%, with the question, where is the rest of my raise? We are getting closer to understanding how to determine merit increases.

Mr. Rupp: I think what Dr. Miller is saying is that teaching off-campus courses should not get special merit pay but should be just one of the extra things that faculty do to merit a special raise.

Vice-president Eickhoff: I always try to be honest. The off-campus offerings are so important to the well-being of FHSU through stabilizing our enrollment that it is necessary to provide strong incentive to faculty by singling out off-campus offerings as a special category.

Ms. Pfeifer: Is there a minimum number of students needed in a course before the course will be allowed?

Vice-president Eickhoff: We cannot have a fixed minimum number.

Dean Huffman: We try to keep the average for all off-campus offerings somewhere around 15 students per class.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. I have figures which contradict what the Leader Editorial said last week. The Leader reported that 90% of the faculty earn salaries which exceed \$15,000. The figures I have from the Office of Institutional Research are that 57% of the faculty earn more than \$15,000 on a nine (9) month contract. Twenty-eight percent earn more than \$17,000 on a nine (9) month contract.
2. We are urged to contact our legislators to ask them to put back the appropriate items which were cut from the budget. (See the recent COD minutes for details.)

#### COMMITTEE REPORT

Academic Affairs: No report.

Bylaws: No Report

Student Affairs: Ms. Harsh, chairperson, moved that the general catalog and the Graduate Bulletin be revised to:

1. Include the Appeal of Academic Evaluation from the Graduate Bulletin in the General Catalog.

Students shall have protection through orderly procedures against prejudiced or capricious academic evaluation. In matters relating to academic performance an informal procedure exists. The student should first consult with the professor(s) involved. If the issue is not resolved at that level, the student may consult with the chairman of the department who will, if necessary, inform the student of further specific appeal procedures.

2. Change "must" to "should" (line 4) in the revisions of the Graduate Bulletin, Statement: Appeal of Academic Evaluation
3. Include the following Academic Honesty statement in the General Catalog.

Effective learning may involve differences between views of the student and faculty. Students are responsible, however, for learning the content of courses of study outlined by the instructor, regardless of privately held judgments, and for demonstrating attainment in an honest manner. Students who compromise the integrity of the academic process are subject to disciplinary action on the part of the University. Students accused of abridging a standard of honesty may protect themselves through established academic appeal procedures and are assured of due process and the right of appeal. The student should first consult with the chairman of the department who will, if necessary, inform the student of further appeal procedures.

4. We also recommend that the specific appeals procedure be on file in the offices of all the department chairmen and deans.

Motion seconded by Dr. Votaw.

Motion carried.

These proposals originated with COD therefore the proposal as well as the revisions will be returned to COD.

University Affairs: Dr. Caplan moved that the standing rules be suspended so that he could make an oral proposal on Allocation, Reallocation and Reduction of Personnel.

Seconded by Dr. Frerer.

Motion passed.

The University Affairs committee moves that the Faculty Senate is in favor of an Early Voluntary Retirement plan but can neither accept nor reject the proposed plan Voluntary Early Retirement (VER) Partial and VER Total until further clarification of its impact is made available.

Seconded by Dr. Frerer.

More clarification means gives us some examples through TIAA and CREF with numbers.

Motion passed.

Dr. Zakrewski moved that we increase percentages by 30% on VER partial and 25% on VER total. Seconded by Dr. Caplan.

Discussion followed which clarified that the first Early Voluntary Retirement Proposal originated with Council of Presidents (COP) and the second plan for Early Voluntary Retirement originated with the KU faculty. After considerable discussion the motion as well as the second was withdrawn.

Dr. Busch: Suggested that we have the Chariman of the Department of Business use whatever resources his department has to advise the Faculty Senate with examples to clarify VER Partial and VER Total.

Dr. Caplan moved that the Faculty Senate President ask the chairman of the Department of Business give us advice on VER Partial and VER Total.

Seconded by Dr. Busch.

Motion passed.

Dr. Caplan handed out criteria for Allocation, Reallocation and Reduction of personnel which will be placed in the form of a motion next time. Faculty should send responses to Ms. Veed or Dr. Caplan.

In September 1976 the Kansas Board of Regents appointed a special task force to evaluate the adequacy of its funding procedures. This task force identified five institutions that are similar in program emphasis, size and other relevant factors to Emporia, Pittsburg and Hays. (N.W. Mo. St., Kearney St., Northern Iowa, Eastern N. Mexico, Moorhead, Ky) Also identified were the following academic disciplines: Agriculture, Business, Science and Mathematics, Education, Fine Arts, Social Sciences/Humanities, Health Professions, and other. It is suggested that allocation of new positions, reallocation of existing positions and reduction of personnel should be based on peer institution comparisons.

- I. Peer institution comparison of ratio of administration and unclassified support staff to teaching faculty.
- II. Peer institution comparison by academic discipline
  - A). SCH/EFT
  - B). Number of degrees granted and number of majors.
- III. Peer institution comparison by department.
  - A). SCH/EFT
  - B). Number of degrees granted and number of majors.
- IV. Fulfilling Kansas Board of Regents 1972 Guidelines for State Universities.
  - A). Critical size of departments
  - B). Priority of programs

- C). Quality of programs
- D). Future potential of departments.

V. Other

- A). Extent of service courses (Induced course load matrix)
- B). Market potential of programs.
- C). Effect on graduate programs
- D). Extent of departmental service to the university and off campus.
- E). Value of department in recruiting and attracting students

It is expected that for all three cases (new positions, reallocation of positions, and reduction of personnel) the Reallocation Committee will first consider criteria I and II. This will determine to a large degree which academic disciplines (including administration and unclassified support staff) will be effected. The remaining criteria will then be used to determine which departments in the selected disciplines will be affected.

Old Business: None

New Business:

Dr. Watson: I am puzzled that out of 162 applicants that the selection committee for the new Associate Dean of Students found it necessary to go against two (2) directives. One directive is from the North Central Association of Accredited High Schools and Colleges which criticized FHSU in the 1970 evaluation for hiring too many of its own graduates. The other directive comes from the President of FHSU and a motion approved by the faculty senate and accepted by the president which says that after the fall of 1977 that only in extreme circumstances will people be hired without the terminal degree.

I move that we invite Vice-President Jellison and Associate Dean of Students Knoll as well as any other appropriate members of the selection committee to come to explain why they did not observe the criticism in the 1970 North Central Association evaluation and the present University guideline which states only terminally degreed people will be hired on the tenure track.

Second by Dr. Votaw.

Motion carried.

There being no further business, Ms. Veed adjourned the meeting at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. John L. Watson