

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

2-19-1973

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, February 19, 1973

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, February 19, 1973" (1973).
Faculty Senate. 617.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/617

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

TO: Faculty

FROM: Pat Drinan, Secretary-Faculty Senate

Minutes of Fort Hays Kansas State College Faculty Senate meeting of February 19, 1973 at 3:30 p.m. in the Smoky Hill Room of the Memorial Union.

- I. Roll Call. Members absent: Mr. Jack Heather, Mrs. Ilene Allen, Dr. Samuel Hamilton, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Mr. Ruff Gentry, Mr. Robert Crissman, Dr. Robert Adams, Dr. LaVier Staven, Dr. Richard Baker, Mrs. Nancy Popp, Mr. Cade Suran, Mr. Gary Tobias.
- II. It was moved to approve previous minutes as distributed. Seconded. Motion carried.
- III. Chairman Miller reported on state college and university faculty senate chairmen meeting with Board of Regents on January 19.
 - A. Described the objective of impressing Regents with plight of faculty salaries. Dr. Miller's first impression was that Regents were not too sympathetic. However, Dr. Miller did feel that he did impress Regents with the fact of the comparatively lower salaries at Fort Hays State.
 - B. Results of meeting: Dr. Miller read into the minutes two Regents' communications.
 1. Letter to Dr. Miller from Jess Stewart
 - a. "By this time you have probably received a copy of the Board resolution, relative to faculty salaries passed by the Board of Regents at our Wichita meeting.

Again let me reiterate that the Board intends to press hard for the fringe benefits before the Ways & Means Committees.

Today I have requested President Budd, as chairman of the Council of Presidents to call a special meeting of the C. of P. and the finance committee of the Board. This meeting will be concerned with faculty salaries and the development of a plan to initiate a three year schedule of salary increases which, if acceptable to the legislature, would bring the faculty in line with comparative institutions.

I wish to personally thank you for your fine presentation at the luncheon meeting. The entire Board found it informative and constructive."

b. "It was moved by Mr. Bubbs and seconded by Mr. Helman that the following Resolution be approved:

The Board of Regents wishes to call to the Legislature's attention that the 5.5% requested salary increase for faculty is not the ceiling under the Wage-Price Freeze. All salaries paid to faculty who have received promotions or new assignments are not included in the overall figure that is used in such computations. Also, fringe benefits of nearly 1% do not come under the 5.5%.

The Board of Regents is unanimous in its belief that substantial increases are imperative if quality education is to be maintained in Kansas.

The Board of Regents is not changing its request for the present legislative session, but will make every effort in future sessions to bring faculty salaries to a point where faculty can be reimbursed at a level comparable to those institutions with which we compete.

In the present session, the Board will redouble its efforts to achieve the total approved request, particularly in the area of fringe benefits for faculty.

Motion carried unanimously."

C. Discussion

1. Dr. Forsythe indicated that the AAUP has employed legal counsel and the Regents are aware of it.
2. Dr. Robinson asked which fringe benefits the Board is trying to reinstate. Dr. Miller indicated the TIAA contribution and disability insurance were the two.

IV. Committee reports

- A. Dr. Witten indicated that revision of Bylaws is nearing completion and recommendations would be offered at the next meeting of the Senate.
- B. Dr. Forsythe for College Affairs committee distributed instructor and course evaluation forms that had been recommended by the committee. He indicated that the forms were available for instructor use only at Dean Garwood's office. The forms, he added, are not designed for administrative use.
 1. Dr. Forsythe moved adoption of instructor and course evaluation forms through Dean Garwood's office. Seconded.
 2. Motion Carried.
- C. Mr. Rupp introduced Mr. Schamber, chairman of the Student Senate. Mr. Schamber indicated that the Student Senate was considering procedures for choosing a student for the tenure committee. He said that Faculty Senate input would be useful.
 1. Dr. Parish asked if the administration favored a student on the tenure committee. She also suggested that similar procedures for choosing the faculty on the committee could be used for choosing students.
 2. Mr. Schamber indicated that the administration tentatively favors a student on the tenure committee.
 3. Dr. Oliva asked if the student should have tenure.

4. General discussion.
 5. Dr. Forsythe moved that we not consider procedures until administration makes it mandatory to have a student. Seconded. Motion carried unanimously.
- D. Dr. Smith reported deliberations of Academic Affairs committee on the issue of intersession.
1. Dr. Smith summarized the options presented to the Senate without committee recommendation.
 - a. "Since the Board of Regents sets the academic calendar for all state colleges and universities, the Administration should negotiate with the Council of Presidents and COCAO to establish a uniform plan and system for all six state colleges and universities.
 - b. Continue Intersession as it was conducted in January, 1973.
 - c. Eliminate the intersession time by returning to longer semesters, possibly 17-18 weeks each.
 - d. If intersession is extended to the length of 3-4 weeks between two four-month semester, faculty members who teach courses during the intersession should be either paid extra for this teaching or have their spring course load reduced by one course each."
 2. Dr. Smith discussed the reasons given by administration for considering a longer intersession and summarized committee deliberation.
 3. Dr. Moss indicated that the issue of faculty not working is absurd. He said that we may have a PR problem, not a problem of faculty not working.
 4. Dr. Oliva moved adoption of option "a." above with the addition of following sentence: "This body is opposed to intersession, voluntary or involuntary, unless all other institutions are operating on the same schedule." Seconded. Discussion. Dr. Forsythe asked if this motion would reverse decision of Senate last year against an intersession. Dr. Miller indicated that last year we had voted against a formal intersession. He also said that his discussions with Dr. Tomanek had clarified how this intersession had grown informally through student demand. Dr. Forsythe asked if Dr. Oliva's motion could be construed as us favoring intersession. Dr. Miller indicated that Dr. Oliva's motion does not appear to favor the concept of intersession. Dr. Robinson asked if we could build enrollment through intersession. Dr. Oliva replied that the opposite may occur through lower enrollments in regular sessions. Dr. Miller indicated that one-third of intersession students were from other colleges. Dr. Slechta said that he doubted if we

attracted many full-time students through intersession. Dr. Parish indicated that there were some advantages for our students for graduating early. Dr. Miller asked if there was any further discussion. Motion carried with one dissenting vote.

V. New business

- A. Miss Veed said that Senate will soon get recommendations on general education and affirmative action.
- B. Dr. Miller asked if Senate was going to be given any time to deliberate on the new general education program.
- C. Dr. Robinson asked if copies of general education proposals would be distributed. Miss Veed indicated that they would be distributed soon.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 p.m.