

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

11-13-1973

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, November 13, 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, November 13, 1973" (1973).
Faculty Senate. 623.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/623

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.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Rose Arnhold, Secretary
Faculty Senate
RE: Faculty Senate Meeting
Minutes
DATE: November 13, 1973

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Tuesday, November 13, 1973, at 3:30 P.M. in the Santa Fe Room of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call:

Members absent: Mr. Marc Campbell, Mrs. Nancy Popp, Dr. Arris Johnson, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Wallace Harris, Dr. Samuel Hamilton

Also Present: Dr. Gil Nichols for Dr. Dobbs, Mrs. Katherine Rogers for Mr. Lowen, Mr. Al Link, Miss Pam Fondoble

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Dr. Forsythe said that he had received a note from Dr. Jimmy Rice informing him that the item under "Old Business" in the October 15, 1973, minutes was not correct. There was not a quorum present at the July, 1973, meeting and the Academic Affairs Committee had a recommendation ready for that meeting. Dr. Rice asked that the correction be made in the minutes of the previous meeting:

The October 15, 1973, minutes read:

"Dr. Forsythe reported that the only unfinished business known to him was that the General Education Committee operating in summer, 1973, made a proposal but that it was tabled."

Dr. Forsythe asked that the minutes be corrected to read:

"The Academic Affairs Committee recommended that the Faculty Senate refer the proposed General Education Program back to the General Education Committee for its reconsideration. Further, the Academic Affairs Committee recommended that it be represented through membership in the new General Education Committee."

NOTE:

The purpose of the second part of the recommendation is to provide a means of input for the Academic Affairs Committee, rather than putting it into the position of simply approving or disapproving future proposals.

Dr. Marshall moved to accept the minutes as corrected. The motion was seconded and carried with no one in opposition.

III. Announcements:

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had received the following message from President Gustad on November 5, 1973:

"Pursuant to your letter of October 31, I met today with the Council of Deans. We agreed that the Senate's recommendation regarding the reinstatement of the 40-hour upper division requirement be approved."

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Executive Committee had been scheduled to meet with President Gustad on Monday, November 12, but that it had been postponed to Friday, November 18, at 3:30 in the President's Office.

Dr. Staven asked what items were to be discussed. Dr. Forsythe indicated that concerns relative to the role of the Faculty Senate which were raised when the Executive Committee met with Dr. Tomanek would receive attention at the meeting with Dr. Gustad. Such items as the degree of Faculty Senate involvement with faculty affairs, the mini-course program, and curriculum affairs would probably be discussed.

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had written a note of appreciation to those off-campus persons who participated in the dedication of Gross Memorial Coliseum in October and reported that most had responded.

Dr. Forsythe requested that individuals seeking the floor should wait for recognition from the chairman. In addition to being good parliamentary procedure this action would enable the secretary to take notes which would accurately reflect the actions taken in Senate. The entire faculty would know the rationale for Senate actions.

Dr. Forsythe reported that he had attended a meeting in Lawrence on November 4, where college students were inaugurating Higher Education Week. Fort Hays State students were in attendance.

IV. Reports of Standing Committees:

A. BYLAWS AND STANDING RULES COMMITTEE

Dr. Frerer stated that the committee had nothing to report at this time.

B. STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Dr. Marshall stated that the committee had nothing to report at this time but that it was working on a recommendation regarding the college policy pertaining to graduating with honors.

C. COLLEGE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Miss Veed reported that after meeting with Mr. Link the College Affairs Committee wished to make the following recommendation which was then presented as a motion.

"The Faculty Senate is opposed to mandatory student evaluation. However, voluntary participation in the student evaluation program is acceptable. We are neither approving nor disapproving the students' proposed evaluation instrument."

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

Dr. Frerer raised an objection to the wording of the recommendation. He questioned inclusion of the statement "The Faculty Senate is opposed to mandatory student evaluation."

Miss Veed stated that there had been considerable misunderstanding regarding the evaluation and that the statement had been included to indicate participation in the evaluation was voluntary, not mandatory. The Faculty Senate was opposed to mandatory student evaluation.

Dr. Adams asked whether or not a rationale should be secured from Mr. Link regarding the mandatory nature of it.

Mr. Link noted that nine faculty members had refused to participate.

Dr. Forsythe noted that he was one of the nine who declined.

Dr. Hiller asked about the nature of the instrument.

Miss Veed pointed out that the instrument is not geared to improving instruction which is why evaluations are conducted. She said that there was the additional reason that the committee wanted to make it clear that participation would be a voluntary matter.

Dr. Frerer noted that a discussion had been held in the Speech Department of the instrument. He pointed out that the instrument favors the lecture approach and that instructors not using that approach questioned its validity.

The question of listing those who refused to participate was introduced. Dr. Frerer suggested that some faculty members had not been asked to participate which therefore necessitated the listing of those who refused so as to distinguish between the two groups not appearing in the evaluation.

Dr. McCullick suggested the omission of faculty members was an administrative problem and did not justify such action. Dr. McCullick voiced his opposition to listing the names of faculty members who refused to participate.

Dr. Drinan asked Mr. Link why all faculty members were not included.

Mr. Link explained that the students desired to contact faculty members personally to secure their permission but that many were not accessible.

Dr. Parish suggested that contact via campus mail would have yielded better results.

Dr. Forsythe indicated that he objected to the method of the evaluation and refused to participate because he was informed that the students had already selected one class and wanted him to select the other. Also, the History Department requires student evaluation of all classes, not one or two.

Dr. McCullick and Dr. Smith questioned the desirability of listing faculty members who refused to participate. It was pointed out that the inference would be made that faculty members who refused to participate were afraid to have their classes evaluated.

Mr. Heather stated he did not mind being listed as one who refused evaluation if Student Senate would list why he was opposed to the method used.

Mr. Ginther noted that while he had no personal objection to the evaluation it had been the department chairman who asked which class faculty members wished to have evaluated.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that these then are some of the reasons why so much misunderstanding existed on the subject and that the matter had been brought to the attention of Dr. Tomanek.

Dr. Adams voiced the opinion that the lack of tact on the part of the students was unintentional and that details regarding the evaluation had appeared in the student newspaper.

Miss Veed was asked to reread the motion so that everyone understood it.

Dr. Frerer moved to amend the recommendation to delete the statement "Faculty Senate is opposed to mandatory student evaluation."

The motion died for lack of a second. The motion to accept the recommendation of the College Affairs Committee was passed with two dissenting votes.

Miss Veed stated that the College Affairs Committee was considering other items such as developing criteria for salary increases, guidelines for tenure, and disability insurance.

D. ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Dr. McCullick stated that the committee had nothing to report at this time but that it was considering items such as the mini-course issue, curriculum matters, and a change in course withdrawal policy. He voiced the opinion that it was the intention of the committee to move curriculum matters into Faculty Senate as is the case in other state schools.

V. Unfinished Business:

Dr. Forsythe indicated there was nothing to report regarding unfinished business.

VI. New Business:

Dr. Drinan apprised Senate members that Ron Pflughoft, individuals from Student Senate and students from Political Science were concentrating efforts on generating lists of individual faculty members who would be willing to write legislators. Information about faculty members' hometown, home county, etc., is being collected.

Dr. Forsythe encouraged faculty to work on the project of increasing the visibility of Fort Hays State in this manner. He noted the work of the Student Senate and urged faculty to participate.

Dr. Adams asked Faculty Senate to pass a resolution that the library budget be spared any budget cuts during the school year.

Dr. Parish seconded the motion.

Dr. Miller asked for clarification of the term budget. He suggested that a distinction be made between operating budget and acquisitions budget.

Dr. Robinson questioned if Dr. Adams was referring to the current budget.

Dr. Forsythe suggested that the purpose of Dr. Adams' recommendation was to express the same sentiment as last year's Faculty Senate resolution regarding the library. Dr. Forsythe noted that this was used last year to indicate to Mr. Bibb the intention of the faculty to maintain quality in face of budgetary cuts.

Dr. Staven asked if the resolution is intended to protect the library and where the cuts would be absorbed.

Dr. McCullick pointed out that if the resolution is passed and if budget cuts are incurred the individual departments would have to absorb the cuts. He cautioned Senate members that such action would diminish the flexibility now possessed.

Dr. Drinan offered a friendly amendment to Dr. Adams' original resolution. He suggested it read "The library budget be spared any budget cuts during the current year if possible."

Dr. Miller stated that if the resolution was directed toward library acquisitions he could support it.

Dr. Adams clarified the original suggestion by noting that he was referring to the acquisitions budget.

Dr. Staven noted that textbook costs were predicted to increase 25-30%.

Dr. McCullick noted that all departments do not use library resources to the same extent and that Faculty Senate should not make what are essentially departmental decisions.

Dr. Staven noted that the administration in the past has not been receptive to Faculty Senate debating budgetary issues.

Miss Veed expressed the opinion that last year's resolution to protect the library from cuts was in fact a protest against arbitrarily decreasing library funds.

Mr. Lojka asked for a clarification of operating budget and acquisitions budget.

Dr. Staven suggested that perhaps the entire issue placed Faculty Senate in "no-man's land."

Dr. Adams suggested that he thought that the administration was receptive to such action by Faculty Senate and even if the administration was opposed that fact should not inhibit the Faculty Senate. He noted that last year such a measure passed unanimously.

Mrs. Powell explained that the library is allotted a given amount each year to spend on books, periodicals, equipment and supplies. She noted that two months were spent last year cancelling orders.

Dr. McCullick noted that by passing such a resolution the Faculty Senate is making judgments that departments should be making.

Dr. Marshall pointed out that without books the chemistry department could not function. If budget cuts are made regarding the library, the department's operation, particularly the graduate program, becomes questionable.

Dr. Parish noted acquisitions touches the entire campus and cited the English department's dependence on acquiring recent works.

Dr. McCullick explained that if there is a two per cent cut in the operating budget and if the acquisitions department is spared, each department will have to absorb disproportionate cuts. Dr. McCullick offered the following amendment: "That the library not suffer a disproportionate decrease should budget cuts occur."

Dr. Pruitt seconded the amendment.

Dr. Drinan expressed the opinion that it was important for Faculty Senate to go on record supporting and protecting library acquisitions.

Dr. Forsythe called for a voice vote and stated the amendment proposed by Dr. McCullick was defeated.

Dr. Pruitt called for a roll call vote. Dr. Forsythe asked for a vote by show of hands. Nine members approved of Dr. McCullick's resolution and twenty opposed. The amendment was defeated.

Dr. Forsythe asked for a vote on Dr. Adams' original motion. A voice vote was taken, the measure passed but it was not unanimous.

Dr. Frerer announced the details of the second major production of the Fort Hays theatre and invited Faculty members to attend.

Dr. Staven asked why the campus patrol were off campus in light of the program to conserve fuel.

Mrs. Pfeifer noted that individuals seeing violations of the rules were supposed to report such violations directly to the Department of Administration.

Mr. Rupp indicated that he felt there were probably legitimate reasons to explain off campus driving of the Campus Patrol such as taking receipts to the bank.

Mr. Ginther added that such driving was required to keep batteries charged.

VII. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 P.M.