

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

1-29-1974

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, January 29, 1974

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, January 29, 1974" (1974).
Faculty Senate. 625.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/625

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: January 29, 1974

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Tuesday, January 29, 1974, at 3:30 P.M. in the Smoky Hill Room of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call:

Members absent: Dr. Samuel Hamilton, Dr. Wallace Harris, Dr. Roger Pruitt, Dr. Arris Johnson

Also present: Mr. Jim Kellerman, Registrar; Dr. Louis Fillinger for Dr. Edith Dobbs; Mr. Robert Smith for Mr. Marc Campbell; Mr. Larry Walker of the Leader staff; Mr. Mike Wilcox of the Leader staff; Ms. Sue Gillum, Student Senate; and Mr. Mike Schardein, Student Senate

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

Dr. Drinan moved that the minutes of the previous regular meeting be approved. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion. The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Dr. Forsythe noted that Dr. Wallace Harris was in attendance at the special Faculty Senate meeting called on Saturday, December 15, 1974. His name was omitted unintentionally. Dr. Marshall moved that the minutes of the special meeting be approved as corrected. Dr. Robinson seconded the motion. The motion passed with no one in opposition.

III. Announcements:

Dr. Forsythe read a letter from President Gustad thanking the Faculty Senate members for their attendance at the special Faculty Senate meeting held on December 15, 1974.

Dr. Forsythe announced that an oral agreement had been made by Dr. Tomanek and Mr. Keating to carry faculty members who were disabled for 180 days. Dr. Forsythe pointed out that this oral agreement would not pertain to faculty members not on the payroll at the time the disability was incurred.

Dr. Staven asked if the various departments had been apprised of this agreement. Dr. Forsythe noted that Faculty Senate minutes go to all faculty members and therefore faculty members would be informed. Dr. Forsythe stated that he would also ask that the administration make this explicit to all department chairmen.

Dr. Forsythe announced that there had been no decision made regarding the five faculty positions in the event they are restored to Fort Hays State.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Associate Arts degree is being considered. He suggested that every department may be asked to submit a proposal along this line. Dr. Forsythe noted that junior colleges do award the Associate Arts degree upon completion of a two year course of study. Dr. Forsythe stated that the matter would probably be referred to the Academic Affairs Committee for consideration.

Dr. Forsythe reported that he had attended a meeting of all Faculty Senate Chairmen in the Kansas College and University system at Emporia and that Emporia and Pittsburg argued in favor of becoming universities and perhaps members of a university wide system in Kansas. He asked Senate members to provide him with feedback from departments regarding this matter by the next meeting.

Dr. Fleharty asked how this would affect the autonomy of the individual schools. Dr. Forsythe stated that this was one of several important issues that would have to be considered.

Mrs. Popp questioned what standards would have to be met. Dr. Forsythe noted that there were none to the best of his knowledge.

Dr. Fillinger noted that university denotes a higher standard of education to foreign students and the suggestion deserves consideration.

Dr. Forsythe noted that a list of faculty positions in the State was being circulated. Dr. Forsythe also noted that Kansas State University's salary report had been sent to all legislators. Dr. Forsythe offered his copy of the report to those interested in reading it.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that the University of Kansas was seeking information concerning faculty position cuts. At the meeting of the faculty chairmen the Emporia faculty suggested to K.U. that they not use the same method employed by Emporia.

Dr. Forsythe asked that members carefully study and discuss with colleagues the suggested approaches for the preparation of an Undergraduate Program Review at the Regents' institutions. Questions regarding the draft should be directed to Dr. Tomanek.

Dr. Forsythe noted that the problem of faculty members violating final examination schedules had been brought to his attention. In response to this Dr. Forsythe sent a letter to Dr. Tomanek on this matter.

Dr. Forsythe stated he especially wanted to stress the fact that the Faculty Senate had in past years fully agreed to the final exam period and that it was the administration's responsibility to enforce the issue.

Dr. Frerer mentioned that the most widespread complaint coming to his attention was that finals were being given the week previous to final week.

Mr. Ginther noted that in accordance with the final examination regulations the last period was for final summation which meant an examination could be administered earlier.

Dr. Smith pointed out that if all exams were moved up a week the student could not plan his course of study as effectively.

Dr. Frerer noted the additional problem of students being absent from class the week prior to final week as pressure was put on them to take examinations early.

Dr. Forsythe reiterated the fact that the Administration would have to enforce the stated regulations.

Dr. Forsythe noted that while some department Chairmen required faculty members to be on campus during intersession it was not the intention of the Administration to require this and that the Administration should not be blamed for this. In fact, to conserve fuel the Administration had been hopeful of faculty using private homes for meetings, etc. Dr. Forsythe said that he had discussed this with Dr. Tomanek to make sure that he was right.

Dr. Forsythe brought to the attention of the Faculty Senate members that minority students have lodged complaints regarding differential treatment being accorded them. Senate members should advise their respective departments of the futility of recruiting minority students if a favorable environment does not exist in which they can obtain their education.

Mr. Heather called attention to the fact that demeaning statements might also be made to white students and asked what action would be taken in such cases.

Dr. Forsythe noted that a committee is being established to deal specifically with minority recruiting and advising.

Ms. Gillum pointed out that Student Senate had received complaints from foreign students regarding differential treatment as well.

Mrs. Popp asked what machinery existed to handle such complaints. She noted that charges should be thoroughly investigated as the incident in question occurred in the Health, Physical Education and Recreation Department and the facts were, in her opinion, misconstrued and the issue mishandled.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the administration was taking precautions to keep faculty members from feeling undue pressure to contribute to scholarships. Dr. Forsythe noted that Dr. Miller had pointed out that there is no assurance at this time that money given can be designated for a specific department. This subject will be taken up with the Administration.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the faculty may be called upon to fill out another Faculty Activities Report. Copies of the forms being considered for use may be secured from Dr. Forsythe. He urged that the faculty cooperate if the report is required. The information has proven valuable in the past as it reflects the work of the faculty.

Dr. Forsythe distributed a report on excessive number of hours taken by students. The matter will be discussed at a later meeting.

Dr. Drinan announced that all faculty members are being encouraged to write their legislators. Dr. Drinan asked that when writing to legislators one or several of the following items should be communicated:

1. urge full funding of the Board of Regents request for higher education

2. identify the difficulties for the quality of higher education of faculty cuts and cuts in programs
3. remind them that Fort Hays State has significantly lower state funding per student than the other state colleges* and that faculty members at Fort Hays State teach more credit hours per faculty member than at the other five state colleges and universities**

*General Revenue Fund Appropriation per FTE student in 1974

Pittsburg	-	\$1250.00
Emporia	-	\$1210.00
Hays	-	\$1010.00

**Student Credit Hours per Full-time Faculty Member

KU	KSU	WSU	KSTC	KSC	FHS
167.69	191.82	214.66	238.04	251.13	267.64

4. urge them to support adequate increases in faculty salaries (annual faculty salary in Kansas, after adjusting for inflation, has increased less than \$300 since 1967).

Dr. Forsythe announced that he would be meeting with a group of legislators Wednesday, January 30, 1974.

IV. Reports of Standing Committees:

A. Student Affairs Committee

Dr. Marshall announced the committee had nothing to report at this time.

B. Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

Dr. Frerer clarified the question of proxy voting. He noted that according to the Faculty Senate Bylaws in Article III, Section C, part 3:

"A department may provide an official alternate either by authorizing the department chairman to appoint an alternate or by electing an alternate. The duly elected or appointed alternate shall have voting privileges."

Mrs. Baxter asked how lengthy absences from campus would be handled insofar as Senate representation was concerned.

Dr. Frerer suggested in cases of extended absence (absence from campus during summer, etc.) the department should elect an official alternate. He reiterated the point that if a department sends a substitute that substitute has voting privileges only if he is an official alternate. Should a department elect an official alternate the secretary of Faculty Senate should be advised of the action.

C. College Affairs Committee

Ms. Veed recommended in the form of a motion that a change of schedule be instituted. The motion was to start classes at eight-thirty a.m. and run classes on the half hour.

Ms. Powell seconded the motion.

Dr. Staven pointed out that such a change would bring havoc to the teachers education program unless classroom space could be guaranteed.

Mrs. Popp voiced opposition to the proposed change. She noted that it was necessary to begin classes at 7:30 a.m. in the HPER department to free the faculty members to coach the various sports.

Mr. Ginther stated that while he had been responsible for making the original motion for this in Committee but other factors had come to his attention which made him question the desirability of the time change. He suggested that schedules be left to the discrimination of each department.

Dr. Staven announced that it was his personal feeling that the matter be postponed until Congressional action on the subject of Daylight Savings Time was completed.

Dr. Witten reminded Senate members that fall schedules were in the process of being completed at this time.

Dr. Ginther moved to table action on the subject. Dr. Staven seconded the motion. The motion carried with some opposition.

Ms. Veed distributed copies of the Class Attendance and Records recommendation. Miss Veed explained that the document had come from the Administration and that several changes had been made in committee. She made a motion that the revised statement be approved.

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

Dr. Frerer asked what process was involved in handling semi-excused absences. He requested clarification regarding the lists coming from the Dean's office citing absences of specific students.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out these were not officially excused absences.

Mrs. Pfeifer asked whether being called into the Dean's office would mean the initiation of official withdrawal.

Dr. Parish stated that withdrawal would be handled according to specific withdrawal policy.

Mr. Ginther reminded Senate members that the Senate had yet to act on a motion redefining withdrawal.

Mr. Schardein asked whether or not absences would be interpreted as actual work missed. He specifically asked whether or not this could justify grading on attendance.

Ms. Veed explained that the motion was designed only to allow a Dean to initiate withdrawal.

The motion passed with one Senate member in opposition. The statement will replace the existing statement on page 41 of the Faculty Handbook if approved by the Administration.

Ms. Veed requested Mr. Rupp to explain the Evaluative Criteria for Salary Determination.

Mr. Rupp explained that he and Dr. Forsythe had met with all department chairman on the subject of developing criteria for salary determination. Mr. Rupp noted that the document is a guide which individual departments can use, ignore, or modify.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that the document was simply a recommended guide and that all faculty members should be apprised of that fact.

Miss Veed made the motion that:

"I move that the Senate recommend that each department set guidelines for use for salary determination and that the Senate accept this document as a possible guideline."

Dr. Wall questioned whether or not other factors should receive consideration. Dr. Wall expressed concern that departments were not aware of the document nor the proposal to use it.

Mr. Rupp noted that all department via department chairmen had an opportunity to see the proposed guide for salary determination in October. It was assumed that department chairmen had discussed it with their department members.

Mr. Crissman admitted that poor communication may be the fault but that faculty members were not apprised of this development.

Dr. Frerer expressed reservations about the document. He questioned how a department chairman might use it.

Dr. Smith pointed out that the history department requires faculty members to have on file each semester course syllabi, outlines, etc.

Dr. Staven noted that a department can begin with the three general areas, teaching, research, and service, and modify the criteria to suit the departments best interest. He indicated that by supporting this proposal we are in essence attempting to make evaluation more concrete.

Mr. Ginther noted that it is intended to be used as a guideline and that a department chairman can use it, revise it, etc.

Ms. Veed stated that the intention of the proposal was that evaluation criteria be established by the department members not by the department chairman alone. Departments should meet and decide, not the department chairman alone.

Ms. Veed was requested to reread the motion.

Mrs. Allen suggested that the document might be more appropriately entitled "A Guide for Evaluative Criteria for Salary Determination."

Dr. Staven expressed the hope that the initiative be taken by faculty members before the matter is externally edfined and imposed on faculty members.

Dr. Fillinger pointed out that the faculty at the University of Northern Colorado agreed to award 85% of increase to faculty members on the basis of cost of living. Only monies above that 85% can be awarded on basis of merit.

Dr. Staven noted that under our Board of Regents pay increases can be awarded only on the basis of merit.

Ms. Veed reread the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Frerer asked what action could be taken if a chairman did not use the guideline.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that no action can be taken because it is a recommendation. It is not mandatory on department, but faculty will probably want to determine the criteria for merit salary increases.

After the discussion was over, Dr. Forsythe circulated the Kansas State University's "Proposed Policy Statement on Procedures Used in Determining Merit Salary Increases." This document passed the KSU Faculty Senate. It was distributed for the information of the Senate.

Dr. Forsythe thanked Dr. Wall and Mr. Crissman for bringing the views of their department to the attention of the Senate. The purpose for sending the "Evaluation Criteria" was to get faculty views. Every senator should be doing that.

D. Academic Affairs

Dr. Jack McCullick reported that while there were no new items of business from his committee there were two tabled motions deserving attention.

Dr. McCullick moved to take from the table the matter of internalization of curriculum.

Dr. Frerer seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Dr. McCullick distributed a copy of the original proposal dealing with internalization of curriculum and an amended proposal.

Dr. McCullick moved that the amended proposal be accepted. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Dr. McCullick explained that the amended proposal was a compromise. Dr. Forsythe and Dr. Tomanek drew up the amended proposal.

Dr. Frerer asked what action could be taken to keep the Senate from being slowed down with the additional responsibility of handling curriculum matters.

Dr. McCullick responded by noting under the proposal the subcommittee would take initial action and the entire Senate would be requested to act only on those new courses receiving a favorable recommendation from the subcommittee.

Dr. Ginther requested that the proposal be more definitive of the responsibility of the committee. He suggested the etc. be stricken from the sentence and that it read "Beginning in the fall semester of 1974 all matters relating to curriculum (new course proposals, change of course title or hours of credit) will be approved by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate."

Dr. McCullick accepted the motion by Dr. Ginther as a friendly amendment.

Dr. Staven expressed the desire to have the selection of the three members of the subcommittee approved by the entire Senate.

Dr. McCullick pointed out that the three members would be rotating and that it would consume an undue amount of Senate's time to approve their appointment. Also the Committee composition would change so that there would be expertise on the Committee when classes from each area were submitted.

Dr. Wall asked whether or not Senate action on new courses might delay actual course offerings for a semester.

Dr. Robinson expressed concern about requiring so much time from faculty members.

Dr. McCullick pointed out that two members, Dr. Wall and Dr. Marshall, now serve on the committee dealing with new course proposals and appear to be surviving.

Dr. Staven noted that this may serve the latent function of requiring departments to do some long term planning.

Dr. Drinan noted that the major value of such a move would be in the fact that faculty members would be alerted to wholesale changes in curriculum. He cited the widespread proliferation of courses as being a concern to many.

Mrs. Hoffman suggested that the measure as it reads should not be too time-consuming as there are fewer new courses proposed today than in the past and that the machinery appears to be adequate to handle it.

Dr. Marshall pointed out that short delays may have some merit. He expressed the opinion that panic proliferation of courses was worse. He questioned whether the amended proposal need include in the first sentence the phrase "change of course title or hours of credit."

Mrs. Popp suggested that perhaps the subcommittee could act on matters of approval without sanction from the entire Senate body.

Dr. Staven voiced opposition to this proposal.

Dr. Frerer moved that the phrase "change of course title or hours of credit" be deleted.

Dr. McCullick pointed out that by changing course title one can literally change entire course.

Ms. Veed noted that the amended proposal provided for department appeals. There will be an appeal for course rejection; there has been no such procedure in the past. This is an important improvement.

Dr. McCullick called for the question.

The amended proposal passed.

Dr. McCullick moved the withdrawal policy be taken from the table.

Dr. Frerer seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

Dr. McCullick distributed copies of the withdrawal policy.

Dr. Drinan offered a compromise proposal which read as follows:

"The adviser must give written permission for a withdrawal on the appropriate withdrawal form prior to the written permission of the instructor. Students may withdraw until four weeks prior to the last day of regularly scheduled classes."

Dr. Drinan explained that four weeks prior to the last day of regularly scheduled classes would give the student time to examine mid-term performance and would give instructors ample time to determine which students would be finishing the course.

Mr. Kellerman clarified the point that after the deadline students could not withdraw from specific classes but could complete total withdrawal if so desired.

Dr. Frerer asked whether the amended proposal was not throwing the student on the mercy of two individuals, the instructor and the adviser.

Mr. Schardein voiced his opposition to the amended proposal. He stated that the feeling of Student Senate and his personal feeling was that changing the present policy in force was an unnecessary action.

Mr. Ginther suggested that some consideration should be given to the system of recording WP and WU. This would allow the student to decide what course of action he wished to take but it would also reflect on the transcript.

Dr. Robinson commented that flexibility was desirable and to him it appeared even the amended policy was a return to the days of tighter regulation of students.

Dr. Fillinger pointed out the policy of the various Junior Colleges is to leave transcripts unclouded. He implied that if we are discussing competing with the Junior Colleges in the matter of Associate Arts degrees that perhaps we need to examine Junior College policies regarding withdrawal as well.

Dr. Drinan stated that his amended proposal was an attempt to achieve the balance needed between a rigid system and a wide open system. He pointed out that two or three weeks was in his estimation ample time for a student to evaluate his position in the class.

Mrs. Popp announced that the Department of HPER would see the amended proposal as congruent with their desires on the policy.

Dr. Drinan reread the amendment.

Mr. Kellerman noted that the adviser signature had at one time been required on the withdrawal slip and it was through the action of Faculty Senate that this was deleted.

Mr. Schardein agreed that the adviser system should be strengthened but that moving the deadline for withdrawal ahead was not in the best interests of the student body.

Dr. Frerer asked whether or not an adviser or an instructor could refuse consent.

Ms. Veed replied in the negative.

Dr. Staven asked Mr. Schardein what would be considered by him to be in the students best interest.

Mr. Schardein replied the only change he saw to be beneficial would be to include the signature of the student's adviser.

Dr. Drinan stated that he felt students were "under the gun" psychologically near the end of the semester and many unnecessary withdrawals from class occurred.

Dr. Fillinger noted that under the proposed amendment a student could actually complete his modular class and then withdraw.

Mr. Ginther pointed out that the faculty handbook includes special provisions regarding withdraws from modular classes.

Dr. Frerer asked Mr. Schardein why he saw the extra three weeks as being such an advantage.

Mr. Schardein replied that many times mid-term grades are not indicative of a student's standing in a class and that the extra time would provide the student with a better basis to make the decision.

Dr. Frerer agreed that mid-terms do not reflect actual standing in class as many give blanket mid-term grades and many professors base mid-term grades on only one exam.

Dr. Forsythe recognized a division of the house on the voice vote and called for a vote by show of hands -- eighteen Senate members voted to approve the amendment; eight voted against.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Administration would not have accepted the original amendment. He did not reveal this at a prior time because he did not want to influence voting. It was an issue which needed full discussion, and it was important that all points of view be expressed regardless of how the Administration viewed the proposal.

Dr. Forsythe called for the vote on the amended motion.

Dr. Frerer announced that before voting he felt Faculty Senate should be apprised that Student Senate opposed change of present policy.

Dr. Staven called for a vote on the amended motion. Dr. Forsythe called for a vote and because of a division of the house requested a vote by show of hands. Thirteen members voted in favor of the amendment, twelve against.

Dr. Frerer questioned whether or not members casting a vote were duly elected members.

Dr. Staven noted the seriousness of the issue and Dr. Forsythe pointed out a roll call vote could be requested.

Dr. Robinson moved to have a roll call vote. Dr. Frerer seconded the motion.

Dr. Forsythe declared there was division of the house and called for a show of hands.

Dr. McCullick objected on the basis of the motion having been declared as passed. The chair agreed.

Dr. Staven moved to reconsider the motion and was ruled out of order by Dr. Forsythe as Dr. Staven had voted in the minority.

Dr. Drinan who had cast his vote in favor of the proposed amendment moved to reconsider the motion. Dr. McCullick seconded the motion.

Mr. Ginther asked whether or not the issue might be postponed.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the negative.

Dr. Wall asked if the entire faculty could be polled.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the negative.

Dr. Frerer requested that due to the seriousness of the issue all faculty members cast a ballot.

Mr. Ginther requested a roll call vote which passed. The results were as follows:

Mr. Jack Heather	NO	Ms. Ellen Veed	YES
Dr. Verna Parish	NO	Dr. Jack McCullick	YES
Ms. Ilene Allen	NO	Dr. Maurice Witten	YES
Dr. William Robinson	NO	Mr. Robert Lowen	YES
Dr. Wilda Smith	NO	Dr. Delbert Marshall	YES
Ms. Kathleen Kuchar	NO	Ms. Vivian Baxter	YES
Mr. Robert Brown	NO	Dr. Richard Zakrzewski	YES
Dr. Lloyd Frerer	NO	Dr. George Wall	YES
Dr. Eugene Flenarty	NO	Mr. Robert Crissman	YES
Dr. Robert Adams	NO	Mr. Helmut Schmeller	YES
Ms. Rose Arnhold	NO	Dr. Patrick Drinan	YES
Dr. LaVier Staven	NO	Mrs. Nancy Popp	YES
Mr. Glenn Ginther	NO	Ms. Bettie Powell	YES

To break the tie the Chairman cast his vote. Dr. Forsythe voted NO on the issue. The amended motion failed to pass and the withdrawal policy remains unchanged.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 P.M.