

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

3-5-1974

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 5, 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, March 5, 1974" (1974). *Faculty Senate*. 627.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/627

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: March 5, 1974

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Tuesday, March 5, 1974, at 3:30 P.M. in the Frontier Room of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call:

Members absent: Mr. Jack Heather, Dr. Verna Parish, Dr. William Robinson, Dr. Edith Dobbs, Miss Kathleen Kuchar, Dr. Samuel Hamilton, Dr. Robert Adams, Dr. Arris Johnson

Also present: Mr. Robert Smith for Mr. Marc Campbell, Sidney Johnson for Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Mr. Mike Schardein

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

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

III. Announcements:

Dr. Forsythe opened the meeting by reporting on issues raised at the Administrative Council meeting of February 19. In Administrative Council it was announced that Civil Service employees would not work the Friday afternoon preceeding Easter. The Registrar's Office, the Business Office, etc., will be closed. The Faculty will receive a day of vacation the Monday following Easter.

In Administrative Council it was announced that the mailroom would be open on Saturday mornings to facilitate faculty members who wished to pick up their mail at that time.

Concern was expressed in Administrative Council regarding the possible damage to the floor that might be incurred with the appearance of the Doobie Brothers on March 29.

In Administrative Council it was noted that every department chairman received a memo regarding the number of freshmen who did not return to Fort Hays State Spring semester. Dr. Forsythe cautioned that the statistics be interpreted carefully.

Dr. Forsythe reported on his attendance at the retreat at President Gustad's residence on Thursday, February 27th. Issues discussed by those in attendance, including administrators, faculty and townspeople, were as follows: How to maintain a quality institution, the strategy for planning a smaller college, the idea of retraining faculty members, etc. Dr. Forsythe served on a sub-committee dealing with student concerns.

In Administrative Council on March 5 it was noted that Fort Hays Kansas State College was in error by advertising. Dr. Miller asked whether or not advertising such as advertising Band Camp was permissible. Dr. Forsythe replied that such advertising was considered illegal. Mr. Ginther clarified the issue by noting that any news regarding Fort Hays State was permissible but it is prohibited if it is paid advertising. Dr. Staven noted that the schedule of classes had been published in the Hays Daily News and questioned whether such action was in the range of legality. Mr. Lowen reported that the publication of class schedules is permissible but that the Alumni and the Endowment Associ-

ation cannot pay for advertising for the college. Mr. Lowen expressed some hope that change would occur regarding this ruling.

Mr. Schardein asked whether or not the Athletic Department was also prohibited from advertising, and was informed that the Athletic Department could engage in advertising.

Dr. Forsythe noted that in Administrative Council it was revealed that 63% of the students attending Fort Hays State need financial aid.

Dr. Forsythe reported that in a meeting with President Gustad he had been informed that raises were to be entirely merit-based raises. Ten percent of the allocated funds (assuming passage in the Legislature) are to be given to departments with $\frac{1}{2}\%$ to be retained by the Deans and the remaining $\frac{1}{2}\%$ to be retained by the President. The one percent held back from departments is designated to provide funds for promotion and other uses. Dr. Forsythe noted that with this arrangement department members would not be "paying for" colleague promotions.

Dr. Forsythe stated that President Gustad rejected as sheer rumor the statement that all deans were to be given \$27,000 and all chairmen elevated to \$22,000.

Dr. Forsythe announced that no items of business requiring Senate attention were raised in the Administrative Council meeting held March 5, 1974.

Dr. Forsythe reported that President Gustad had not taken action nor advised the Senate of any intended action regarding issues raised at the January meeting.

Mr. Schardein asked whether or not any action had taken or opinion crystallized regarding the suggestion made earlier about University status.

Dr. Forsythe reported that President Gustad indicated to him that he would support such a move. Also, Dr. Forsythe noted that Emporia and Pittsburg share the belief that such a move would be their only salvation.

Dr. Forsythe clarified one further point regarding scholarship monies. Whereas a faculty member can designate his contribution be retained in a specific department, he may also designate the money be transferred to other departments.

IV. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees:

Dr. Forsythe requested a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Advising. Dr. Robinson was absent but had earlier indicated that a report on advising would be made at the April meeting.

Dr. Forsythe requested a report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Evaluate Pre-Enrollment. Mr. Ginther indicated that this committee had been and intended to continue working closely with the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Advising.

V. Reports of Standing Committees:

A. Student Affairs Committee

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

B. Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

Dr. Frerer was absent. The committee had nothing to report at this time.

C. College Affairs Committee

Ms. Veed reminded Senate members that the College Affairs Committee had distributed for member's consideration an Evaluative Criteria for Faculty Performance and Tenure. She asked for comments regarding the criteria as outlined by the subcommittee on Tenure and Competency.

Dr. Forsythe opened the floor for discussion noting that action was not being sought, only discussion. He announced that a maximum of fifteen minutes would be allotted to discussion of the topic.

Dr. Miller asked the committee to justify the inclusion of off-campus activities in the evaluative criteria.

Dr. Staven explained that many faculty members participate in and serve the Hays community in off-campus non-related activities and that such action adds to the individual's growth and contributes to involvement in the larger community.

Dr. Forsythe asked what the intent was of the statement, "Tenure status should be reviewed every three to five years." Dr. Forsythe pointed out that the phrase "reviewing tenure" contained a contradiction.

Dr. Staven replied that it was the feeling of the committee that as a faculty we should take the initiative and identify areas we are willing to "live with". He openly expressed doubt regarding what Faculty Senate could do regarding review but stated that as faculty members we should be alerted and willing to alert others who are not keeping up with expectations.

Dr. Forsythe suggested that if that is the intention of the committee perhaps rewording the statement to read, "People with tenure should be reviewed," might solve the apparent contradiction. It seemed the intent of the Committee that those with tenure were expected to keep current in their field and that a way needed to be devised to bring short-comings to their attention.

Mr. Rupp suggested that the Evaluative Criteria might be incorporated with the Salary Criteria earlier formulated and that departments could use, modify or ignore both sets of guidelines.

Dr. Forsythe noted the possibility of doing this because both criteria emphasized the same three core areas of teaching, research and service.

Dr. Drinan requested that the phrase "off-campus peer assessment" be clarified.

Dr. Staven reported that the inclusion of this stemmed from the fact that our colleagues at other institutions many times could be of assistance in evaluation. Dr. Staven cited the examples of the individual writing, presenting papers, exhibiting art works, etc., all which might be some means through which off-campus peers could judge competency and ability.

Dr. Miller pointed out that the inclusion of the word final was redundant in the statement, "An assessment of a faculty member's performance should be made each year thereafter until the final sixth year."

Ms. Veed agreed final was redundant.

Dr. Miller stated that in his estimation the inclusion of off-campus, non-related activities in the criteria should be questioned. Dr. Miller suggested that how well one teaches and how well one maintains her/his integrity are of prime concern. He pointed out that many things one does in life are done for the joy of it.

Mr. Crissman pointed out that in some departments off-campus activities might enable one to perform on-campus functions better.

Dr. Miller responded that riding a bike might make one better but the problem is one of evaluation.

Dr. Drinan noted that while he was in basic agreement with Dr. Miller and that while the line between related and non-related activities is thin it would be an error to completely exclude non-related activities.

Mr. Crissman asked whether the individual who actively seeks jobs for students would be engaging in related or unrelated activities.

Dr. Smith suggested such would be an example of directly related activity.

Dr. Forsythe reminded Senate members that even if approved by Faculty Senate use of the evaluative criteria would not be mandatory. This would be suggested criteria for departments to use, modify, or not use as they please.

Ms. Allen asked what was meant by an "unsolicited evaluation."

Dr. Staven explained that an unsolicited evaluation might involve a report of an instructor not attending class, using class time to discuss personal affairs, refusing to fail anyone, etc.

Mr. Schardein asked why solicited opinion and evaluations were not included.

Dr. Staven responded by stating that the committee felt comments of graduates would give a better picture than on-campus students.

Mr. Schardein remarked that he felt evaluative criteria should rightfully include both graduates' perceptions and on-campus evaluation.

Dr. Staven agreed that inclusion of both might present a stronger picture.

Dr. Forsythe said that effective evaluation by a student might not be until 5 or 10 years after the student took an individual professor.

D. Academic Affairs

Dr. McCullick stated that the committee had nothing to report.

VI. Unfinished Business:

There was no unfinished business.

VII. New Business

Mr. Crissman brought to the attention of Faculty Senate the fact that the Trading Post Book Store, intended to serve the student, allowed faculty members a 10% discount on items purchased. While this might be considered a fringe benefit by some, Mr. Crissman voiced his objection to the practice because in principle it operates to discriminate against the student.

Mr. Crissman also reported that some individuals do not have to pay for meals in the Memorial Union. He noted that in cases brought to his attention individuals, their friends, and their wives were exempt from paying. Whereas some of the individuals who eat without paying have contracts with CMI others enjoying this "benefit" do not have such contracts. In Mr. Crissman's view both particular practices are wrong in principle.

Dr. Forsythe asked Senate members for observations and/or reactions. There were none cited.

Mr. Schardein reported that while he was familiar with the 10% faculty discount on items purchased from the book store he was not aware of the second practice. He suggested that both matters be brought before the Union Board scheduled to meet at 4:30.

Dr. Forsythe requested Mr. Schardein to bring up the issues and deliver a report back to Faculty Senate.

Dr. Marshall reported that he had read an advertisement regarding the purchase of research papers on the bulletin board at Albertson Hall. Dr. Marshall suggested the Senate respond to this matter.

Dr. Forsythe noted that this had been discussed at Kansas State University.

Dr. Marshall moved that the Faculty Senate condemn this particular practice since it constituted an open invitation to engage in plagiarism.

Dr. Miller seconded the motion.

Mr. Schardein asked whether the advertisement had appeared on a Union bulletin board. Dr. Marshall reiterated the notice was found in Albertson Hall.

The motion passed with one person in opposition.

Dr. Forsythe announced that Mr. Kellerman, Registrar, had informed him that the new catalog stated a student must complete at least 124 hours of credit to graduate from Fort Hays Kansas State College. This was in relation to the note at the February meeting of the discrepancy. Since the minimum requirement has been stated in several ways but was 124 hours, the Senate should act on this.

Dr. McCullick moved that 124 hours be considered the minimum number of hours required for graduation.

Dr. Smith seconded the motion.

Mr. Ginther asked if this meant the individual entering college with two hours of physical education credit from the military would need to complete 122 hours but if the entering student was disabled he would be required to complete 124 hours for graduation.

Dr. Forsythe answered yes.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Dr. Drinan moved to adjourn. Dr. Miller seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 P.M.