

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

7-23-1974

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, July 23, 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, July 23, 1974" (1974). *Faculty Senate*. 632.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/632

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: Ms. Rose Arnhold, Secretary,
Faculty Senate
RE: Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes
DATE: July 23, 1974

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Tuesday, July 23, 1974, at 3:30 P.M. in the Smoky Hill Room of the Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call

Members Absent: Mr. Jack Heather, Mr. Marc Campbell, Dr. Samuel Hamilton, Dr. Verna Parish, Ms. Kathleen Kuchar, Dr. Wallace Harris, Ms. Ilene Allen, Ms. Alice McFarland, Mr. Glen Lojka

Also Present: Dr. William Daly for Dr. Dobbs, Dr. Norma Herman for Dr. Eugene Fleharty, Mr. Charles Votan for Ms. Vivian Baxter, Dr. Edward Stehno for Dr. LaVier Staven, Dr. Forrest Price

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

Dr. Forsythe announced that there were two corrections to the June 24, 1974, Senate Meeting Minutes.

The first correction was received from Mr. Jim Kellerman, Registrar, asking that the report on page 8, paragraph 7 be corrected to read Applications for Admission rather than Pre-Enrollment Figures.

The second correction was received from Ms. Ilene Allen, Department of Nursing, asking that the last sentence on page 14 be corrected to read "Ms. Allen pointed out that such guidelines could have been helpful to the difficulty experienced by the Faculty of Nursing" instead of "Ms. Allen pointed out that if such guidelines had been provided that the difficulty in Nursing could have been avoided."

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

III. Announcements

Dr. Forsythe announced that Dr. Tomanek has notified all department Chairmen that certain guidelines were to be followed when filling a position. The three guidelines are as follows: 1) All jobs must have well-defined descriptions, 2) all positions must be nationally advertised and there will be a statement that Fort Hays State is an equal opportunity employer and 3) a list of all persons considered, contacted, and/or interviewed must be kept.

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had appointed Mr. Glen Ginther and Ms. Rose Arnhold to serve on the Reduction in Personnel Committee.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate met with President Gustad on July 15, 1974. Dr. Forsythe announced that the President had approved the Senate's proposal to internalize the curriculum in Faculty Senate. The changes in the original proposal are as follows:

- 1) The committee will be comprised of six members instead of five; four members will be selected from outside the Senate.
- 2) These four committee members will serve staggered terms of office.
- 3) Outside expertise will be sought when program changes are being considered.
- 4) Department Chairmen will have to submit program changes by Spring so the committee can take action by Fall. The concern with speed is necessitated by the fact that Dr. Tomanek will have to take suggested programs to COCAO in late Fall.

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had appointed members to serve on an Ad Hoc Committee to Consider an Urban and Foreign Semester. A copy of the appointments reads as follows.

TO: Ad Hoc Committee to Consider an Urban and Foreign Semester
FROM: James L. Forsythe, Chairman, Faculty Senate
DATE: July 15, 1974

The following individuals are hereby appointed to the Ad Hoc Committee to Consider an Urban and Foreign Semester:

Chairman: Dr. Richard J. Zakrzewski, Assistant Professor of Geology
Mr. Bill D. Rickman, Assistant Professor of Economics
Mr. R. Scott Brooks, Assistant Professor of Political Science
Ms. Rose Brungardt, Instructor of Nursing
Dr. Harold Choguill, Professor of Chemistry
Dr. Stephen G. Tramel, Assistant Professor of Philosophy
Ms. Jean Stouffer, Associate Professor of Education; Associate Dean of Students
Ms. Rachel Christopher, Associate Professor of Library Science; Reference Librarian
Dr. Raymond E. Youmans, Professor of Education
Ms. Jean Meis, Instructor of Nursing
A student to be appointed by the Chairman of the Student Senate

If you are unable to serve, please let me know. The committee will select its own secretary.

The committee should have an orientation meeting this month. Several members may not be available until the fall semester, so your work cannot start until then.

The advantages of a semester or a year on another campus or in a foreign country were discussed at a recent Council of Deans meeting. It was brought out that many colleges have such an arrangement, and apparently Fort Hays State has had some type of a program similar to this in the past. Some colleges have arrangements whereby tuition rates are the same at both colleges, thus allowing a Fort Hays State student to attend another college for the same tuition and dorm costs. Perhaps there are urban or foreign universities that are willing to enter into an arrangement with Fort Hays. Perhaps faculty could be exchanged for a semester or a year. It was mentioned in the COD meeting that Washburn University has an exchange program.

The Ad Hoc Committee is to explore the advantages and disadvantages of an urban or foreign semester and report the findings to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate. It will probably take about a semester to collect all the information that you need. You are also to determine the types of programs which are available and which might be feasible for Fort Hays State. You are to consider programs for students, but you should investigate faculty opportunities as time permits.

Your report will be submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee by the Chairman of the Faculty Senate for formulation of a policy statement to be recommended to the President.

Please send copies of the committee minutes to the Chairman of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the report compiled by the Ad Hoc Committee on Advising had been sent to the Deans. They are to distribute the report to department Chairmen. Dr. Forsythe noted that the report is being discussed and a reply can be expected in September. He stated that several items were questioned not in theory but in implementation. For instance, faculty loads are heavy, and faculty cannot be expected to schedule a week or a semester as they have many other things to do.

Dr. Forsythe distributed a report from Ms. Kay Gilmore, Office of the Registrar, which indicates that applications for Admission are running higher this year than they were last year at the same time.

	Freshmen	Transfers	TOTAL
July 18, 1971	1,056	341	1,397
July 18, 1972	1,035	348	1,383
July 18, 1973	936	352	1,288
July 19, 1974	1,124	404	1,528

Dr. Forsythe distributed two additional items for Faculty Senate members' information. They are as follows:

FRESHMAN/JUNIOR COLLEGE ENROLLMENT INFORMATION

FRESHMAN

Fall 1972			Fall 1973		
Enrolled	873	72.39%	Enrolled	792	71.11%
Did not Enroll	333	27.61%	Did not Enroll	322	28.89%
Applications	1206		Applications	1114	

JUNIOR COLLEGE

Fall 1972			Fall 1973		
Enrolled*	445	75.94%	Enrolled*	450	77.59%
Did not Enroll	141	24.06%	Did not Enroll	130	22.41%
Applications	586		Applications	580	
*9.20% of the total enrollment			*9.78% of the total enrollment		

ONE YEAR JUNIOR COLLEGE ENROLLMENT

Fall 1973

Enrolled	450	77.59%
Did not Enroll	130	22.41%
Applications	580	

Spring 1974

Enrolled	174	79.45%
Did not Enroll	45	20.55%
Applications	219	

FRESHMAN ENROLLMENT, 1952-1973*

Fall	Freshman					Total Enrollment					Freshman as % of Total
	Male	%	Female	%	Total	Male	%	Female	%	Total	
1952	221	59.09	153	40.91	374	634	57.01	478	42.99	1112	33.63
1953	309	61.43	194	38.57	503	710	54.62	590	45.38	1300	38.69
1954	357	62.20	217	37.80	574	967	57.19	724	42.81	1691	33.94
1955	418	60.40	274	39.60	692	1230	59.08	852	40.92	2082	33.24
1956	452	61.00	289	39.00	741	1455	61.39	915	38.61	2370	31.27
1957	409	62.63	244	37.37	653	1472	62.69	876	37.31	2348	27.81
1958	436	57.44	323	42.56	759	1520	59.24	1046	40.76	2566	29.58
1959	500	59.45	341	40.55	841	1648	58.73	1158	41.27	2806	29.97
1960	512	60.38	336	39.63	848	1722	59.63	1166	40.37	2888	29.36
1961	647	60.92	415	39.08	1062	1965	60.11	1304	39.89	3269	32.49
1962	691	60.35	454	39.65	1145	2188	61.29	1382	38.71	3570	32.07
1963	674	57.46	499	42.54	1173	2363	60.76	1526	39.24	3889	30.16
1964	749	57.84	546	42.16	1295	2538	61.25	1606	38.75	4144	31.25
1965	904	54.99	740	45.01	1644	2871	60.04	1911	39.96	4782	34.38
1966	842	54.85	693	45.15	1535	2885	60.04	1920	39.96	4805	31.95
1967	798	52.60	719	47.40	1517	2962	57.83	2160	42.17	5122	29.62
1968	804	51.57	755	48.43	1559	3112	57.01	2347	42.99	5459	28.56
1969	797	53.13	703	46.87	1500	3139	56.30	2436	43.70	5575	26.91
1970	720	51.47	679	48.53	1399	3006	55.24	2436	44.76	5442	25.71
1971	540	46.96	610	53.04	1150	2938	56.00	2308	44.00	5246	21.92
1972	533	48.85	558	51.15	1091	2695	55.70	2143	44.30	4838	22.55
1973	629	48.13	678	51.87	1307	2436	52.92	2167	47.07	4603	28.39

*The information for 1952-1971 was taken from the catalog. The information for 1972-1973 was provided by the Registrar's Office.

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had sent a letter to Dr. Tomanek concerning grievance procedures. He asked if there were questions regarding this matter. There were no questions. The letter is as follows:

Dr. Gerald Tomanek
Vice-President for Academic Affairs
Fort Hays Kansas State College
Hays, Kansas 67601

July 9, 1974

Dear Dr. Tomanek:

We have discussed recently what the implications are of a grievance procedure, and we have also discussed promotions, merit salary increases, and appointments. The following represents my reflections on this.

There are four areas from which the administration should expect the greatest number of grievances: merit salary increases, promotion, continuation in the tenure track (reappointment), and working conditions. In the first three instances, the primary responsibility for recommendations lies with the department chairperson. The appropriate deans react to the recommendations, and the president makes the ultimate decision. In the fourth instance, it seems to me that the individual department is and should be quite autonomous in determining working conditions except in instances such as where the president might be apprised of reduced loads or some similar situation.

If the above is correct, then each department chairperson must work closely and fairly with all assigned faculty to prevent grievances. As for salaries, there should be established departmental criteria for merit increases. Each faculty member should be apprised before salary recommendations are made of that person's strengths and weaknesses during the year and whether there will be no increase or certain levels of merit increase recommended. This does not mean that the chairperson will state a given percentage. It will only mean that the chairperson is telling the faculty member that his or her work is worthy of a recommendation for a merit salary increase. This procedure will give the faculty member a chance to react to negative information or to provide additional information that will affect the evaluation. If the faculty member still believes that inadequate consideration was given by the department chairperson, or if the person believes that the chairperson was arbitrary or was discriminatory in applying established criteria, the faculty member could then present his or her case to the appropriate dean before the departmental recommendation was made. This way, the dean could visit with the department chairperson when recommendations are presented to the dean to make sure that adequate consideration was given to the faculty member. The faculty member should also be allowed to visit with the president if he or she believes that there was inadequate consideration or if the decisions were arbitrary or discriminatory.

This does not mean that the dean or the president will make a decision for or against the faculty member at that time. It does mean that the dean and the president are aware of all aspects of the situation and that they will make sure that adequate consideration will be given to the recommended merit salary increase or the lack of a recommended increase.

It is imperative that these procedures be accomplished before the actual merit salary recommendations are made by the department chairperson. Once merit increases are allocated to departments by the deans and the increases are approved at each level and are made a part of the budget and are submitted to the Board of Regents, it is too late to make sufficient adjustment.

It is also imperative that each faculty member apprise the department chairperson of all activities or other information that will affect the merit salary recommendations. If a faculty member decides in May or June that there is more information which will help his or her case, that is too late.

It should also be pointed out that when there is a grievance, it is the responsibility of the aggrieved faculty member to prove his or her case. A grievance is far different than a case of dismissal or suspension where the burden of proof is on the administration.

Dr. Tomanek - Page 2

It also seems to me that it is grossly unfair for department chairpersons to tell some faculty members the specific recommendations for a merit salary increase. For instance, the department chairperson of a given department has all salaries determined. Faculty member number one is told that he or she is recommended for a ten percent increase. Faculty members two through ten present evidence, such as the publication of a book, high student evaluations, or commendations from colleagues. Now the department chairperson believes that faculty members two through ten deserve larger increases. What does the chairperson now do about faculty member number one? When faculty member number one receives notice from the president of a lower increase, who is blamed for the change?

It is the responsibility of the president of the college to make the final recommendation to the Board of Regents, so it should be the president who notifies the faculty member what salary increase is recommended to the Board of Regents. It also seems to me that except in unusual cases, the president should accept the recommendations made by the department chairpersons with whatever adjustments have to be made in consultation with the deans.

The considerations mentioned above regarding merit salary increases also apply to promotion, continuation in the tenure track, and other similar situations. In each instance, the faculty member must be protected against inadequate consideration or arbitrary and/or discriminatory application of existing criteria. The absence of criteria by which one can be judged leaves a department chairperson open to any or all of these things which a faculty member must be protected against. It also places a dean in an uncomfortable position when there is no criteria.

There is also the possibility that a faculty member might charge that there was a breach of a commitment about salaries, promotion, or tenure made when employed or that there is a misinterpretation or a misapplication of some commitment in these areas. It is more likely that grievances relating to a breach of a commitment or a misinterpretation or misapplication of a commitment will occur in matters relating to conditions of employment.

There are general conditions of employment that are college-wide, such as one must meet classes when scheduled, the final examination period shall be used for some useful purpose, and library books may be checked out for faculty use. Each department has its own unique problems and situations which cause each department to have its own rules which go beyond college rules. For instance, a department may decide to rotate night and/or Saturday classes. Another department may decide that faculty should take an occasional summer to rest, to research, or to travel so as to improve course offerings. Another department may release a person from part of a teaching load so the person can research, write, handle all departmental advisees, or some similar situation.

It is these departmental rules which must be explained to all new faculty so that they will know the terms of their employment. In some instances, college rules and regulations may need to be explained. Permanent faculty may also need to be reminded occasionally. It is unfair to the faculty member to be told at the end of say the fourth year that he or she has been violating a departmental rule adopted in 1927.

I hope that this does not sound too harsh on department chairpersons, but it is at the department level that most decisions are made.

James L. Forsythe, Chairman, Faculty Senate

Dr. Forsythe asked if there were questions regarding the report he had earlier distributed regarding Teaching Extension Courses for Inconvenience pay. The report reads as follows:

TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Dr. James L. Forsythe, Chairman, Faculty Senate
SUBJECT: Teaching Extension Courses for Inconvenience Pay

DATE: July 9, 1974

The administration is urging departments to offer extension courses during the 1974-75 school year that can be counted in the Base, especially during the fall semester of 1974. If these courses are taught for inconvenience pay and not for the regular extension rate of pay, the hours generated can be counted for EFT. For instance, in the fall of 1973, there were 18 classes which generated 895 credit hours. If those hours had been counted in the base, they would have generated 2.98 faculty positions.

The key to counting extension course credit hours is whether the faculty member receives inconvenience pay (hours can be counted) or regular extension course pay (hours cannot be counted). Under the administration's proposal, it will still be up to the individual faculty member to select voluntarily to take inconvenience pay or to select to take regular extension course pay if a faculty member decides to offer an extension course.

I have discussed this several times with Vice-President Gerald Tomanek, a discussion of the proposal appeared in the February 11, 1974 Faculty Senate minutes, a meeting was held with department chairpersons last year, the proposal was discussed at a Council of Deans meeting, and it was discussed again at a meeting with department chairpersons on July 2, 1974. The following is a summary of the July 2 meeting.

The Continuing Education Officer of the Board of Regents has given permission to experiment with extension courses this coming school year. As a result of this decision, the administration at Fort Hays State proposed at the July 2 meeting the following schedule of inconvenience pay based on mileage:

Miles	Per Trip	Average Number of Trips	Inconvenience* Pay
0-49	\$20	15	\$300
50-99	\$30	15	\$450
100-149	\$40	15	\$600
150-199	\$50	15	\$750

*If the class was for one hour of credit, the rate would be one-third of the schedule; if the class was for two hours of credit, the rate would be two-thirds of the schedule. A school car would be furnished.

The money to fund this schedule would come from the continuing education fees. A \$10 per credit hour incidental fee will be taken from each enrollment fee. This will leave \$6 per undergraduate hour and \$12 per graduate hour as a residue. These fees form the residue from which inconvenience pay will be taken. Also, part of Mr. Ralph Huffman's Field Service Office expenses must come from this residue. The deficiency will come from the operating budgets.

There will be a general rule that a class must have 15 students in it. If there are between 10 and 15 students, the administration will look at the course to see if

Teaching Extension Courses for Inconvenience Pay - Page 2

it should be taught. If a class has fewer than 10 students, it will need extreme justification before it can be taught.

A total of 65 classes (6 in the summer of 1973; 18 in the fall of 1973; and 41 in the spring of 1974) generated 2999 credit hours during the 1973-1974 year. The fall classes enrolled an average of 19.3 students. The average class size for the year was 20.4 students.

The administration is not defining load or overload; anyone teaching an extension course can draw inconvenience pay. The average load at Fort Hays State is 12.8 hours. Some faculty have reduced loads for various reasons, so there is no set number of hours which is considered normal.

The question was raised about fees such as for the HPER building and the Memorial Union if the extension course credit hours are counted in the base. If these bond payments are based on the student count at Fort Hays, then must the extension students pay the extra fees, or will that money come from departmental operating budgets? The administration will check on this. (We do not have to pay these fees on hours generated by continuing education.)

The issue was raised about new positions generated if the program is a success and campus enrollment also stabilizes, or the reallocation of faculty positions if the program was a success but on-campus enrollment declined. For instance, if enrollment was stable and if a department generated 300 extra credit hours, would that department get a new faculty position? The answer was yes, but the administration hoped that that department would use that position for continuing education. If a department generated 100 credit hours, that would be equivalent to .33 faculty positions, and the administration hopes that that part of a position would be used for continuing education.

The administration hopes that all extra positions that are generated (assuming stable campus enrollment) will be used to expand continuing education. For instance, if the 895 hours of extension in the fall of 1973 had been counted, the administration would have wanted to use the 2.98 positions for continuing education.

But then there is the question of what if campus enrollment declines and extension enrollment takes up the slack so that the fall enrollment in 1974 is the same as for 1973. In other words, assume that the fall 1974 enrollment is down 1000 credit hours and that 1000 credit hours is generated by extension courses. Assume that one department generates 900 credit hours, or 3 faculty positions. This would call for a reallocation of faculty positions across the campus. Which three departments would now lose one additional faculty member to the department which generated the 100 credit hours. The administration will have to consider this as the college cannot afford to destroy programs to enlarge one department. Also, each department is dependent upon the other departments if there are viable programs.

The issue was raised concerning inconvenience pay for mini-courses as they are also above the normal load. The answer was no. There is no way to generate sufficient funds to pay for mini-courses. Faculty voluntarily offer mini-courses to help their department.

The question was also asked about counting adjunct professors in the base. If a consultant or a teacher who is supervised by a Fort Hays State faculty teaches a course, and if they share the pay, then the hours generated can count as credit in

Teaching Extension Courses for Inconvenience Pay - Page 3

the base. The supervising faculty member must be at the class meetings one-third of the time and is responsible for the course content, the final examination, and the course grade.

A question was raised about summer school enrollment. Would an expanded extension course offering adversely affect summer school enrollment? Field Service said that the apprehension was correct. The more extension courses offered, the fewer people who have to attend summer school. It does not always follow that summer school will be adversely affected, but there is that tendency. It was also pointed out that extension courses could help summer enrollment as individuals who take extension courses might want to work on a degree and might take summer classes.

There was discussion about the proximity of extension classes. There must not be competition between classes in a town or nearby towns or in community areas. This will have to be carefully monitored.

The question was asked about reasonable expectations for the fall semester. Field Service acknowledged that it is hard to get a school to sponsor an extension class in the fall because there are so many activities. They prefer more spring classes. Public school teachers have more time in the spring. This means that the individual faculty member must go out and sell his or her course. It will have to be a hard sell if classes are to make, and the faculty member must do the selling.

There was discussion of teaching classes to high school seniors. There are 18 junior colleges which do it. Field Service pointed out that high school seniors tend to go to the school where they took their freshman class or classes. It was also pointed out that a person needs only 124 hours to graduate from Fort Hays State and that if a high school senior does come to FHS after taking a freshman course, the student will take three less hours on campus. The other side of the argument is that if the student does not go to college or goes elsewhere, FHS has picked up the additional three hours.

Some of the department chairpersons were concerned that they would have to tell individuals who had received \$600 or \$750 for an extension course during the 1973-1974 year that now they can only receive \$300. It seemed that it would be very hard to sell to a faculty to give up voluntarily \$300-\$450.

It was again pointed out that the program was voluntary. A faculty member could take the full extension pay of \$750 for a three hour graduate course or could volunteer only for inconvenience pay. It is up to the faculty member.

The deadline for submitting extension courses for inconvenience pay is about August 1. However, that is not a set deadline as school systems ask for courses at various times during the year. The courses must be started before the 20th class day if they are to count in the base.

The issue of faculty time was brought up in the discussion. Faculty are asked to teach a mini-course on campus and a three hour extension course off campus. This amounts to a four hour overload. How much time can a faculty member give to these extra courses and still do an effective job of teaching on campus where the greater number of credit hours is generated?

The question was asked about the rate of pay for the spring and summer extension courses. There was apparently no firm decision on this, but it was pointed out that

Teaching Extension Courses for Inconvenience Pay - Page 4

if a faculty member receives inconvenience pay in the spring or summer, the credit hours can count in the base. However, only the fall semester credit hours help.

A question was raised about extra pay for a faculty member if there were more than 15 students in the class. Should faculty receive more pay for a heavier load? It was brought out that there really must be about 20 students in a class to make it pay. If there are only 15, then money must come from the operating budget to meet the inconvenience pay needs. It would be impossible to pay faculty an extra increment if a class enrolled 30 or more students. As it is, there may not be enough money generated and some inconvenience pay may have to come from the general fund.

General discussion followed. The department chairpersons seemed to view the proposed inconvenience pay schedule as too low. It seemed that the department chairpersons were of one accord that their faculty members would not teach for the level of pay that was proposed by the administration. Out of the general discussion came a proposal that the following would be more realistic and that more faculty might be interested in volunteering to forgo the regular extension pay rate to receive the inconvenience pay so credit hours could be counted in the Base. This schedule was proposed: 0-100 miles \$450; 100 plus miles \$600. This schedule would be based on the course, not only on trips or small mileage increments. A person might offer a class in 10 meetings rather than 15 in order to conserve gas. The pay would be for the course. Also, the pay would be for hours of credit, such as \$150 for a one hour course within 100 miles of Fort Hays. This schedule of inconvenience pay which the department chairpersons argued for would be discussed with the Vice-President for Administration and Finance.

The meeting was adjourned.

Vice-President Tomanek circulated a memo on July 3, 1974 to all deans, department chairpersons, and other administrators. The schedule that the administration agreed to after the meeting with the department chairpersons is as follows:

INCONVENIENCE PAY SCALE

Mileage	1 Cr. Hr.	2 Cr. Hr.	3 Cr. Hr.
0-100	\$150	\$300	\$450
100	\$200	\$400	\$600

The individual faculty members have the choice of volunteering for inconvenience pay at the above rate and having the credit count in the Base and thus possibly save some faculty positions or possibly build up positions for other programs, or they can take the regular extension pay and the credit hours taught will not count in the base. Faculty also have the right not to teach any extension courses if they so choose. The entire program is voluntary this year, but the fall semester of 1974 is critical as the rules are relaxed for some experimentation.

The following tables and information are added to this memo for your information.

Table I -- Extension Enrollment by Semester and Term, 1973-1974

Date	Classes*	Students	Percentage of Enrollment
Summer 1973	6	126	9.5
Fall 1973	19	358	27.0
Spring 1974	40	842	63.5
	<u>65</u>	<u>1326</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE II -- Hours Generated in Extension Enrollment, 1973-1974, Translated to Faculty Positions

Date	Hours	Percentage of Total Hours	Classes	Faculty Positions
Summer 1973	208	6.9	6	.69
Fall 1973	895	29.8	18	2.98
Spring 1974	1896	63.2	40	6.32
	<u>2999</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>65*</u>	<u>9.99**</u>

*There was a class in December, 1974, with 15 students that is to be included either in the Fall or Spring enrollment to give the total of 65 classes.

**Based on 300 credit hours per faculty position. The 9.99 faculty positions is hypothetical as only the fall enrollment is counted for the allocation of faculty positions. This column indicates the potential if this many hours could have been generated and counted in the Base.

TABLE III -- Hours Taught by Department and Translated to Faculty Positions, Fall Semester, 1973

Department	Classes	Students	Percentage of Total Students	Hours Generated	Percentage of Total Hours	Faculty Positions
Art	2	20	5.59	60	6.7	.20*
Biology	1	10	2.80	30	3.3	.10
Education	12	239	66.76	581	65.1	1.94
Library Science	2	32	8.94	81	9.1	.27*
Sociology	1	18	5.03	54	6.0	.18
Speech	<u>1</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>10.89</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>9.7</u>	<u>.29</u>
	19	358		893	99.9	2.98

*Taught by non-FHS faculty.

TABLE IV -- Classes Taught by Reporting Area, 1973-1974

Reporting Area	Classes	No. of Students	Percentage of Total Students
Biology	4	31	2.3
Business	4	72	5.4
Education	40	783	59.0
Fine and Applied Arts	3*	24	1.8
Letters	2	59	4.4
Library Science	4**	71	5.4
Psychology	3	114	8.6
Social Science	<u>5</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>13.0</u>
	65	1326	99.9

(972 graduates;
354 undergraduates)

*Classes taught by non-FHS faculty

**Classes taught by non-FHS faculty in Hutchinson and Colby

TABLE V -- EXTENSION CLASSES July 1, 1973 to June 30, 1974

-12-

Summer 1973						
Dept.	Class	Place	Date	Instructor	No. of Students	Hours
Educ.	Individualized Instruction, 383	Conway Springs	Aug. 6-24, 1973	E. Stehno	32	3G
Educ.	Workshop - Human Relations, 340	Rock Springs	Aug. 17-19, 1973	E. Stehno	53	1G
Educ.	Seminar - Creative Writing for Elem. Teachers, 383	Great Bend	Jul. 2-20, 1973	E. Dobbs	6	3G
Educ.	Seminar - Reading Inst., 875	Salina	Aug. 30 - Dec. 20, 1973	R. Jennings	14	3G
Educ.	Prob. of Elem. Art, 200	Great Bend	Jul. 2-20, 1973	C. Calnan	13	3B*
Educ.	Seminar in Teaching Children with Reading Diff., 383	Great Bend	Jul. 9-20, 1973	J. Huber	8	3B
Fall 1973						
Educ.	Seminar - Individual Instruction, 675/875	Belleville	Sept. 1 - Nov. 24, 1973	E. Stehno	32	3B
Educ.	Seminar - Child Development & Language Art, 765	Scott City	Sept. 4 - Dec. 18, 1973	G. Nichols	18	3B
Educ.	Institute - Teaching Metric System, 571	Winona	Sept. 5 - Oct. 3, 1973	L. Fillinger	16	1B
Speech	Norm. & Path. Develop. of Speech in Children & Adults, 560	Oakley	Sept. 5 - Dec. 19, 1973	C. Wilhelm	39	3B
Educ.	Seminar - Curr. Dev. in Social Studies, 875	Sylvan Grove	Sept. 5 - Dec. 19, 1973	R. Baker	20	3G
Lib. Sci.	Books and Society, 254	Hutchinson	Sept. 5 - Nov. 12, 1973	E. Hollingsworth	15	2U*
Lib. Sci.	Classification & Cataloging, 256	Colby	Sept. 5 - Nov. 14, 1973	D. Jones	17	3U*
Educ.	Advanced Educational Adm., 951	Colby	Sept. 5 - Dec. 19, 1973	L. Staven	20	3G
Educ.	Curriculum for Mentally Retrd., 645	McPherson	Sept. 6 - Dec. 20, 1973	M. Claflin	9	

TABLE V (cont'd)

-13-

Educ.	School Community Relations, 856	Pratt	Sept. 6 - Dec. 20, 1973	W. Robinson	15	
Art	Fund. of Appr. of Art, 180	Logan	Sept. 6 - Dec. 20, 1973	Jane Braden	7	3U*
Educ.	Instructional Media Workshop, 870	Hanston	Sept. 27 - Dec. 6, 1973	R. Youmans	25	2G
Art	Painting, Ceramics, 222/260	Plainville	Sept. 10 - Dec. 20, 1973	G. Doerfler	13	3U*
Educ.	School Law and Related Problems	Logan	Sept. 11 - Dec. 18, 1973	Harbin, Slechta Staven & Wood	7	3G
Biol.	Can Man Survive? 521	Logan	Sept. 10 - Dec. 20, 1973	Hulett, Fleharty	10	3B
Educ.	Seminar - School Law & Related Prob., 875	Great Bend	Sept. 13 - Dec. 20, 1973	C. Harbin	19	3G
Educ.	Seminar, Micro Counseling, 875	Great Bend	Sept. 11 - Oct. 9, 1973	Bloss, Stansbury	47	1G
Educ.	Seminar - Human Relations, 675/875	Rock Springs	Dec. 28 - Dec. 29, 1973	E. Stehno	11	1B
Soc.	Soc. Welfare as a Social Institution, 248	Hays	Sept. 15 - Dec. 22, 1973	M. Weber	18	3U
Spring 1974						
Psy.	Seminar - Behavior Modification for Teachers, 610	Hill City	Jan. 2 - Mar. 20, 1974	R. Slonaker	50	1-3B
Educ.	Seminar - Human Relations in Classroom, 675/875	Dodge City	Feb. 1-3, 1974	E. Stehno	13	1B
Educ.	Seminar - School Law & Related Prob., 875	Smith Center	Jan. 16 - May 8, 1974	C. Harbin	18	3G
Educ.	Seminar - Human Relations, 675/875	Belleville	Feb. 6 - May 14, 1974	E. Stehno	29	3B
Educ.	Learning Disorders, 743	Colby	Jan. 16 - May 8, 1974	E. Morrison	19	3G
Biol.	Can Man Survive? 521	Hays	Jan. 9 - May 1, 1974	Hulett, Fleharty	20	3B

TABLE V (cont'd)

Soc.	Topics in Soc.: Social Work, as Prof., 248	Hays	Jan. 19 - May 11, 1974	M. Weber	17	3U
Educ.	Institute: Teaching Metric System, 571	Ness City	Apr. 13 - May 2, 1974	L. Fillinger	21	1B
Educ.	Seminar - Corrective & Remed. Reading, 875	Colby	Jan. 14 - May 6, 1974	R. Jennings	16	3G
Hist.	Europe Since 1914, 629	Hill City	Jan. 21 - May 13, 1974	H. Schmeller	10	3B
Soc.	Readings in Soc. - Perspectives on Population, 672	Ellsworth	Jan. 17 - May 9, 1974	R. Fundis	20	3B
Bus.	Commercial Banking, 542	Hays	Jan. 21 - May 13, 1974	Daghestani	14	3B
Educ.	Seminar - Person. Proced. & Oper. Process, 875/975	Colby	Jan. 17 - May 9, 1974	L. Staven	20	3G
Bus.	Gen. Prin. of Insurance, 345	Hays	Jan. 16 - May 1, 1974	D. Heeter	18	3U
Educ.	Institute - Teaching the Metric System, 571	Oakley	Jan. 14 - Feb. 11, 1974	L. Fillinger	27	1B
Educ.	Seminar - Positive Social Intervention in American Classroom, 675/875	Hugoton	Jan. 7 - Mar. 2, 1974	E. Stehno	33	2B
Educ.	Individ. Instruct., 875	Rock Springs	Mar. 12-13, 1974	E. Stehno & Staff	44	1B
Lib. Sci.	Library Management, 257	Hutchinson	Jan. 14 - Mar. 25, 1974	E. Hollingsworth	15	2U
Educ.	Institute - Teaching the Metric System, 571	Great Bend	Feb. 20 - Mar. 27, 1974	L. Fillinger	32	1B
Hist.	The Indian in American Hist., 548	Salina	Jan. 17 - May 13, 1974	L. Oliva	9	3B
Educ.	Seminar - Curriculum Development in Social Studies, 675/875	Hanston	Jan. 16 - May 8, 1974	R. Baker	15	3B
Psy.	Seminar - Beh. Mod. for Teachers, 610	Russell	Jan. 21 - May 13, 1974	R. Slonaker	32	3B
Speech	Norm. & Path. Dev. of Speech & Lang. in Children & Adults, 560	Russell	Jan. 16, - May 8, 1974	C. Wilhelm	18	

TABLE V (cont'd)

-15-

Educ.	Seminar - Strategies in Teach Modern Elem. Sci., 675/875	Ulysses	Jan. 21 - May 6, 1974	W. Claflin	20	3b
Educ.	Learning Disorders, 743	Salina	Jan. 23 - May 15, 1974	M. Claflin	16	3G
Psy.	General Psychology, 100	Russell	Jan. 21 - May 13, 1974	R. Adams	23	3U
Bus.	Accounting Principals II, 112	Hays	Jan. 17 - May 16, 1974	C. Wilhelm	18	3B
Educ.	Seminar - Valuing & Goal Setting in the Classroom, 675/875	Hugoton	Mar. 4 - May 6, 1974	I. Werner	11	3U*
Educ.	Workshop - Spec. Educ., 870	Hays	May 1-2, 1974	E. Morrison	41	1G
Art	Painting & Ceramics, 520	Plainville	Jan. 14 - May 6, 1974	G. Doerfler	11	3U*
Educ.	Seminar - Corrective & Remedial Reading, 875	Salina	Jan. 17 - May 6, 1974	R. Jennings	20	3G
Educ.	Workshop in Storytelling, 570	Pratt	Mar. 8-9, 1974	D. Harsh	36	1B
Lib. Sci.	Cataloging & Classification, 256	Hutchinson	Apr. 8 - May 29, 1974	E. Hollingsworth	17	3U*
Educ.	Workshop in Storytelling, 570	Solomon	Apr. 20-27, 1974	D. Harsh & Staff	36	1B
Educ.	Human Relations, 675/875	Seneca	May 17-18, 1974	E. Stehno	16	1B
Educ.	Corrective Remedial Reading, 675/875	Great Bend	June 4-21, 1974	P. Price	9	3B*
Bus.	Personal Income Tax, 113	Hays	Feb. 12 - Mar. 7, 1974	G. Wall	15	1U
Educ.	Practicum in Educ. -Clinical Reading Diagnosis, 879	Salina	June 10-28, 1974	W. Gwaldtney	10	4G*
Lib. Sci.	Selection of Printed Material, 252	Hutchinson	June 17 - July 21, 1974	E. Hollingsworth	15	3U*
Educ.	Workshop in Storytelling, 570	Russell	May 29-30, 1974	D. Harsh	20	1B

Dr. Frerer asked whether or not a course taught on campus could be considered eligible for inconvenience pay.

Dr. Forsythe stated that even classes meeting on campus were eligible for inconvenience pay. He noted that there will be, in all probability, some meeting on campus this fall. Dr. Forsythe pointed out that a faculty member has a right to draw extension pay instead of inconvenience pay but in such a case students could not be counted in F.T.E. He pointed out that one who receives inconvenience pay is volunteering to teach for a little less money so the credit hours generated can count in the Base.

Dr. Forsythe noted that he had corresponded with Dr. Garwood regarding the issue of teaching for inconvenience pay and had found out that there are no limits to how many hours one can teach. An adjunct professor can teach only one course, while a faculty member can teach a regular load on campus and teach an unlimited number of courses in conjunction with adjunct professors. For instance, a faculty member can teach three courses carrying three hours credit each but have the course handled by an adjunct professor. Dr. Forsythe pointed out that the Continuing Education Committee is in the process of drawing up general guidelines regarding extension courses. One of the changes likely to be implemented is the requirement of the Graduate Dean's approval if the extension or continuing education course is taught for graduate credit. Also, department chairpersons and deans will have to approve the course. Dr. Forsythe pointed out that a degree of flexibility must be retained regarding extension offerings.

Dr. Stehno asked Dr. Forsythe to indicate what his personal feelings were regarding inconvenience pay and extension offerings were.

Dr. Forsythe replied that when the issue came up he was asked how an individual could teach a full-time load on campus and several extension courses off campus and still do justice to students on campus. This had been discussed by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Stehno asked what criteria should be used to determine whether or not a person could do this.

Dr. Forsythe answered that the issue came to the attention of Faculty Senate because those students could now be counted in headcount. Thus this becomes Faculty Senate business though it still seems to be a gray area. Dr. Forsythe indicated that he did not know how a person could manage to teach an excessive number of classes on campus.

Dr. Stehno asked who would determine this.

Dr. Forsythe replied that in the past if a department chairman and the Field Service approved such a course, it would be taught. He pointed out that the proposed policy is that now approval of the department chairman, the Dean, the Graduate Dean, and the extension service would have to be secured. Dr. Forsythe stated that as chairman of Faculty Senate he did not feel he could personally answer the question, but he noted that one fact emanating from the advising report was that faculty members are already overloaded. Department chairpersons say that their faculty are already teaching heavy loads.

Dr. Robinson stated that the Education Department appeared to be teaching many hours. He noted however, that many adjunct professors are being utilized. Dr. Robinson

noted that while one person may be listed as teaching several hours it must not be interpreted that he is teaching all these hours alone. Dr. Robinson pointed out that an adjunct professor may get \$200 or \$300 while the professor may get \$30 or perhaps no pay for his work on extension courses.

Dr. Smith said that it seemed to her that, while many extension courses are needed, if many more faculty members teach extension hours for whatever reason the faculty is setting itself up. She warned that should faculty members teach eighteen hours it will be difficult to convince the "powers that be" that faculty need twelve hour loads.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that there was an attempt in the state legislature to increase faculty load about two years ago. A bill was introduced to mandate that every faculty member teach so many hours.

Mr. Ginther pointed out that in an emergency one semester he had taught twenty-three hours and could not recommend that many hours.

Mr. Crissman stated that he felt faculty who taught an excessive number of hours in effect were "short-changing" the regular student on our campus.

Mr. Pfeifer reminded those present that if faculty member taught additional courses off campus travel time was an additional consideration as it takes many extra hours to drive those long distances.

Mr. Ginther asked whether or not there was a trend to determine what a full-time load was?

Dr. Forsythe answered there was not.

Mr. Ginther asked why not.

Dr. Forsythe noted that Fort Hays State now has the highest teaching load of any school in Kansas.

Dr. Adams reminded those present that an attempt to equate teaching loads was soundly rejected by Faculty Senate two years ago.

Dr. Forsythe noted that the administration feels flexibility is necessary and that each department should decide on what a full load is. Special projects may come up that requires a reduced load for a faculty member, or there may be other situations, but it is up to the department.

Dr. Miller asked how many extension hours were recertification hours. He questioned whether or not Fort Hays State through offering extensive extension courses was in fact raiding its own credit hour potential.

Dr. Forsythe replied that he did not have the data at hand to answer that question.

Dr. Miller asked whether or not someone from education could provide that information.

Dr. Robinson stated that he had no statistics but that through extension many students are picked up who might have gone to other schools.

Dr. Stehno stated that he was personally involved with eighteen hours of extension courses this past school year. He noted that some he received pay for; others he did not. He stated that there were eleven students on campus now who originally started at Wichita State University. He suggested that if the Senate wished to look at something it should look at the distance traveled by those teaching extension classes.

Dr. Smith asked who taught the classes if Dr. Stehno did not.

Dr. Stehno replied that several Ph.D.'s around the state taught. He pointed out that he was involved in federal projects.

Dr. Smith noted that junior colleges had been going to high schools offering courses solely as a recruitment feature.

Dr. Stehno reported that not only were junior colleges going to the high schools but that is was with the hearty support and encouragement of both the administration and the Board of Education.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that he had been asked why Fort Hays State doesn't go to a number of these towns to recruit or to offer courses.

Dr. Forsythe announced that two resolutions had been received from the Student Affairs Committee and both will be held for consideration at the September meeting.

Dr. Forsythe distributed a draft of the most recent articulation agreement between regent schools and the junior colleges. It read as follows:

TRANSFER AND ARTICULATION AGREEMENT

Kansas Public Community College - State College and University

On this ____ day of _____ in the year _____,
_____ has joined with public institutions
of higher education in the State of Kansas in acceptance of the following transfer agreement effective with the academic year 1975 - 1976.

A student who completes an Associate Degree based on a baccalaureate oriented sequence at a state and regionally accredited Kansas public community college and whose program of studies has met the requirements of the Kansas Public Community College-State College and University Transfer and Articulation Agreement will be accepted with junior standing and will have satisfied the lower division general education requirements of all Regents' institutions of the state.

This voluntary commitment by _____
reaffirms its intent to continue to cooperate with its sister colleges and universities in matters of student transfer and articulation for the ultimate benefit of all transfer students in the State of Kansas.

(SEAL)

Signed _____
Title _____
Date _____

Dr. Forsythe indicated that the earlier articulation agreement would be discussed in detail later by the Academic Affairs Committee. The Senate can act at the September meeting so that Dr. Tomanek will know the views of the Senate.

Dr. Forsythe said that he met with President Gustad on July 12 to discuss Senate action which was before the President. The Senate unanimously passed a motion that there were a number of reasons for the move in this direction and suggested that Mr. Keating be contacted regarding specific plans. Dr. Forsythe talked to Mr. Keating about this.

Dr. Forsythe reported that although duplication services are going to be centralized on campus ditto machines would remain in departments for the time being. Dr. Forsythe announced that printing would be done by a new machine. The major problem was the use of xerox machines.

Dr. Miller asked why xerox machines were being centralized.

Dr. Forsythe stated that xerox machines had to be monitored. Some departments were going far over their budgets because of excess usage of the xerox machines. He had heard of one department over \$8,000 and one or two others about \$1,000 over in May, 1974.

Dr. Miller asked why they had to be monitored since the expense accrued to the particular department.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that this was true, but when one department exceeds its budget, other departments are forced to pay. Some departments overspent their budget by large margins this year and the difference came from other departmental budgets. It was grossly unfair for this to happen. Departments were deprived of needed equipment because of the excesses of other departments.

Dr. Forsythe announced that the Pre-enrollment Committee report and the Advising Committee Report was discussed briefly with the President and would be forwarded by him to the Council of Deans.

Dr. Forsythe announced that COD would not meet again until the end of summer. He reported that items discussed at the last three COD meetings attended included the following: sick leave, the urban semester, leave of absence policy, G.E.D. testing, degrees at Fort Hays State, transfer agreements with junior colleges, departmental hour requirements, degrees offered by Fort Hays State, and the problem of closed classes. A committee will be set up with Dr. Bloss to consider making Fort Hays a GED Center. The college cannot get credit hour production from remedial work, but the GED testing could be used for recruiting. The discussion of departmental hours for a major centered on a comment made in COD that it was understood that some departments required over 30 hours of major courses and cognates for a degree. Dr. Forsythe said that he hoped that he correctly voiced the opinion of the Senate when he said that he found nothing with a department requiring 50 or 60 hours of major and cognate courses. He said that he believed that if such programs made Fort Hays State students competitive in the market place then there was nothing wrong with that. He said that if Senators thought that that was the wrong position to take they could advise him. He said that he supported strong programs for Fort Hays students.

Dr. Forsythe announced that he had sent a letter to Dr. Tomanek and President Gustad about an article in the Chronicle of Higher Education. The article reported

on the State of Florida legislature eliminating 100 positions because the two state universities had urged their faculties to place students, especially graduate students, in heavy overloads to generate extra credit hours.

Dr. Forsythe also noted that the Wichita Eagle had in a recent edition carried the story of law enforcement students taking classes in the summer which they formally enrolled in in the fall.

IV. Reports of Ad Hoc Committees

No reports of Ad Hoc Committees were presented.

V. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Bylaws and Standing Rules Committee

Dr. Frerer indicated that the Committee had nothing to report.

B. Student Affairs Committee

Dr. Marshall indicated that the Committee had nothing to report.

C. Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. McCullick distributed copies of two recommendations which read as follows:

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Academic Affairs Committee

The AAC respectively recommend the adoption of the following:

1. That students have approval of the appropriate dean before being allowed to enroll in more than 18 hours.
2. Academic Recognition at Graduation--There will be three levels of academic honor at graduation: cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude.

Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.4 to 3.59 and 3.4 to 3.59 while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Magna Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.6 to 3.79 and 3.6 to 3.79 while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Summa Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.8 or above and 3.8 or above while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Each student graduating with academic recognition must have attended Fort Hays State for one of the last two years, and at least 62 hours must be earned in an institution offering regular upper division credit.

Dr. McCullick offered the first recommendation in the form of a motion. Dr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Dr. Frerer stated that he was of the opinion that the Faculty Senate had already taken action on the issue of students taking excessive hours.

Ms. Popp noted that the per hour fee structure would not control excessive number of hours. Control of excessive hours had been one of the intents of the Senate passed fee structure.

Dr. Forsythe pointed out that the fee structure proposed by Faculty Senate had been changed by the Council of Deans and that a student pays per credit hour only for the first fifteen hours. There is no control at the moment in the number of hours that a student may take.

Dr. Witten asked what kind of approval was being discussed.

Dr. Forsythe stated that approval would be sought from the appropriate Dean. He pointed out that last fall such a provision would have involved approximately two hundred students.

Dr. Adams asked what the criteria would be for granting approval of an overload.

Dr. McCullick suggested that if Faculty Senate empowers the Deans to grant approval then the Deans should determine criteria. He stated that if Faculty Senate chose to do so that members might wish to develop criteria.

Dr. Frerer stated that a discrepancy might result if some Deans were flexible and others were not. Dr. Frerer asked if an outside limit such as twenty-one hours was being considered.

Dr. McCullick stated he would personally oppose such a measure.

Dr. Forsythe stated that the feelings of the Faculty Senate earlier had been that no upper limit would be established.

Dr. Drinan suggested that the Deans should report to the Academic Affairs Committee on the criteria they were employing. He made a motion to that effect.

The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Ginther suggested that the Faculty Senate should determine criteria. He stated that if left to the Deans criteria might not be forthcoming.

Dr. Miller remarked that he felt the number of hours taken was a matter that should be between the student and his/her advisor.

Dr. Forsythe stated that one of the things which had come up in discussion with various administrators was advisors might encourage students to enroll in an excessive amount of hours to boost head count for a particular department.

Dr. Miller expressed disbelief that a department would engage in that kind of business if in any way detrimental to the student.

Dr. Frerer moved that the motion be amended to read "students be allowed to take in excess of eighteen hours only by recommendation of the adviser and approval of the appropriate Dean."

Dr. Marshall seconded the motion.

Dr. Adams pointed out that such a move would be a step backward in light of the action taken by the Faculty Senate to give students greater responsibility.

Dr. Marshall pointed out that many students do not accept responsibility.

Dr. Wall asked if each student would have to talk to the appropriate Dean before enrollment. He pointed out that such a provision would cause a great deal of inconvenience for students. Dr. Wall said that during the last pre-enrollment period he handled sixteen students. He stated that if each student had to see the Dean in all probability the Dean's secretary would probably end up signing the Dean's name.

Dr. Pruitt stated that such a requirement would apply to only those students who wished to take nineteen hours or more.

Dr. Wall stated that we might well be talking about two hundred students.

Ms. Veed stated that she felt such a requirement would in effect announce that the requirements at Fort Hays State are stiff enough that if the student thinks he is capable of taking nineteen or more hours he must make the case.

Ms. Pfeifer cited examples of students known to her who did not perform well due to enrolling in an excessive number of hours.

Ms. Popp cited an example of a student who carried twenty-two hours per semester in order to finish school in two years. Ms. Popp agreed that such a requirement would be an inconvenience but, for that matter, life itself is an inconvenience.

Ms. Pfeifer said such a measure might lessen parental pressure on students to finish quickly.

Dr. Miller asked Senate members if they believed for even a minute that a Dean would say no if an adviser said yes. Dr. Miller asked what possible information the Dean would possess that the adviser would not have.

Ms. Popp asked how many of Dr. Miller's advisees did exactly what he wanted them to do.

Dr. Miller replied that students do not sign his name and that he is aware of all student programs and program changes.

Dr. Marshall said advisers could not be realistically expected to control the matter because there have been cases of advisers signing undergraduate students for thesis hours.

Dr. Drinan said we are either talking about the intent of Senate or establishing specific criteria.

Dr. Marshall said it would be very difficult to draw up uniform criteria. He suggested that the task be assigned to the Deans and that they be allowed to "run with it."

Ms. Pfeifer asked whether the Deans were apprised of the proposal under discussion.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Crissman asked whether or not Faculty Senate could require the Deans to develop a common body of criteria.

Dr. Adams moved that the issue be tabled until criteria was developed.

Dr. Miller seconded the motion.

Dr. Forsythe indicated that if the issue was tabled an additional meeting might be required as the administration was already talking in terms of the normal load being 15 to 18 hours.

Dr. Miller asked why the issue must be decided at this time.

Dr. Forsythe answered that it should be decided to be consistent with earlier action taken by the Faculty Senate. At the May meeting the Senate passed a fee structure that in part was designed to control heavy enrollment somewhat. COD accepted the idea of controls on heavy enrollment.

Dr. Zakrzewski pointed out that since we have already pre-enrolled students for Fall the question becomes an academic question.

Dr. McCullick stated he did not consider Dr. Adams motion to be an unfriendly one.

Dr. Johnson asked whether or not the requirement would be retroactive.

Dr. McCullick suggested it would be in the interest of all to start with a clean slate.

Dr. Busch pointed out that the Senate must vote on the main motion before it can vote to table the measure. Dr. Forsythe asked the Parliamentarian Dr. Johnson for a ruling and Dr. Johnson said that the point raised was correct. The motion to table was out of order.

Dr. Forsythe called for a vote on the amendment. He ruled that the ayes had it.

Dr. Adams moved to table the original motion as amended until the September meeting so that guidelines and criteria could be provided by the Deans.

Dr. McCullick seconded the motion. The motion to table failed to pass.

Dr. Busch stated that perhaps one factor overlooked up to this point was that students needed to have some contact with Deans.

Dr. Marshall moved that the motion be amended to read as follows: "That students be allowed to take in excess of eighteen hours only by recommendation of the adviser and approval of the appropriate Dean, effective Spring, 1975."

Dr. Forsythe called for a vote on the proposed amendment to the motion. The proposed amendment passed.

Dr. Forsythe called for a vote on the original motion. Dr. Wall asked whether such action would require a new form. Dr. Frerer explained that he felt the appeal to take additional hours be handled by memorandum.

The motion passed.

Dr. McCullick introduced the second item dealing with academic recognition at graduation in the form of a motion.

Dr. Zakrzewski seconded it.

Dr. McCullick explained that the proposal was drawn up by Dr. Forsythe. It is intended to allow an avenue to award distinctions at graduation because the Honors Program is being phased out.

Dr. Frerer stated that he favored it over the old honors system because under the old system a student with a 4.0 grade average could not have graduated summa cum laude.

Dr. Adams asked whether the new proposal lowered the grade point for cum laude distinction.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the affirmative. Dr. Forsythe said that he had checked with the Registrar's Office and that 10 percent of the graduating class averages 3.4. It fluctuates between 8 and 12 percent.

Dr. Adams asked whether or not the percent of students having that average was increasing. Dr. Forsythe replied it was not.

The motion passed with no one in opposition. The motion that passed reads:

Academic Recognition at Graduation--There will be three levels of academic honor at graduation: cum laude, magna cum laude, and summa cum laude.

Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.4 to 3.59 and 3.4 to 3.59 while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Magna Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.6 to 3.79 and 3.6 to 3.79 while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Summa Cum Laude: Achievement of a cumulative grade point of 3.8 or above and 3.8 or above while in attendance at Fort Hays State.

Each student graduating with academic recognition must have attended Fort Hays State for one of the last two years, and at least 62 hours must be earned in an institution offering regular upper division credit.

Dr. McCullick noted that the Academic Affairs Committee did not have a report on the articulation agreement. Dr. McCullick stated since it was of significance the action taken should not be hasty.

Dr. Forsythe asked that the matter be considered at the September meeting because Dr. Tomanek would need feedback on the issue before he attended the COCAO meeting.

D. College Affairs Committee

Ms. Veed stated that at the June 24th Faculty Senate meeting the College Affairs Committee circulated a document on Procedures for Hearings and Appeals. Ms. Veed moved that it be accepted.

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS AND APPEALS

In accordance with the principles of administration and due process and in order to insure prompt determination of contested decisions and fair play to all concerned, the following options to disaffected faculty members (faculty defined as all individuals holding academic rank of instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor) are available. Any faculty member directly concerned and affected by a college decision related to academic freedom, condition of employment, termination of employment, termination related to financial exigency, and other grievances shall have these recourse procedures.

1. There is an established tradition of informal appeal at Fort Hays Kansas State College, and this informal procedure shall be maintained. The aggrieved faculty member has the right of an informal effort at mediation with his or her departmental chairperson, and if unsuccessful at this level, the faculty member has the right of an informal effort at mediation with the Dean of his or her respective faculty.

Since an open-door policy has been maintained at all administrative levels, the aggrieved faculty member also has the right of informal appeal to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs and to the President. This right shall not be infringed upon, but the usual procedure for pursuing mediation if informal mediation is not successful at the level of the respective Dean will be to initiate a request for a formal hearing or appeal.

2. A request for a formal hearing based on an appeal in writing will initiate the proceedings. The written request shall state the issue and the reasons for appealing. It shall be dated and signed by the appealing faculty member and addressed to the appropriate department chairperson with a copy to the appropriate Dean. Within five working days from the receipt of the written request for such hearing, the department chairperson shall set a time and place agreeable to both parties for such hearing by a departmental committee and notify the person in writing. A decision shall be made within five days following the departmental hearing and the decision reduced to writing and delivered to the appealing faculty member with a copy to the department chairperson and the appropriate Dean. A record of the departmental meeting will be kept.

3. If the departmental hearing committee does not support the faculty member, or if it does support the faculty member and the Dean does not concur in the committee's decision, a formal appeal may be made directly to the Appeals Committee of the College Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.

4. The faculty member may notify the Chairperson of the College Affairs Committee that he or she has a formal appeal, formally state in written form the reasons for the appeal, and ask that an Appeals Committee be established by the College Affairs Committee. The Appeals Committee shall select its own chairperson. The Appeals Committee shall, within one week, set up its own procedures and conduct its own meetings in accordance with the Faculty Senate by-laws and regular rules of review.

When the Appeals Committee considers appeals of the nature of severe sanction or the dismissal of a tenured professor, it shall establish detailed and explicit

Procedures for Hearings and Appeals (continued)

procedural safeguards in conformity with Section 5 "Dismissal Procedures" of the American Association of University Professors' 1972 Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (AAUP Bulletin, LVIII (Winter, 1972), 428-433), and as outlined in section b. 4 of the April 18, 1947, Board of Regents minutes.

The decision of the Appeals Committee in the form of a written recommendation to the President of the College shall be transmitted to the appealing faculty member and to the President within 48 hours after the hearing.

5. The President shall take action on the Appeals Committee recommendation within one week unless prevented from so doing by absence from the campus. If the President does not concur with the Appeals Committee findings, the President shall submit a detailed statement of the compelling reasons for nonconcurrence. The Appeals Committee shall reply to the counterarguments presented by the President, and the President will then make a final decision.

6. In the event the final decision is adverse to the interests of the affected faculty member, and if the appeals is of the nature of severe sanctions or dismissal, the faculty member shall have the right to ask the Board of Regents to review all documentary evidence and testimony.

Dr. Frerer asked that the document be briefly summarized.

Dr. Forsythe explained that in effect it institutionalized the informal procedures already used on campus. The document, Dr. Forsythe explained, is intended to protect the legal rights of faculty members. Faculty who know of the informal procedures use them. Those who do not know them are thus deprived of this protection. Now everyone will know.

Dr. Miller offered a friendly amendment proposing that if accepted the document be published in the Faculty Handbook.

Ms. Veed accepted Dr. Miller's friendly amendment.

Dr. McCullick asked whether the college legal counsel had seen the document.

Dr. Forsythe answered in the affirmative. Dr. Forsythe pointed out that as he understood it affirmative action also requires such a provision.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Ms. Veed moved that each department develop the machinery to establish a departmental appeals committee and that next year's College Affairs Committee do the same.

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

Ms. Veed explained that such committee should exist before an actual problem arises.

The motion passed with no one in opposition.

Ms. Veed distributed a document dealing with Leaves. It read as follows:

LEAVES

Sabbatical. The policy of the College with regard to leaves of absence is governed by regulations of the Board of Regents.

Sabbatical leaves may be granted to a number of members of the faculty not to exceed 4 percent of those on the faculty roster as of July 1 of the fiscal year for which the leave is granted. The Board of Regents Sabbatical Leave Regulation, adopted December 16, 1961, is as follows:

"It is ordered that, in strictly meritorious cases, a full-time faculty member on regular appointment at any of the six state schools of higher education who has served continuously for a period of six years or longer at one or more of these institutions, may, at the convenience of the institution and upon the recommendation of the president or chancellor of the institution with which he is connected, be granted by the Board of Regents not to exceed one leave of absence for each such period of regular employment, for the purpose of pursuing advanced study, conducting research studies, or securing appropriate industrial or professional experience; such leave shall not be granted for a period of less than one semester nor for a period of more than one year, with reimbursement being made according to the following schedule:

- a) For nine-months faculty members, up to half pay for an academic year, or up to full pay for one semester.
- b) For twelve-months faculty members, up to half pay for eleven months, or up to full pay for five months.

Provided, That the amount paid during the period of leave shall not exceed fifty percent of the absentee's regular salary. Regular salary is defined as the salary being paid at the time the sabbatical leave begins. Provided further, That the number of faculty members to whom leave of absence with sabbatical pay is granted in any fiscal year shall not exceed four percent of the number of full-time persons with rank of instructor or higher, or equivalent rank, for the institution concerned for the fiscal year for which the leave of absence is granted; and provided further, That no faculty member will be granted leave of absence with sabbatical pay who does not agree to return to the service of the institution for a period of at least two years following the expiration of the period of leave. Persons failing to return to the institution granting sabbatical leave shall refund all sabbatical pay. Those who fail to remain for the full two years of school service (18 months or 24 months, depending on annual term of employment) shall refund that portion of their sabbatical pay as represented by the portion of the two years which they fail to serve."

See the sabbatical leave agreement at the end of this section.

Leaves of Absence. For leaves of absence without pay, the policy of the College has been to encourage faculty members to take a semester or a year off to improve themselves by advanced study. This policy has to be adjusted to the needs of the College and the faculty member. If such a plan is contemplated, the faculty member should see the chairman of his department, his dean and the President early in the year.

LEAVES (continued)

The following is the Board of Regents' policy covering Leave Without Pay:

"A leave without pay for one year may be granted when such is judged to be in the best interest of the institution and such leave will not be regarded as a break in continuous service; however, such leave without pay will not count toward earning Sabbatical Leave nor will other than a scholarly leave count toward tenure; a scholarly leave will count toward tenure unless the staff member and the institution agree in writing to the contrary at the time the leave is granted. Any extension of a leave without pay for a second year requires the specific consent of the Board of Regents. Two years is the limit for such leaves."

To qualify for leave without pay, an individual must appear on a budget line in the printed budget; or, if employed after that budget is prepared, he must be listed in the Annual Budget when it is prepared for the following academic year. Individuals not listed in the regular budget when first appointed and who are not to be included in the next printed budget, are considered to be on a temporary basis when employed and should have temporary in their title and contract. They are not eligible for Leave Without Pay.

Faculty who have regular nine-month appointments and are not appointed for summer school, or who do not elect to take their salary in twelve equal installments, are placed on leave without pay for the summer (June, July, August).

An employee may continue health insurance coverage for up to one year if on an approved leave. Otherwise, an employee may continue the health insurance only while on leave without pay for the summer (June, July, August). The employee must pay the full costs if the health insurance is retained during this period unless his pay is made in twelve installments.

Sick Leave. Faculty members accumulate sick leave with full pay at the rate of one working day for each calendar month employed. Cases of protracted incapacity due to illness are acted upon by the Board of Regents on an individual basis on the recommendation of the President.

Vacation or Annual Leave. It is the expectation of the College that each member of the faculty will plan for and take an adequate vacation each year in order to refresh and to prepare himself for the duties of the ensuing year. College employment policies reflect this expectation.

Annual leave should be arranged in advance with the approval of the staff member's department head and dean for periods convenient to the work of the College. Every effort will be made to accommodate the personal wishes of the faculty member, however.

Full-time faculty members of a 12-month basis earn one calendar month of annual leave with pay not to exceed 22 working days per fiscal year. Leave credit shall be accumulated on the basis of two days per month for each month of service. (The month of annual leave is not considered a month of service for purposes of crediting annual leave) To provide desirable flexibility the month of leave may be broken into smaller increments but it does not need to be reported for increments of less than one-half day.

Holidays officially designated by the Governor (i.e., New Year's Day, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day and Christmas Day) need not be

LEAVES (continued)

reported as vacation days. All other days, however, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, but including those days during which time College classes may not be in session, are considered working days and must be reported as vacation days if time off is taken.

Annual leave is not earned while on sabbatical leave. Annual leave taken in more than one installment may not exceed 22 working days for each fiscal year.

Annual leave earned in any fiscal year (July 1 to June 30) must be taken on or before the following January 31. In some instances annual leave may be carried beyond the January 31 date. Requests for such an extension must originate with the faculty member concerned and are subject to the approval of the appropriate department head and dean. Requests for such extensions are usually for purposes of academic study. Unless otherwise specifically set out as a condition of the extension, such accumulation will be used prior to the end of the fiscal year or be lost. Not more than two calendar months or 44 working days of annual leave may be used in any 12 consecutive months. To extend or accumulate annual leave beyond January 31, approval must be granted by letter in advance by the faculty member's dean. A copy of the dean's letter is sent to the President's Office for the personnel file. Nine-month faculty members do not earn annual leave.

Military Leave. Any faculty member excluding those on temporary appointment, who is a member of a reserve component of the military service of the United States or a member of the state or national guard, shall be granted leave of absence with pay for the purpose of attending annual active duty for training with such component or for the duration of any official call to emergency duty for a period, or periods, not to exceed a total of fifteen calendar days in any one calendar year. Such leave shall not be counted as a part of such employee's annual vacation.

Terminal Leave. In the case of employees who resign from the College, the date at which the resignation takes effect, including any accumulated annual leave to which they may be entitled, shall be determined at the convenience of the College. The date upon which the earned terminal annual leave begins shall be the date beyond which, in the opinion of the College, the employee's services are no longer needed. The date shown on the minute of resignation shall be the date that concludes the period of terminal leave.

Faculty members terminating employment at the College will be paid unused earned annual leave up to a maximum of 30 consecutive calendar days as terminal leave including unused annual leave earned during the fiscal year in which the resignation occurs. If the resignation occurs prior to January 31, this 30 calendar day maximum may include such unused annual leave as remains from the previous fiscal year. If a faculty member has been prevented from taking annual leave prior to January 31 at the request of the College, and if his dean previously has authorized its extension in writing beyond January 31, that leave may also be used as a part of the 30-day terminal maximum.

Death Benefits. Salary is paid up through the date of death. The estates of deceased employees receive salary for all earned and unused leave as of the date of death.

Data Collection Form

NAME: _____

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: _____

DATE FIRST EMPLOYED: _____

MONTHS EMPLOYED SINCE DATE ABOVE: _____

DAYS OF SICK LEAVE TAKEN SINCE FIRST EMPLOYED TO JUNE 30, 1974 _____

* UNUSED ANNUAL LEAVE AS OF JUNE 30, 1974: _____ days

I CERTIFY THAT ALL INFORMATION GIVEN HEREON IS ACCURATE AND TRUE TO THE
BEST OF MY BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE.

Signature

*12 months employees only

S.S. Number

Name

Period covered: From _____ To _____

Complete this section of the card for leave
taken during the above period.

Annual leave taken _____ days

Sick leave taken _____ days

Other leave taken _____ days

Kind of leave taken

Sign and return this card to
the Business Office no later
than 12:00 noon on the first
working day following the end
of the period above.

signed

Ms. Veed noted that members of the College Affairs Committee did not approve the statement on sick leave because the statement was vague.

Ms. Pfeifer asked for clarification on the point of sick leave.

Mr. Ginther explained that previously faculty members were covered for 180 days via verbal agreement with the College and after 180 days disability benefits were received. Mr. Ginther pointed out that now the verbal agreement regarding college coverage for the 180 days was being questioned. He pointed out that everyone was beginning with zero days accumulated.

Dr. McCullick stated it was his understanding that we will be allowed to estimate.

Dr. Forsythe explained that as it was discussed in COD the estimation applies only to those retiring this year, but no one knows for sure yet.

Ms. Pfeifer asked if there was a limit on days accumulated.

Dr. Forsythe replied that no one knows.

Dr. Forsythe said that before adjournment he wanted to tell the Senate that he had briefly discussed the Appeals Procedure and the Honors at Graduation documents with the President. The Appeals Procedure will be submitted to COD for their input. The President liked the recommendations on Academic Recognition at Graduation. He said that Honors are bestowed upon students by the professors who have taught them at the school where they graduate. This is no reflection on schools from which our students come. It is simply a matter that each school awards its own honors just as each school awards tenure. Dr. Forsythe said that he did not say this earlier when he reported on his meeting with the President as he wanted the items to reflect Senate deliberation.

VI. Unfinished Business

There was no unfinished business.

VII. New Business

There was no new business to report.

Dr. Zakrzewski moved that the meeting be adjourned.

Dr. Johnson seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:05 P.M.