

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

3-16-1975

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 16, 1975

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all)

---

#### Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 16, 1975" (1975). *Faculty Senate*. 639.

[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/639](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/639)

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: Bob Lowen, Secretary  
Faculty Senate  
RE: Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes  
DATE: March 18, 1975

Minutes of the meeting of Faculty Senate, Tuesday, March 18, 1975, Faculty Lounge, Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call

Members Absent: Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Miss Kathleen Kuchar, Mrs. Jane Littlejohn. Mr. Gentry for Dr. Wallace Harris, Dr. John Doggett for Mrs. Alice McFarland, Dr. Bob Dressler for Dr. Delbert Marshall, and Dr. Nevell Razak for Mrs. Rose Arnhold.

II. Minutes of the Previous Meeting

The minutes of the previous regular meeting were approved.

III. Announcements

Dr. Drinan distributed to the Faculty Senate copies of the Attorney General ruling on sick leave at Kansas University. Dr. Drinan called the attention of the Senate to one of the key passages of the ruling which suggests that the colleges can only maintain someone on the payroll for temporary absences from duty that do not interfere with the continuing substantial fulfillment of the duties of the faculty appointment or contract. In Administrative Council, Mr. Keating had been asked for his interpretation of the sick leave ruling. Mr. Keating had replied that, as far as his affirmation of payroll, any longer than a two week period of continued leave due to sickness would probably tend to remove someone from the payroll. Dr. Drinan said that the Faculty Association had begun working on an insurance package that would pay salary for those times after the two weeks and prior to 6 months. Apparently the sick leave policy will remain in the air for most of the Regents' institutions for the next few weeks. The resolution of the bi-weekly payroll issue also will have an impact on the kind of sick leave policy that will be written over the next several months. Dr. Drinan said he would be attending a Faculty Senate Presidents meeting in Topeka on Thursday, March 20, and he hoped to gain more information on the status of the sick leave policies at the Regents' institutions.

The Senate President said that the agenda for the State College Coordinating Committee meeting on March 20 included the Regents' budget guidelines for the colleges and universities. Mr. Schardein and Dr. Drinan were going to address themselves to the inequities of general revenue funding at the state colleges. The Senate Presidents have also reacted to Senate Bill 472 which established a student



advisory group to the Board of Regents. (See Appendix). The Senate Presidents also anticipate meeting with the Governor sometime in the next 6 weeks.

Dr. Drinan said that there have been some rumors in Topeka that there is a danger of losing a portion of the 10% raise for unclassified personnel. As far as he knew, it is not yet a serious movement to cut the salary increase.

The Senate President said that he had discussed with the President of Faculty Association and the College Affairs committee the formation of a welfare committee that would help coordinate fringe benefits packages in the requests to the Council of Presidents and the Regents. We've had to rely in the past at Fort Hays State on much of the research into salaries and fringe benefits that K-State and Wichita State have done. It appears desirable that we begin accumulating research and data to support various requests in the area of salaries and fringe benefits. Hopefully, this special subcommittee of the College Affairs committee will be in operation this spring.

The Senate President said that the Council of Deans have had a concern with the variety of topics including the use of the faculty activity analysis. There had been some problems associated with how to count graduate assistants for purposes of the activity analysis. It appears that some of the universities have counted the graduate assistants as .5 instead of .2 which makes their faculty load reports look a little better than normally would be expected. The faculty activity analysis will be utilized on campus; there is no intention at the present time to use the information from the faculty activity analysis off campus.

Dr. Drinan said that COD is in the process of developing a consulting request form. If anyone has comments or reactions to the format, contact Miss Ellen Veed immediately.

A subcommittee of the Council of Deans met on March 10 to develop guidelines on implementation of the community college transfer agreement. The chairman of Academic Affairs committee will report on that meeting later.

Dr. Drinan said that inconvenience pay is in jeopardy for the continuing education areas. Mr. Casper of the Board of Regents office has been attempting to remove it and Dr. Tomanek has made a strong appeal to maintain inconvenience pay for these courses. (See Appendix). The status of inconvenience pay at the Regents' institutions will not be resolved any earlier than May of this year.

The Senate President announced that Mr. Rupp had been appointed to a special committee formed by the student body president to reconcile some of the conflicts between the Memorial Union Activities Board and the Artists and Lecture Committee.



The Faculty Senate President also announced that the student body president had been invited to attend executive committee meetings of the Senate so that students would be aware of items that were coming on the agenda of the Faculty Senate. Dr. Drinan said that Mr. Schardein had been asking for student representation at all college committees this year. Dr. Drinan said that each committee of the Faculty Senate should decide for itself whether or not it wishes student attendance at their meetings.

The Senate President said that he had met with President Gustad on a couple of items recently. President Gustad accepted the revised preface to the guidelines for merit pay determination. Dr. Drinan said that he had also talked with President Gustad about utilizing some of the experience of former faculty senate chairman and presidents, an issue which President Gustad has brought up frequently over the last year. Dr. Drinan suggested that perhaps the former senate chairman and presidents could act in some capacity on any academic long-range planning committee that may be formed in the future.

The Senate President announced that the next meeting of the Faculty Senate will be on April 21. The room is still uncertain, depending on whether we will have a general faculty meeting on that day.

#### IV. Responses to Dr. Drinan's Announcements:

Concerning sick leave, Dr. Miller asked what if the course one missed while ill was being covered by another faculty member?

Dr. Drinan said the two-week policy still stood, regardless.

Mr. Rupp said that he understood that when we were hired here, we were covered one full semester. He suggested that that be pointed out to Topeka.

Dr. Staven asked then that if a faculty member was gone for two weeks, who would teach his load. Could we hire a teacher for his load?

Dr. Drinan said evidently you could hire someone.

Dr. McCullick asked if the two weeks had to be continuous, not simply two or three days at a time.

Dr. Drinan said that two weeks continuous was correct.

Dr. Robinson asked if it counted that we had in the past covered for someone who had missed more than two weeks.

Dr. Drinan said he doubted whether that would matter.

V. Reports From Standing Committees

A. Bylaws Committee

Dr. Miller said his committee had encountered a problem attempting to count faculty for departmental representation on the Senate. He said there were many problems such as how many hours one should teach to be eligible or the fact that some (such as Library Science) do not teach at all. He said that the Senate's Executive Committee had originally agreed that persons teaching one or more courses should be eligible but that would eliminate Library Science faculty, so it was agreed that was not a good tool of measurement. Dr. Miller asked Senate members their feelings about how and who to count for eligibility purposes.

Dr. Miller suggested and Dr. Drinan agreed that for this year and this year only, department chairmen determine who is eligible.

Dr. Staven asked who would monitor the election?

Dr. Miller said department chairmen would this year.

Dr. Staven asked if faculty need to teach one to three hours in order to be eligible and posed the question that if they don't teach, they be disenfranchised?

Dr. Miller said no to both questions. We are trying to determine only who is eligible to be elected. We are trying to weigh how much representation each department gets.

Dr. Pruitt asked if Institutional Research could furnish figures to help with determining teaching loads?

Dr. Miller said the problem of those who don't teach not being eligible would still exist.

Mrs. Pfeifer asked exactly who is eligible to serve on the Senate?

Dr. Miller explained that the Senate is comprised of persons who have been elected as the result of a 1:10 ratio, one member in Senate for each 10 faculty members.

Miss Veed added that Faculty Senate does not only represent the teaching faculty but the total faculty.

Dr. Miller said the problem of some departments gaining extra representation by having more members eligible exists. He suggested that because his committee did not have time remaining to work out a palatable solution, that for 1975 only, department chairmen appoint those eligible for election. He put that into the form of a motion.



Dr. McCullick seconded the motion.

Dr. Drinan called for the question.

The motion proposed by Dr. Miller passed.

B. Academic Affairs Committee

Dr. McCullick talked about the implementation of the Transfer and Articulation Agreement and how it fit the College's general education program. He suggested the following guidelines in respect to advisement under the new general education program:

- All freshmen for 1975 be advised under the new general education program.
- All community and junior college transfers for 1975 be advised under the old general education program.
- All students enrolling for fall, 1977, be advised under the 1975 general education program.

Dr. McCullick said that JUCO transfer transcripts now have to be compared with our current general education program to see if they meet requirements. Next year, transcripts will be codified for easier transition.

He also noted that if the JUCO transfers come in with an A.A. degree, they will have fulfilled our P.E. requirement. If they did not finish or receive the A.A., they probably will take P.E. here.

Dr. Drinan noted that P.E. at FHS is now in the college catalog under the general education program.

Mr. Rupp said FHS stands to lose JUCO athletes under this new agreement. He said that as it currently stands, JUCO athletes can come in during the spring and be eligible for fall sports.

Mr. Lojka said that HPER students at FHS feel they are being jeopardized under the new General Education program.

Mr. Gentry said that he felt that some JUCO students who have taken but two hours of P.E. get the other two hours waived after transferring to FHS.

C. College Affairs Committee

Miss Veed asked that faculty send comments in writing to her about the sick leave policy.

Miss Veed also made a motion commending the sub-committee on behalf of its work with collective bargaining and the unbiased report it worked hard on and distributed for faculty consumption.

Dr. Doggett seconded the motion.

The motion carried.

D. Student Affairs Committee

The committee had nothing to report at this time.

E. Special Committees

Dr. Zakrzewski, chairman of the subcommittee of Academic Affairs, distributed copies of two-year programs in industrial arts and then made a motion to approve the programs.

Dr. McCullick seconded the motion.

Miss Veed asked if the students have to take some kind of science?

Dr. Zakrzewski said yes, something in the sciences.

Dr. Votaw asked if industrial arts calculations was necessary?

Mr. Ginther said yes, that a math course geared to the industrial arts area is required.

Dr. Lewis Miller asked why require social and behavioral sciences, why no courses in other humanities?

Mr. Ginther said each person drawing up the programs had own desires and suggestions and attempted to be selective.

Dr. Drinan asked if the programs were terminal.

Mr. Ginther said no, they would dovetail into the four-year industrial arts programs.

Dr. McCullick asked if the general education program was built into the first two years of these programs.

Mr. Ginther said no.

Dr. McCullick said, then, that it is strictly a two-year terminal program now.

Mr. Ginther said the general education would not fit the proposed programs.

Dr. Zakrzewski said this is a two-year program, not an A.A. degree program.

Mr. Ginther said the program was patterned after the two-year program in the business department. It is not baccalaureate oriented.

Dr. Staven asked what job opportunities are available after completing this two-year program.



Mr. Ginther said he felt jobs such as carpenters, qualified laborers and others would exist.

Dr. Adams asked if the subcommittee could check to see if this program meets the A.A. requirements.

Dr. Zakrzewski said it could but there was no need because the program was not A.A. oriented. It is vocationally oriented and has nothing to do with transfer agreement or A.A. degree program.

Miss Veed asked if a student got a degree when he completed the program.

Dr. Zakrzewski said yes, probably an associate of applied arts degree which is distinct from any other program.

Miss Veed asked if options were set out somewhere.

Dr. Zakrzewski said not at this time but would be.

Dr. Drinan called for the question.

The motion passed.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked that new course proposals for spring, 1976, be in his office by April 7, 1975.

Dr. Zakrzewski also said that in relation to Urban and Foreign semesters, a representative would be on campus in April to discuss future possibilities.

VI. There was no unfinished business.

VII. There was no new business.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.



APPENDIX

March 14, 1975

TO: Members of the House Education Committee and House Leadership  
FROM: Faculty Senate Presidents of Kansas Regents' Institutions  
RE: Senate Bill No. 472, an act establishing the students' advisory committee to the state board of regents.

The Faculty Senate Presidents of the Regents' institutions wish to call your attention to the existence of the State College Coordinating Committee composed of four regents, student body presidents, faculty senate presidents, and minority representatives. The Faculty Senate Presidents appreciate the opportunity to meet with regents on this committee. Although we are not opposed to Senate Bill No. 472, we feel that the present Coordinating Committee serves well as an instrument of communication. To establish another advisory committee for only students will lead certainly, in our opinion, to requests for comparable faculty representation.

If you have any questions concerning faculty reaction to Senate Bill No. 472, do not hesitate to contact me or any of the other Faculty Senate Presidents.

Sincerely,

Dr. Patrick Drinan  
Chairman of State College and  
University Senate Presidents

Dr. James Seaver  
University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS  
Dr. Robert Linder  
Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS  
Dr. Kay Camin  
Wichita State University, Wichita, KS  
Dr. Bob Smalley  
Emporia Kansas State College, Emporia, KS  
Dr. Max Mathis  
Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, KS

CC: Faculty Senate Presidents

March 18, 1975

Dr. Joe McFarland  
Academic Officer  
Board of Regents  
Merchants National Bank Bldg.  
800 Jackson Street, Suite 1416  
Topeka, KS 66612

Dear Joe:

In reading the COCAO minutes I felt that, under the Inconvenience Pay section of continuing education, you missed the tenor or full meaning of the discussion. I know this was unintentional and also that I feel most strongly of any present about the issue. I checked with another member of COCAO before I wrote this memo.

When the discussion was finished, it was my feeling that the following points were established:

1. There is considerable inconvenience in teaching continuing education courses---
  - a. When considerable distances are involved (i.e., in western Kansas, we often make round trips of 200-300 miles to teach these courses and teach a course on campus the next day.)
  - b. Because travelling long distances is not only tiresome but involves additional risk and a lot of time.
  - c. Because of meal costs--most trips are made in one day and the instructor is not reimbursed for the meals.
  - d. Because frequently these courses require more resources than a course on campus.
  - e. Since teaching materials must be carried each time from the college to the town where classes are held.
  - f. Because we use our own car  $\frac{1}{2}$  or more of the time with inadequate mileage.
  - g. Since there is more local pressure for top teacher performance.

I think these inconveniences were acknowledged by the group. The group also decided that we should send this back to CDDCE for their reconsideration of their recent recommendation to suspend inconvenience pay. It seemed to me that most of the COCAO members felt some type of remuneration should be given to regular faculty teaching continuing education courses and still count the hours in the FTE base. This remuneration should be tied to mileage travelled. Hays did pay according to distance travelled last year.

This letter was not designed to be critical of your recording the minutes but rather was an attempt to detour any possibility of misconception of the full meaning of our request to CDDCE at their next meeting.

Best personal regards and "No, I don't want to take the minutes next time."

Sincerely,

G. W. Tomanek

CC: Dr. Gene Kasper; Mr. Ralph Huffman; Dr. John Garwood; COCAO Members



The President of the Senate directed to be attached to the minutes the following summary of developments on sick leave policy.

Following the Senate meeting there were several faculty who brought to my attention aspects of the Attorney General ruling on sick leave that may be more liberal than the first interpretation of that ruling by the administration. After discussions with Mr. Keating and Dr. Tomanek I suggested to them that we may wish to request an Attorney General ruling on the adequacy of our sick leave policy. Our sick leave policy specifies a maximum number of days and clearly states that there is an established policy of covering class (see p.22 of Faculty Handbook). This makes our sick leave statement more of an institutional policy than that of K.U. (see p.4 of A.G. ruling).

On March 20 at the State College Coordinating Committee meeting the Faculty Senate Presidents learned of a K.U. proposal to make possible accumulated sick leave at the rate of 10 days per year. The Senate Presidents endorsed that proposal with the modification that there be no maximum on number of sick leave days accumulated. Quoted below are the major points of the K.U. proposal.

- "1. So long as faculty members substantially perform duties assigned by the Chancellor or a delegate, they will be paid from payroll.
2. When a faculty member cannot so perform, his or her supervisor will so certify to the business office and sick leave will be paid.
3. Sick leave will be available on the basis of years of service at the University.
4. A faculty member with ten or more years will have the maximum of 100 days of leave, provided that his or her supervisor(s) certify that the member in question has always substantially performed assigned duties during that period. (Obviously, some supervisors will not be here and evidence from other colleagues, supervisors, etc. will have to be substituted.) Faculty members with nine years service will have 90 days of leave under the same condition, and so forth down to ten days for one-year members.

This policy would provide accumulated leave immediately in amounts determined on an equitable basis. In addition, it would require no record keeping other than that which supervisors must currently employ to determine that faculty members are substantially meeting assigned responsibilities."

The Council of Presidents included sick leave policy on their agenda March 20. It is hoped that a resolution of the issue will be forthcoming this spring. If you have any comments on the K.U. proposal please bring them to the attention of the chairman of the College Affairs committee, Miss Veed, prior to April 1.

Patrick Drinan  
March 21, 1975