

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

9-13-1976

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 13, 1976

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, September 13, 1976" (1976). *Faculty Senate*. 657.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/657

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.

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

September 13, 1976

Mr. Dan Rupp, President of the Faculty Senate, called the meeting to order at 3:30 P.M., September 13, 1976, in the Santa Fe Room, Memorial Union.

I. Roll Call and Approval of the Minutes.

Members Present: Ms. Joanne Harwick, Dr. Clifford Edwards, Mr. Mike Walker, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Wallace Harris, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Stanley Robertson, Mr. Dale Peier, Ms. Ellen Veed, Ms. Vera Thomas, Mr. Dan Rupp, Dr. Allan Busch, Dr. Patrick Drinan, Dr. Ron Smith, Dr. Louis Fillinger, Dr. Billy Daley, Ms. Donna Harsh, Mr. Ed McNeil, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Ms. Esta Lou Riley, Ms. Rose Brungardt.

Members Absent: Dr. Steven Tramel, Mr. Keith Campbell, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Ms. June Krebs, Mr. Donald Jacobs, Dr. Suzanne Trauth.

Also Present: Mr. James Beck for Campbell, Ms. Sandria Godwin for Krebs, Ms. Calvina Thomas for Jacobs, Ms. Sandy Johnson.

There being no additions or corrections to the minutes, they were approved as distributed to the faculty.

II. Mr. Rupp introduced the Senate's special guest, Dr. Harold Eickhoff, Vice President for Academic Affairs, who on request from Mr. Rupp and the new Faculty Senate President, Dr. Charles Votaw, agreed to address the Faculty Senate and to answer questions from the floor.

Dr. Eickhoff expressed his thanks for the invitation and stated that he would spend a few minutes on his interest in the Faculty Senate and then receive questions as time permitted. He said he would be looking to the Faculty Senate for expressions of faculty concerns, not exclusively in that regard, but as "spokesbody", the voice of the faculty. Dr. Eickhoff felt that a strong Senate is an asset to any institution and would say more about that later.

Dr. Eickhoff reminded the Senate of his remarks to the faculty at the opening of the Fall Term. He said two things at that time which he felt should be repeated: (1) that any college cannot be strong without a strong faculty voice in the affairs of the institutions, and (2) that decisions from the Vice President's Office will be challenged from time to time and some of that challenge will come from the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Eickhoff stated he wished to move on to several points that will be matters of concern this year and in years to come.

(1) There has always been concern for the appropriate role of the Senate and that of administration in a collegiate institution. Dr. Eickhoff felt that absolute definitions of those roles are very difficult to arrive at and probably should not be attempted "with any great clarity." Each institution

should work out its own system and there should be an "evolutionary quality" about the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the Administration.

(2) The question of what is administration and what is policy has always generated concern. Dr. Eickhoff stated that administration has been delegated to the President and his staff. However, there is also a recognition within the institution of the faculty participation in formulating policy. Agreement can be gained on those points. The conflict usually arises over what really is administration versus what really is policy. Semantics and plain definitions are then involved because the formulation of policy often invades administrative prerogatives and administrative decisions often make policy. Dr. Eickhoff stressed that it is important for us to recognize that while policy formulation is the "legitimate preserve and prerogative of the Faculty Senate," the carrying out of policy (partly faculty recommendations and Board of Regent's policy) is "clearly the province of the administration." There is often an overlap, which then requires patience for the resolution of differences in opinion. Dr. Eickhoff added his hope that the Senate would never be a "Forum for taking cheap shots at the administration." The proper approach in areas of conflict is to resolve those differences on a personal level if possible through telephone calls and personal visits. He intends to follow such a procedure and hopes others will. Avoidance of the personal approach tends to produce "polarization," and "I believe in almost every instance, it tends to produce paralysis rather than productive efforts." Dr. Eickhoff stated he will begin "with a respect for the Faculty Senate and a respect for its role within the college and a hope that it is reciprocated." He added that he would like to repeat here what he said in his interview with the Search Committee when asked about his feelings on strong faculty input into the administrative side of the institution. "I said I feel fine about that; a college, I believe, cannot be strong unless it has good, solid faculty input into its operation, into its governance."

(3) Dr. Eickhoff made a final point, drawn from his earlier address to the faculty, in regard to "standards of performance." He believes he has high personal standards of performance and expects those he works with to have the same. In regard to the faculty this means a continued emphasis on "quality of instruction, quality of academic effort. And I just think that we cannot say that often enough, cannot remind ourselves often enough, cannot examine our standards often enough; it just cannot be done too much. Ultimately the test of whether this institution is worthy of its name is the quality of the education we give to our students. . . ." He added that we are in "perilous times in that regard because all the forces in higher education. . . are pushing in another direction," not higher quality but poorer quality. Dr. Eickhoff then reminded the Senate of the institution's funding, if enrollment goes up there is more money, if it goes down there is less, that is, formula budgeting. When numbers become the primary concern, a hard time preserving quality ensues. The question must necessarily arise "whether we are properly addressing the issue of keeping our enrollment stable or at least keeping it to the point where we do not damage ourselves financially on the one hand and still preserve and upgrade the quality of our offerings." He will cheer when he hears the faculty's concern for increasing the quality of the offerings at FHS and we will see him working very hard to enhance that quality.

III. Dr. Eickhoff left off his address at this point and opened the floor to questions.

Dr. Edwards asked what relationship Dr. Eickhoff sees between the "blue-ribbon task force" and the Faculty Senate?

Dr. Eickhoff answered that an honest response would be an "evolving relationship." The "task force" is to be a beginning, to develop a target for the institution. The decision to form the "task force" was fairly arbitrary, but only to get something moving, later to rely on the traditional lines of communication to develop specific programs and to implement the principles enumerated in the "task force" statement. He thought his answer might seem like "double-talk;" however, no particular arrangement has been made for implementation of any statement from the "task force." Various groups, students, faculty, towns-people, Regents, Regents' staff and political figures will be in on the planning; implementation will also involve various bodies, Faculty Senate, Student Senate, Administration, Alumni, working through implementation committees. Dr. Eickhoff does not believe that a new system of governance will emerge but that it should be considered along with many other matters.

Dr. Drinan posed three questions: What kind of time span does Dr. Eickhoff foresee for the Blue-ribbon Committee? How open does he think this process will be - will there be progress reports? What is going to be the relationship of the established Academic Long-Range Planning Committee to this blue-ribbon Committee?

Dr. Eickhoff answered that in regard to the timetable, since good time has been made so far, he might expect a completed document around April 1st or a little sooner. The process will be for the Blue-ribbon Committee to come up with a statement from its meeting Sept. 30th and Oct. 1st. Secondly, the Statement will be distributed across the campus community and beyond. Thirdly, the statement with those revisions will be considered, from which will emerge a second draft, which will go through the same process. Dr. Eickhoff assumes a final draft would then emerge from the Committee. He said there will be open, public hearings on the campus toward the end of the first and the beginning of the second semester. Finally, the document would be recommended to the President, with any minority reports. As regards the Long-Range Planning Committee, Dr. Eickhoff sees it as the coordinator of the various committees working toward implementation of the Statement. He envisions the LRPC as the most prestigious and most important committee on campus as it will pull together all the efforts to give them a sense of direction.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked if Dr. Eickhoff visualizes the Statement of the Blue-ribbon Committee as a very specific document as a general, philosophical document?

Dr. Eickhoff replied, it would be the latter, quite general, probably less than ten pages, double-spaced typescript. He thought it might be like the Ten Commandments, (Laughter) or Luther's Small Catechism, where the Ten Commandments are followed by a half page of meaning. The task of the committees will be to produce the pages of implementation for the broad, philosophical statement. There will be some insecurity as the document will seem ambiguous; however, plenty of time will be available for explanation.

Dr. Zakrewski asked how large the Blue-ribbon Task Force is?

Dr. Eickhoff answered that the group is about thirty people, nearly half faculty, Department Chairmen are heavily represented as they represent excellent choices with their in-between status.

Dr. Robertson asked if Dr. Eickhoff has any particular goals for the college until the general statement of direction is forthcoming?

Dr. Eickhoff replied that he has. Those goals are the priorities that he has set up for his office in the meantime. He will "develop a rational system of evaluation through the entire academic side of the college," to define the role of the Deans and their accountability, the role of Department Chairmen and of faculty members. It is not meant to "strike terror" but to be helpful. Dr. Eickhoff is concerned about what seems a rather ambiguous framework for the evaluation of faculty performance. Evaluation of us all is inescapable; it is Regent's policy, perhaps even Kansas law, that no salary increases may be given other than for merit. Therefore, he intends to provide all with a definition of evaluation that will help them understand why they receive twice the salary increase they expected. (Laughter).

Dr. Miller asked if Dr. Eickhoff envisioned the time when administrators will be evaluated?

Dr. Eickhoff replied that such was unavoidable. There cannot be one set of rules for faculty and another for administration. He expects President Tomanek to inform him of the reasons for his own re-appointment next year, that hopefully the President will consult with the Deans, faculty, community and perhaps even family (usually his strong supporters) and take all the information into account. Deans should be evaluated by Department Chairmen and faculty.

Mr. McNeil asked if Dr. Eickhoff would entertain suggestions on evaluation of administration?

Dr. Eickhoff answered that he would accept suggestions and assumed they would come with fairness and objectivity.

He added that there are other areas of concern besides evaluation of performance. One area of concern is the library. Dr. Eickhoff wonders if the support we have been giving the library is not foolish in the long run. He is now examining the library's condition, "to see what is going to happen in the library if we continue to behave toward it as we have for the last two or three years . . . five years down the road."

He expressed concern about the computers center and its support to the academic community. The budgeting process is another concern. To Dr. Eickhoff it only makes sense to evaluate a budget as it supports programs rather than concentrate on line items so that one does not inadvertently make cuts in line items of the budget, only to discover too late that such cuts were a serious mistake.

Dr. Eickhoff cited Continuing Education, particularly the off-campus program, as another area of concern. He feels that we cannot ignore the significance

in the number of off-campus enrollments. We cannot ignore the College's responsibility to take courses where people will enroll in them. There may be some physical obstacles such as distance but potential enrollment must not be ignored. As the on-campus enrollment continues to decline, the off-campus enrollment takes up the slack. We must look at the continuing education market if we are going to keep our enrollment of quality students.

Ms. Veed asked Dr. Eickhoff what he sees as the role of the faculty in these budget decisions, particularly when cuts come around increasingly?

Dr. Eickhoff replied that regarding departmental requests he tended to see them as primarily administrative exercises. By that he means that he would not look to the faculty for advice where to cut the budget. He would look to the Deans and the Department Chairmen. Pressure would be maintained on the Deans and through them the Department Chairmen to make the judgments wisely and he will assume they are making them in consultation with the faculty. Dr. Eickhoff added that he has informed the Faculty Senate of some of his concerns which he will address this year through his office. He would also like to know whether these are the areas of concern that he should be addressing, are there more, or are they "non-problem" areas?

Mr. Rupp asked whether there is any possible way that certain administrative offices or functions in certain offices might be consolidated?

Dr. Eickhoff asked Mr. Rupp if he had anything specific in mind?

Mr. Rupp replied that he was thinking of alumni, housing--those kinds of areas. Is there any possibility of combining certain areas like these?

Dr. Eickhoff answered that for an institution of this size, the organization reflects three areas of administration which can be seen separately, though under the leadership of the President. One is the academic area, which is the largest and in our institution includes the area of student affairs, housing and that whole array. The second area is business affairs which is the physical plant, custodial services, bookkeeping, etc. The third general area is the public side of the college, which ordinarily includes public relations and fund raising. This is the organization of FHS and Dr. Eickhoff feels it is properly so organized. Did Mr. Rupp have something more specific?

Mr. Rupp answered that it was probably more specific.

Dr. Eickhoff replied that if one were to start a brand new institution, with no history and no personalities attached to it, one might make a few changes. However, he believes in a reasonable pace for anything. "A meat-axe approach for an institution this size is, almost without exception, going to turn out bad." He likes to think of his "approach to administration as a very patient one, but with the clock running,...you know there is a time when the alarm goes off." Problem areas should be identified and a reasonable time appointed to resolve those problems. "Sometimes, as we all know, you just wait until nature takes its course. On that I will conclude, Mr. President." Dr. Eickhoff left the meeting.

IV. Mr. Rupp announced that before he bowed out as President of the Faculty Senate, he would like to thank all members of the Senate for cooperation in the past. He especially thanked the Executive Committee and Vera Thomas for her excellent work as Secretary and finally Betty Wolfe for her work in assisting us with secretarial duties in June and July. Thank you very much. Mr. Rupp then turned over the meeting to Dr. Charles Votaw, Faculty Senate President for 1976-77.

V. Dr. Votaw announced as the first order of business, the election of Vice-president and Secretary. Before proceeding to an election of Vice-president, Dr. Votaw called attention to some corrections of the Faculty Senate list of members. The Math Dept. is now entitled to two members and Ms. Ellen Veed is the second representative from Mathematics. Ms. Sue Trauth will replace Dr. Isaac Catt for the Speech Department.

Dr. Votaw then opened nominations for Vice-President.

Dr. Miller nominated Ms. Ellen Veed.

Dr. Zakrzewski nominated Dr. Cliff Edwards.

Dr. Miller suggested that a second is required for nominations.

Dr. Votaw answered that normally nominations are not seconded.

Dr. Frerer nominated Dr. Rick Zakrzewski.

Dr. Votaw called for further nominations.

Dr. Drinan moved that nominations cease and the motion was seconded by Dr. Miller.

Dr. Votaw put the question and it carried.

Dr. Robertson asked if an absolute majority of those voting or of the entire membership is required for election.

Dr. Votaw stated that by precedent absolute majority of those voting is required.

Mr. Dan Rupp and Ms. Vera Thomas acted as tellers and tallied the votes for Vice-President:

Ms. Ellen Veed 12

Dr. Rick Zakrzewski 10

Dr. Cliff Edwards 6

Dr. Votaw announced a run-off election was necessary between Ms. Veed and Dr. Zakrzewski.

Ms. Ellen Veed was elected Vice-President of the Faculty Senate for 1976-77.

Dr. Votaw introduced discussion concerning the duties of the Faculty Senate Secretary. The Senate meeting was being tape recorded because President Tomanek had agreed in principle that the Secretary should not have to actually record the minutes of the meeting. A classified person is not available for taking the minutes and the President will supply someone to transcribe the tape for the Senate Secretary. Several members expressed their views in agreement with Dr. Votaw that the Senate Secretary should not have to sit and take notes in the meeting. Dr. Votaw feels that the Secretary should approve and distribute the minutes. The By-laws only require the Secretary to keep the minutes, not record the minutes.

Dr. Edwards nominated Ms. Esta Lou Riley for Faculty Senate Secretary.

Dr. Drinan nominated Dr. Allan Busch.

Dr. Zakrzewski moved that nominations cease and Dr. Drinan seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw asked for any discussion on the question.

Dr. Busch stated his objection to his name placed in nomination because if the taping system fails and there is no classified person to take the minutes, he will not be able to perform the duties of Secretary.

Dr. Votaw asked for any further discussion.

Dr. Smith expressed his wish that Dr. Busch's concerns are taken care of. He asked whether someone nominated must give consent to serve if elected?

Dr. Votaw referred the question to Mr. Ginther, who confirmed that by sections of the By-laws, any nominee must give assent to serve before they may be elected.

Dr. Votaw then asked Dr. Busch if he wished to accept his nomination.

Dr. Busch replied that under the conditions expressed by Dr. Votaw on the duties of the Secretary he would accept nomination.

Dr. Votaw called for further discussion on the question to close nominations for Secretary.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked whether the Vice-President and Secretary serve on standing committees?

Dr. Votaw replied that generally they do not. They serve on the Executive Committee and the officers appoint the standing committees. There is no reason why they may not, however.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked whether it would cause a hardship to postpone the election of Secretary until the Senate President could explore the possibility of acquiring a classified secretary, or someone who can take shorthand?

Mr. Rupp stated that he feels the administration had already committed itself last fall to providing some assistance. The only reason it was not done last fall was because Vera Thomas preferred to take the minutes herself.

Ms. Thomas replied that she was willing to do it. If she were to be responsible for the minutes, she preferred to record them. However, assurances were given last fall that civil service personnel would be furnished. The only reason somebody was not here was because no one was available right today.

Dr. Votaw stated that was not correct. President Tomanek does not have any civil service personnel available; his alternative was to try taping the minutes. There is a commitment to assist in taping the minutes and transcribing the tapes.

Dr. Busch inquired why if the Graduate Council is entitled to a professional secretary, the Faculty Senate is not?

Dr. Votaw stated that President Tomanek sees no reason why the Faculty Senate should not have such a person; the problem is that none are available.

The Graduate Council is served by the Graduate Dean's secretary.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked whether each department now had a secretary and perhaps one of those individuals could be used at each meeting?

Dr. Votaw said it was not true that each department had a classified secretary.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked whether, for the few meetings the Senate has during the year, a different person might be assigned each time?

Ms. Thomas stated that it would be extremely difficult for a new person to record the minutes at each meeting. Consistency would be a major problem.

Dr. Votaw said that the Senate does at least have a commitment from the administration to attempt something.

Dr. Drinan suggested that the Senate proceed with the election of the Secretary. Dr. Votaw said that officers may resign if they feel they cannot perform their duties. He then put the question to close nominations for Secretary. The motion carried.

Mr. Rupp and Ms. Thomas acted as tellers for the election of Secretary. Dr. Allan Busch was elected Secretary of the Faculty Senate for 1976-77.

VI. Dr. Votaw made the following announcements.

The KU Executive Committee Minutes state that the Vice-Chancellor has interpreted the 30 days sick leave in the Regents' policy as 30 calendar days rather than working days. Dr. Votaw is not convinced that interpretation is correct.

The Regents have issued a new "Policy and Procedures Manual", only recently published and adopted in July 1976. Dr. Votaw called attention to the section on tenure and fringe benefits for part-time faculty. It is sufficiently vague that the administration may find part-time faculty may or may not be entitled to fringe benefits.

The Regents on August 13 approved \$4880 from the Emergency Maintenance Repair Fund to rebuild the air-conditioner compressor in Malloy Hall.

The enrollment dates for 1977-78 have been established. They are still subject to change; as of now those dates are: June 1st, June 14th, June 28th, July 12th and July 14th.

The FHS report on the proposed new classroom building should be presented to the Regents this week.

The Regents confirmed that classes will be held on November 11th (Veterans' Day), despite the governor's order giving state employees a holiday. Classes will be held. However, classified personnel will have the day off.

Dr. Procter of Kansas State College of Pittsburg is expected to recommend to COCAO at their next meeting that the second semester begin somewhat earlier in January.

Summer enrollment at FHS was down 377 from 1975. The drop was due partly to a workshop not being held, which will be held next year and bring the enrollment up again.

Information as of September 1st indicated that FHS enrollment was down 22 from last year. Emporia was down 200. Pittsburg was down about 200. Wichita claimed theirs was "mixed" but probably down about 200. K-State is up 300-400. KU is up at least 600, perhaps 1000. The increases appear to be at the freshman, sophomore and graduate levels, decreases at junior and senior level. At FHS there is a slight drop at the graduate level. The figures are strictly body not FTE.

Work on the College Catalogue is to begin soon and materials should be submitted now for inclusion.

The State Board of Education will evaluate our Education Program next spring. This evaluation is for all the Regents' institutions and they are beginning with FHS in the spring.

Mr. Rupp and Dr. Votaw discussed with President Tomanek and Dr. Eickhoff the changes in the Faculty Handbook and other matters discussed in the Senate last year. Many of the suggested changes have been approved. Others were not acted upon because the President could not gain enough sense from the minutes to make an evaluation of what the Senate wanted. The College Affairs Committee will have to put those changes into a form which the President can use to approve or disapprove them. President Tomanek did approve the substitution of "supervisor" for "superior" in the Handbook. President Tomanek has also agreed to consider whether a faculty member may choose textbooks without the Department Chairman's approval but that the Chairman must be informed of all selections. Faculty might then place textbook orders so long as the Chairman has been informed.

At 5:00 P.M., September 8th, there were 4523 students on campus by headcount. There were an estimated 643 enrolled in Continuing Education by headcount; the total then being 5166, compared to 5141 last year. As of September 8th, FHS was 25 students above last year. Continuing Education figures may be a little low but the on-campus figure is accurate. There may be a few more enrollments and some withdrawals. The projected FTE figures, which are not firm, run about 4565 compared with 4527 last year.

VII. Dr. Votaw concluded his announcements and moved to committee business. He stated that the By-laws require the Senate officers to appoint the standing committees and temporary chairpersons. Every member serves on a committee and there are four such committees. Each committee elects its own officers (chairperson and secretary). The permanent chairpersons then join the officers to form the Executive Committee. The By-laws specify the numbers to serve on each committee and tradition has been to achieve a balance among the old divisions on each committee. Hopefully, each member may have the first choice of committee. Wednesday, September 15th, is the deadline to make a committee preference.

Dr. Votaw then explained the duties of the various committees to give the members an idea of which committee they preferred.

Dr. Robertson asked if the By-laws Committee is the appropriate committee for sorting the responses of the administration to previous Senate proposals?

Dr. Votaw responded that he was not sure. Probably it would depend upon which committee submitted the proposal. He is inclined to allow the committees to consider the responses to their own proposals.

VIII. Dr. Votaw introduced committee reports.

Dr. Zakrzewski reported for the Academic Affairs Committee. The Academic Affairs Committee submitted for Senate approval, the following courses : Art 600, Problems in Art Therapy; Business 348, Principles of Real Estate; Business 547, Business Uses of Life and Health Insurance; Music 291, Rock

Music; Music 293, Jazz. He stated that the Business courses were intended solely for Continuing Education. Music 291 is already offered as "Rock, Folk, and Jazz", but will now be "Rock" and 391 will be offered for General Education. The Academic Affairs Committee moves acceptance of these courses by the Senate. Dr. Busch seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw put the question and called for discussion. There being no discussion, the question was put and it carried.

Dr. Zakrzewski commented that the Department Chairmen would save the departments and the committee much time if the application forms for new courses were filled out completely and correctly. They also require the Dean's signature and a complete HEGIS number.

Dr. Votaw stated in regard to the applications for new courses that Dr. Eickhoff had a mild objection to the Senate requirements for new courses going out without his seeing them first as he considers it administrative business. Dr. Votaw agrees with Dr. Eickhoff on this matter. Despite the fact that some of the rules were established by the Academic Affairs Committee for its internal operation.

Dr. Votaw and Dr. Eickhoff would like to have seen the rules before they were issued. Dr. Votaw sent the rules on new course procedures to the Department Chairmen.

Dr. Busch said that the Academic Affairs Committee had made the rules before Dr. Eickhoff became the Vice-President so the committee did not know his wishes in that regard.

Dr. Votaw said he understood that, but possibly it would give the Senate some idea of what Dr. Eickhoff considers policy and administration.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked if Dr. Eickhoff had any particular objection to the rules? Dr. Votaw answered, no, only to make a point of what the difference between policy and administration was.

Dr. Votaw then called on Dr. Frerer for the College Affairs Committee.

Dr. Zakrzewski informed the chair that Dr. Frerer had left the meeting and that he did have some business from the College Affairs Committee but which could wait until a later time.

Dr. Votaw announced that one of the matters College Affairs must attend to is pulling together some items discussed previously and bring them before the Senate again.

Dr. Votaw then called on the Student Affairs Committee. Dr. Adams, the chairman, is on leave and Dr. Smith has replaced him, which does not mean Dr. Smith is chairman of Student Affairs, of course. He called for any member of Student Affairs to report. There was no report.

Dr. Votaw then called on Mr. Ginther to report for the By-laws and Rules Committee. Mr. Ginther said there was no report.

IX. Dr. Votaw called for Old Business. There was no Old Business.

X. Dr. Votaw then opened the floor to New Business. He announced that the Senate has been requested to approve an alteration in the Class Schedule for the Student Counselor-Principal Conference, to be held Tuesday, November 16th. The alteration is to be the usual one, to shorten morning classes, up to 1:00 P.M., by ten minutes out of fifty and fifteen out of seventy-five in all classes before 1:00 P.M., Tuesday, November 16th.

Dr. Drinan moved that Dr. Votaw's report be accepted, and Mr. Rupp seconded the motion. There being no further discussion, Dr. Votaw put the question, and it carried.

Dr. Votaw announced that the Faculty Senate on March 8, 1976, directed the Faculty Senate President to invite the Student Senate President to appoint student representatives to participate ex officio on each of the Faculty Senate committee. It is not clear whether the directive was to be a standing rule or only for the 1975-76 Senate.

Dr. Busch suggested the matter be referred to the By-laws Committee for a report.

Dr. Votaw stated that was the procedure for a standing rule; however, if the rule was only for one year, it should return to Student Affairs where it came from. If it is to be a standing rule, then the By-laws and Rules Committee must consider the rule.

Dr. Votaw then asked for any objections to the By-laws Committee considering the rule. There were no objections and it was so ordered.

Dr. Votaw announced that also in the March 8, 1976, meeting the issue of student evaluation of faculty was sent to the College Affairs Committee. He felt that the matter had been referred to committee with no intention that the committee act on it.

Dr. Robertson, a member of college Affairs, stated that the committee had discussed student evaluation of faculty and concluded that the Faculty Senate was not really concerned as long as the evaluations were not to be used for administrative purposes.

Dr. Votaw acknowledged Dr. Robertson's remarks, but added that the intention of the evaluations was in fact that they be used for administrative purposes. He added that at present the issue is probably a dead one in the Student Senate. They may or may not revive it; but there seems little inclination now to do so.

Dr. Votaw introduced discussion of Article 4, Sect. 2 of the By-laws, wherein it is stated that the previous year's Senate President is to preside at the first meeting of the following year. Dr. Votaw wanted some clarification of this rule because the By-laws are not clear on when the change in Presidents is to take place. With no objections, Dr. Votaw referred the matter to the By-laws Committee for a report and recommendation.

Dr. Votaw presented another problem arising from Article 6, Sect. 4b of the By-laws, which states no member of the Senate may serve on more than one other college body. What is an "other body"? Does the rule mean a member may not serve on more than one campus committee? If so, the rule has been violated often and will continue to be violated. With no objections, the matter was referred to the By-laws Committee for a report.

Dr. Votaw then asked whether clarification of Article 3, Sect. 3c of Part I of the By-laws is in order? The section concerns the increase in a department's representation on the Senate through the addition of new faculty. Senators are to be elected by the third week in April to serve for the following year. Should seats in the Senate created by the addition of new faculty be treated as vacancies in the new year? The Biology Dept. has such a vacancy now. However, the rules state Senators are to be elected by the third week in April for the following year. Has the Senate violated the rule in seating new Senators elected after the third week in April. If such elections are conducted under the provisions for vacancies, then the rules have been complied with.

Mr. Ginther stated that he felt a vacancy has been created by the addition of new faculty.

Dr. Votaw had no objection to Mr. Ginther's interpretation and that if there are no objections, he directs that the Senate Minutes formally state that in the future when new Senate seats are created by the addition of new faculty after the third week in April, those seats will be considered vacancies to be filled for a three year term.

Mr. Ginther stated that some rewording of the statement would be necessary.

Dr. Votaw agreed and referred the drafting of a statement on the matter to the By-laws Committee. Dr. Robertson suggested that By-laws Committee also consider the removal of senate seats should the number of faculty in a department fall below the number for two or more seats.

Dr. Votaw agreed and it was so ordered.

Dr. Robertson further questioned what procedure would be followed should the number of faculty fall during the term of a Senator?

Dr. Votaw referred the question to the By-laws Committee.

Dr. Votaw announced that the feelings of the Senate should be expressed on preliminaries to the selection of seniors to "Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities". With no objections, the matter was referred to the Student Affairs Committee.

Dr. Votaw introduced the question of the Faculty Senate President's appointments to the College Tenure Committee. Dr. Votaw's final tenure hearing is to be conducted this year and he sees a conflict of interest, should he appoint members to the committee. Therefore, he proposed that the Academic Affairs Committee, which as constituted for 1975-76 contains the largest number of tenured faculty, should select the faculty appointments to the College Tenure Committee. He added that Dr. Busch is the only non-tenured member of the Academic Affairs Committee, and he would be exempted from participation in the committee action. Six appointments are to be made.

Mr. Ginther moved acceptance of Dr. Votaw's proposal that the Academic Affairs Committee make the selection of appointments to the College Tenure Committee for 1976-77.

Dr. Robertson seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw then called for discussion.

Dr. Edwards asked if the appointments must come from the Faculty Senate?

Dr. Votaw answered, no, only from tenured faculty members at large.

Ms. Veed asked if appointments must be tenured, full professors?

Dr. Votaw replied that they probably need only be tenured faculty, at least assistant professors and three-years service or more. However, President Tomanek or Dr. Eickhoff, whoever make the final approval, will decide; but appointments should at least be tenured to avoid conflict of interest.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Votaw put the question and it carried.

Dr. Votaw announced that the officers will be appointing the standing Committees and temporary chairpersons for 1976-77. The committees must then meet within two weeks of the last Faculty Senate Meeting (that is, by Monday, September 27th) to elect permanent officers (chairman and secretary). An Executive Committee meeting will then be held to determine the agenda of the next Faculty Senate meeting, which will be Tuesday, October 11th at 3:30 P.M. in the Santa Fe Room. Following meetings will be Monday, November 8th and Tuesday, December 7th.

Dr. Drinan moved that the Faculty Senate enter in the minutes its thanks to Mr. Dan Rupp, the retiring Senate President and the members of the Executive Committee for a "job well done last year."

Dr. Miller seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion. There being no discussion, he put the question and it carried.

There being no further New Business, Dr. Votaw asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Ginther moved adjournment and Dr. Drinan seconded the motion. With no objections, Dr. Votaw adjourned the meeting at 5:37 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan Busch
Secretary