

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

11-8-1976

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, November 8, 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, November 8, 1976" (1976). *Faculty Senate*. 659.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/659

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

November 8, 1976

Dr. Charles Votaw, Faculty Senate President, called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. in the Santa Fe Room of the Memorial Union.

The Secretary called the Senate Roll and the following members were present:

Dr. Clifford Edwards, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Sue Trauth, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Wallis Harris, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Charles Votaw, Ms. Ellen Veed, Dr. Stanley Robertson, Mr. Dale Peier, Ms. Vera Thomas, Dr. Allan Busch, Dr. Ron Smith, Mr. Keith Campbell, Dr. Billy Daley, Ms. Donna Harsh, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Ms. June Krebs, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Ms. Esta Lou Riley, Ms. Rose Brungardt, Dr. Louis Fillinger.

Those members absent:

Ms. Joanne Harwick, Mr. Mike Walker, Dr. Stephen Tramel, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Patrick Drinan, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Mr. Donald Jacobs.

Others present were:

Mr. Richard Heil for Drinan, Mr. William Rickman for Rupp, Mr. James Scott for Johnson, Mr. Gary Hennerberg (State College Leader).

Dr. Votaw called for additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting.

Dr. Ed Shearer, member for the Chemistry Department, was inadvertently omitted from the list of those present at the October 12, 1976, meeting. His name was added to the list of those present.

Dr. Busch, Senate Secretary, requested the addition of the name of the member who moved to table the question on the General Education Committee at the end of the October 12, 1976, meeting. No member claimed responsibility.

Dr. Votaw asked for a correction to page seven, paragraph five, sentence two; for "these" read "those."

There were no further additions or corrections to the minutes of the previous meeting and Dr. Votaw directed the minutes to stand as corrected.

Dr. Votaw announced his new procedure for giving the Faculty Senate President's Announcements. In the future he will distribute his Announcements and members may ask questions concerning the Announcements. The Announcements will then be entered in the minutes of the meeting. His intention in this procedure is to save time in Senate meetings.

Faculty Senate President's Announcements:

1. There will be a general faculty meeting on Monday, 4:00 p.m., November 15, at which time Kent Alm, of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, will address the faculty and copies of the proposed statement as to the Destiny of Fort Hays State will be distributed.
2. Our administration is pushing the Board of Regents for more faculty travel money.

3. COCAO has approved an Associate in Applied Science degree at KSU. It is to be a 2-year terminal degree and may accept up to 25 hours in Vo-Tech courses. If we have such programs under consideration, now might be a good time to submit them.
4. Proposed Continuing Education fees are \$27 per hour for graduate courses and \$18 per hour for undergraduate courses, except that in the case of undergraduate courses the fee may be lowered to out-of-county rates. These are to be effective July 1, 1977.
5. By FY 80, state funding is to be based on the FY average enrollment, rather than Fall enrollment. (This is only a proposal. CV)
6. Kay Dey has compiled a list of Faculty Senate motions from Fall, 1969, through Summer, 1975. President Tomanek has gone through this list and responded to those he felt needed responses. In addition, I have gone through the list and have asked about most of those I thought needed responses. The others will be discussed with the President later. Many of the policies called for by the Senate motions have already been put into practice, so no action by the President seemed necessary.

I report here on those not in operation, and not covered by subsequent action, and those I considered worthy of note.

- a. 11-24-69: Requests for class schedule alterations should be submitted at least three weeks before the classes are to be altered. Approved by the President.
- b. 12-01-69: Department chairmen should be made responsible for enforcing college policy regarding dismissal of classes prior to vacation. Approved by the President.
- c. 12-15-69: Deans should appoint Faculty Senate Committee to work with Student Council on the possible change of the name of the college mascot. The President suggests resubmittal if still desired.
- d. 04-19-71: A document entitled "Tenure Policies and Procedures" was adopted. This seems to be covered by later motions, so no action deemed necessary by the President.
- e. 11-11-71: A document entitled "Code of Professional Ethics of Fort Hays Kansas State College" was adopted. Along with this document, in the library file, was another document, "Fort Hays Kansas State College Procedures for the Implementation of Ethics Policy." The President suggests that these be reconsidered by the Senate, if there is still interest in them. (The Code might be acceptable, but the implementation procedures almost surely would not be. CV)
- f. 01-19-72: Faculty participation in departmental budgets should be college policy. Concept approved by the President, but he does not wish to make a formal statement requiring such participation. He will, however, give attention to how the departmental budget was developed and whether there was faculty participation.

November 8, 1976

- g. 01-19-72: The formal Intersession should be abandoned. The President believes we should maintain the option of offering appropriate courses during this time, hence does not approve this motion.
- h. 02-28-72: There should be no transcript notation of audit. The President would like to consider this further. (I think we should let him know if we still want this policy adopted. CV)
- i. 02-28-72: Commencement should include only those expected to graduate by the end of the corresponding Spring semester. The President would like to consider this further. (Again, we should let him know if we still want this policy adopted. Also, I am to bring this up at a COO meeting for input by the Deans. CV)
- j. 03-27-72: Abolish mid-semester grades. The President asks the Senate to reconsider this, if action is desired.
- k. 10-17-72: Tagged degrees should be retained. There seems to be some confusion here. Certain degrees are tagged and if these are all that are to be retained, then no action is required. But, as a general policy, we seem never to have had tagged degrees. Thus, some clarification seems in order if the Senate desires further action.
- l. 01-29-74: Each department should establish guidelines for salary determination, and Senate accepts the document, as published in handbook, as a possible guideline. The President approves the policy of each department establishing guidelines for salary determination and agrees that the document published in the handbook is appropriate for departments to use as a guide in drafting their own guidelines.
- m. 02-11-74: Guidelines for mini-courses were adopted. Approved by the President.
- n. 04-08-74: In document entitled, "Evaluative Criteria for Faculty Performance and Tenure," change "tenure would be reviewed" to "the performance of tenured faculty should be reviewed periodically." Approved by the President.
- o. 06-24-74: Parents' Day participation by departments and faculty should be voluntary. Disapproved by the President. He feels that participation in regularly-scheduled events of the college is part of the job.
- p. 07-23-74: Procedures for Hearing and Appeals adopted. Approved by the President.
- q. 07-23-74: The document "Procedures for Hearings and Appeals" to be published in faculty handbook, if approved. No action. (I need to discuss this further with the President. CV)
- r. 02-27-75: Procedures for Hearings and Appeals amended to clarify situation when department chairman and Dean are same person. No action. (I need to discuss this further with the President. CV)
- s. 02-27-75: Guidelines for Salary Determination amended to indicate people to be consulted in case of differences regarding faculty salary

November 8, 1976

recommendation. Approved by the President. (This will be covered again with proposed handbook revisions. CV)

- t. Faculty should be involved in allocation and reallocation of faculty and the Personnel Committee is to be advisory to the President when additions to, or reductions in, faculty are to be made. Approved by the President.

7. Some Faculty Senate actions since Summer, 1975, are reported on below.

- a. 05-17-76: The last day to withdraw from a regular class during a regular semester to be six weeks prior to last day of examinations. Summer term and short-term course withdrawals to be on proportional basis. Approved by the President.
- b. 05-17-76: Numerous proposed amendments to the handbook adopted. These will be covered by submitting all proposals again at one time, in context. Many of these were previously reacted to by the President and some have since been changed. (These have been compiled by College Affairs Committee. CV)
- c. 10-12-76: Textbook adoptions are prerogative of faculty member, but department chairman places order with bookstore. Concept approved by the President, but this is an amendment to a statement in the handbook which leaves the rest of the statement making little sense. Also, the department chairman should be protected from "last-minute" changes. (This is covered by a College Affairs Committee proposal changing the entire handbook statement. CV)
- d. 10-12-76: The Faculty Senate President shall invite the Student Senate President to appoint a non-voting student representative to each Faculty Senate Committee. Approved by the President.

8. From the Board of Regents' minutes of 10-15-76:

- a. Official FTE enrollments at six state colleges and universities are:

KU	Up	562
KSU	Up	339
WSU	Down	575
EKSC	Down	343
KSCP	Down	237
FHS	Up	32
State Total	Down	222

- b. Adjustments to previous FTE estimates for next fall are:

KU	Up	810
KSU	Up	419
WSU	Down	428
EKSC	Down	300
KSCP	Down	131
FHS	Up	75

November 8, 1976

- c. No positions will be lost until faculty to student ratios are 1-15 at KU and KSU, 1-18 at WSU and 1-20 at EKSC, KSCP, and FHS. Operating expenses decrease will be based on \$240 per FTE at KU, KSU, and WSU; and \$220 per FTE at EKCS, KSCP, and FHS.
- d. Institutions are authorized to increase old retirees payments by 15%.
- e. Meet and confer discussions between KSCP faculty and the Board of Regents are restricted to salary this year with other matters deferred to next year.
- f. FHS is to hire a consultant to update its long range physical plan.
- g. FHS is authorized to buy a new 12-passenger van for Women's Athletics.
- h. David Adams, of FHS, is appointed as a consultant for the High School Publications Workshop at KSU.
- i. FHS' FY 77 remodeling allocation is amended to take \$1000 from dust collection system changes in Davis Hall and use it for wiring changes at Lewis Field and to take \$3900 from tennis court resurfacing and use it to replace nets, backboards, toe boards and concrete approaches of tennis courts.

There followed questions from the floor on the Announcements.

Dr. Robertson asked whether the abolition of mid-semester grades (see Announcements, 6j) had been approved or disapproved.

Dr. Votaw replied that President Tomanek requested the Faculty Senate to reconsider the matter. If the Senate still wants that abolition, it should submit the matter again.

Dr. Robertson further inquired if the Senate had actually formally approved that abolition.

Dr. Votaw answered that the Senate had done so in March, 1972.

Ms. Thomas asked why the Senate action on the time to withdraw from classes (see Announcements, 7a), which was approved by the President, was not implemented.

Dr. Votaw replied that actually President Tomanek had approved the action in principle; however, the absence of a method for communication of such actions delayed a formal approval. That matter would be taken up later in the meeting.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked why departmental course offerings approved by the Senate were not listed among those actions approved by the President.

Dr. Votaw answered that because those courses were already being offered, there was no point in pursuing the matter further.

Dr. Miller asked why in Announcements, 6m, the term "mini-courses" was used when mini-courses no longer exist. Do the guidelines now apply to short-term courses?

Dr. Votaw replied that perhaps 6m is moot because short-term courses now follow the approval procedure for all other regular course offerings.

November 8, 1976

Dr. Frerer referred to Announcements, 5, and asked how the new funding for FY 80 will affect FHS.

Dr. Votaw said that he was not certain how it would affect FHS.

Dr. Frerer replied that the Spring Enrollment was traditionally much lower than that of the Fall.

Dr. Votaw stated that he was not certain of the formula which will be applied in FY 80 so he could not say how it will affect FHS. Presumably, Summer Enrollment and Intersession Enrollment will also be allowed in the base, which will make Intersession worthwhile in terms of student credit hour production.

Dr. Votaw then announced the seating of Dr. John Watson as the second member for the Biology Department. He added that Biology has been entitled to a second member for some time but had not exercised that right under the Senate Bylaws. As Ms. Veed had been seated earlier in the year in a similar circumstance and as there were no objections from the floor, Dr. Watson was recognized as seated.

Dr. Votaw called for any other announcements. There were none.

Dr. Votaw then called for Committee Reports.

Dr. Zakrzewski reported for the Academic Affairs Committee. The committee had submitted to the members a list of courses approved by the committee. He moved their approval by the Senate, with the stipulation that Physics 331, 332, 333, be renumbered to the 200 level as those courses are primarily directed to persons of sophomore standing.

1. Earth Sciences 562, Paleontology of the Lower Vertebrates.
2. Earth Sciences 563, Paleontology of the Higher Vertebrates.
3. Earth Sciences 675, Aerial Photographs and Remote Sensing.
4. Physics 276, Applied Technician Practicum.
5. Physics 331, Electronic Components, Transducers, and Basic Circuits.*
6. Physics 332, Analog and Digital Electronics.*
7. Physics 333, Instrumentation.*
8. Chemistry 284, Selected Studies in Chemistry.
9. Chemistry 562, Biochemistry I.
10. Chemistry 564, Biochemistry II.

* Courses must be renumbered to 200 level for approval.

Mr. Ginther seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion on the recommended courses.

There was no discussion and Dr. Votaw put the question and it carried.

Dr. Votaw asked if the Academic Affairs Committee would be prepared to report on the matter of the General Education Committee at the next meeting of the Senate.

Dr. Zakrzewski replied that the committee would be prepared to report on the matter at the next meeting.

Mr. Ginther reported for the Bylaws and Rules Committee. He called attention to the proposed changes in the Bylaws as distributed to the members in campus mail. He proposed to consider the changes in two parts and moved the following changes as Part I:

Part I

Article III, Section 3, Part C:

Present wording:

C. Method of election.

- (1) They shall be elected not later than the third school week in April for the term of office to begin at the opening of the following fall semester.
- (2) Faculty members not attached to a department and those holding joint appointments may choose the department in which they wish to vote, provided that no faculty member may vote in more than one department.
- (3) Each department shall elect representatives in a meeting at which there shall be nominations from the floor and written ballots which are counted at the meeting.

Revised as follows:

Article III, Section 3, Part C:

- (1) previous provision No. 3 renumbered.
- (2) previous provision No. 1 renumbered; also change first word They to Representatives.

Add:

- (3) If a department becomes entitled to an additional representative after the April election, the department shall elect its additional representative prior to the first fall meeting of the Faculty Senate.
- (4) previous provision No. 2 renumbered.

Article VI, Section 4, b:

Present wording:

- b. Each Senate member, except the officers, shall either serve on one standing committee, or serve as representative of the Senate on or with one other body, and no Senate member shall serve on more than one other body.

Revised as follows:

- b. Each Senate member, except the officers, shall serve on one standing committee and may serve as a representative of the Senate on no more than one other campus committee.

Article V, Section 8:

Section 8. Standing Rules

Present wording:

The Faculty Senate may, upon two-thirds vote of the Senate, adopt, amend, or repeal Standing Rules governing its operations.

Revised as follows:

- a. The Faculty Senate, may, upon two-thirds vote of the Senate, adopt amend, or repeal Standing Rules governing its operation.
- b. A Record of Standing Rules will be kept and made available, as are the Bylaws.

Article IV, Section 4, c (2): (regarding Senate minutes.)

Present wording:

- (2) distribute them to the faculty within a week after each meeting.

Revised as follows:

- (2) distribute them to the faculty (no later than)* one week prior to the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting.

*amendment moved by Dr. Robertson.

Dr. Frerer seconded Mr. Ginther's motion.

Dr. Robertson then proposed a friendly amendment to the wording of Article IV, Section 4, Part c (2), to read "distribute them to the faculty no later than one week prior to the next regularly scheduled Senate meeting."

Mr. Ginther and Dr. Frerer accepted the amendment.

Dr. Votaw called for further discussion.

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

Mr. Ginther then reminded the members of the requirement to submit changes in the Bylaws to the general faculty after approval by the Senate. He requested that members urge their departments to vote. A majority vote of those responding to the campus mail ballot is required for approval.

Mr. Ginther then moved the Part II proposal submitted by the Bylaws Committee, i.e., a Standing Rule to read as follows: "The Faculty Senate President is requested to invite the Student Senate President to appoint one non-voting representative to each of the Faculty Senate Committees. Student alternates may also be appointed."

Dr. Frerer seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion.

There being no discussion, Dr. Votaw put the question to a division of the Senate. The Standing Rule carried, 25 to 0, which fulfilled the two-thirds vote requirement for Standing Rules.

Dr. Robertson reported for the College Affairs Committee and referred the members to the proposals distributed earlier. He moved the following change in the College Tenure Policy Criterion #14:

"With respect to criterion #14 of the proposed Tenure Policy, Dr. Edwards' motion, referred to the College Affairs Committee at the October 12, 1976, meeting, was to replace criterion #14 with: 'cooperates with supervisors in accepting reasonable course, load, schedule assignments and committee responsibilities'. The College Affairs Committee recommends that the motion be amended to read as follows: 'cooperation with supervisors in professional matters'."

Dr. Frerer seconded the motion.

Dr. Robertson explained that the committee did consider Dr. Edwards' motion on criterion #14, moved at the October 12, 1976, meeting; however, the committee felt that his motion was too specific in describing faculty responsibilities. There were many opportunities for review at various points in the tenure procedure which would suffice as protection of faculty members' interests in what faculty are held responsible for as duties.

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

Dr. Robertson then moved the following Tenure Policy Statement and Criteria and that the policy and criteria be included in the Faculty Handbook and recommended as effective for next year's tenure hearings:

TENURE POLICY

The Faculty Senate will submit the names of eight tenured full professors to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs who will select four to serve with him on a Tenure Committee which acts in an advisory capacity to the President of the College in tenure considerations. All faculty members in third, fourth and fifth years of appointment will be reviewed annually by departmental committees made up of the tenured faculty members of the department and the department Chairperson. In a department which has few tenured members, the committee should be supplemented with non-tenured faculty members. This committee will gather evidence which is documented as well as possible and assist the Chairperson in forming a recommendation.⁺ After consultation, the appropriate Dean and department Chairperson will submit the evidence and their recommendation to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs at least one week in advance of a hearing before the Tenure Committee. (The Dean, assisted by the department Chairperson,)* will present a summary to the Tenure Committee at the hearing, answer questions raised by the Tenure Committee members and make a closing statement. After the Dean and Chairperson have left the meeting the Tenure Committee will prepare its recommendation to the President of the College.

⁺The departmental committee for evaluation of a non-tenured department Chairperson will consist of the tenured members of the department and the appropriate Dean.

*Amended by Dr. Frerer as follows: "The Dean and the department Chairperson. . . ."

Suggested Criteria for Evaluation of Faculty Members For Tenure

1. Effectiveness as a classroom teacher
2. Evidence of research and publication
3. Competency in counseling and advisement
4. Compatibility with colleagues
5. Evidence of good character and citizenship
6. The extent of commitment to the position with the college
7. Physical and mental health, as relevant to the position
8. Evidence of professional growth
9. Capacity for professional growth
10. (Ability for verbal and written communication)*
11. Interest and participation in community affairs
12. Academic background and experience
13. Rapport with students
14. (Cooperation with supervisors in professional matters)**
15. Any other considerations which might be pertinent for the individual being evaluated.

*Amended by Dr. Miller to read, "Verbal and written communication ability."

**Amended on recommendation of the College Affairs Committee after consideration of Dr. Edwards' motion in the October 12, 1976, meeting of the Senate.

Ms. Pfeifer seconded the motion.

Dr. Robertson explained that the committee was recommending only minor changes in the Tenure Policy Statement found in the May 17, 1976, Senate Minutes. The Tenure Committee would have four members rather than three and be selected from eight names rather than six. The committee felt that most of the changes requested by Dr. Eickhoff could be implemented without revisions in the Policy Statement. However, Dr. Eickhoff did wish that the Statement be changed to read that "the dean, assisted by the department chairperson, will present the summary to the Tenure Committee." The recommendation to implement the policy next year is because it would be unreasonable to expect its use on such short notice.

Mr. McNeil announced that his department (HPER) would prefer the wording of the Tenure Policy Statement to read "the department chairperson, assisted by the dean," rather than "the dean assisted by the department chairperson." He then moved the same as an amendment to Dr. Robertson's main motion.

Mr. Heil seconded the amendment.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion on the amendment.

Dr. Frerer stated that the College Affairs Committee had considered this very matter; however, the committee had understood from Dr. Eickhoff that the dean would be responsible no matter who actually made the presentation in the tenure hearing.

Dr. Edwards was uncertain whether changing the wording of the statement would change the effect of the presentation, which would no doubt be carried by the department chairperson anyway.

Dr. Votaw suggested that a request for a clarification of the chairperson's role in the tenure hearings would be the solution. If the clarification emerges as similar to Dr. Edwards' understanding, would that be satisfactory to the members?

Mr. McNeil stated that his department merely felt more comfortable with the chairperson representing the faculty because of the closer relationship with the faculty.

Dr. Votaw asked if the initial summary were made by the dean and the chairperson added comments as appropriate, would that procedure be acceptable?

Mr. McNeil said he would be comfortable, but he already had tenure. (Laughter)

Ms. Thomas stated her understanding was that the chairperson sent a summary of the department's recommendations to the Tenure Committee. the committees studied the recommendations before the dean made a presentation; so actually the chairperson had the first talk anyway.

Dr. Votaw clarified the procedure by stating that the chairperson did not actually give a talk but made documented recommendations, with a view to achieving more objectivity in the procedure.

Dr. Frerer suggested that if the inferior role assigned to the chairperson in the Statement was bothering the members, it could be rectified by wording the Statement to read "the dean and the department chairperson."

Dr. Votaw asked if Dr. Frerer was amending the amendment.

Dr. Frerer answered not at the moment.

Mr. McNeil announced he would withdraw his amendment if necessary.

Dr. Miller asked if the dean would actually make a recommendation for or against tenure or simply present the department's recommendations.

Dr. Votaw said he was uncertain of the dean's role but assumed there was some recommendation contained in the dean's presentation.

There was further discussion which indicated an uncertainty among the members of the role of the dean in the tenure hearing process.

Dr. Busch asked if the amendment offered by Mr. McNeil was still on the floor.

Dr. Votaw answered that the amendment was still on the floor as Dr. Frerer had not offered his suggestion as an amendment to Mr. McNeil's amendment.

Further suggestions were made in regard to the list of criteria attached to the proposed Tenure Policy Statement. Dr. Miller recommended some alterations to the wording of criterion #10, to read "verbal and written communication ability", which was accepted by Dr. Robertson as a friendly amendment. Dr. Smith commented on the order of importance of the criteria, and Dr. Robertson clarified the priority by stating that the first four or five were in order of importance, the remainder were in no particular order.

Dr. Votaw then directed the members to consider only Mr. McNeil's amendment which was still on the floor.

Mr. McNeil withdrew his amendment with the consent of Mr. Heil and the chair.

Dr. Frerer then moved an amendment to the wording of the Statement to read "the dean and the department chairperson," rather than "the dean assisted by the department chairperson."

Mr. McNeil seconded the amendment to the wording of the Statement to read "the dean and the department chairperson," rather than "the dean assisted by the department chairperson."

Mr. McNeil seconded the amendment to Dr. Robertson's main motion.

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

Dr. Votaw then called for further discussion on Dr. Robertson's main motion. There was none.

Dr. Votaw put the question on the Tenure Policy Statement and Criteria, and it carried as amended.

Dr. Votaw then asked for a motion to have the Statement and Criteria distributed as a supplement to the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Frerer moved the same and Dr. Robertson seconded the motion.

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

Dr. Robertson then introduced the College Affairs Committee report on the Policy for Change of Textbooks. He stated Dr. Votaw's Announcements indicated the policy, adopted three times previously (Laughter), had been accepted by the President. He then moved on behalf of the committee the following addition to the Faculty Handbook Statement on Change of Textbooks adopted at the October 12, 1976, Senate meeting:

"Book orders should be sent to the book stores three or more months in advance of the semester in which they are needed if it is possible to do so." "This sentence completes the policy for changes of textbooks and that the new policy shall replace the policy currently stated on p. 52 of the Faculty Handbook."

Dr. Busch seconded the motion.

In discussion, Dr. Robertson pointed out that the addition was in response to President Tomanek's comment that chairpersons should be protected from last minute

November 8, 1976

changes. This matter arose after the committee reported on October 12, 1976. Dr. Votaw added that there was no way to absolutely avoid last minute changes. There were questions on how much time the book stores needed to obtain books. Dr. Robertson said that three months was adequate for most publishers.

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

Dr. Robertson announced the last item in the College Affairs Committee report. A questionnaire was sent to faculty members requesting suggestions for fringe benefits for faculty. Twenty-seven replies were received. Those replies, together with committee suggestions, form the basis of the list of suggested fringe benefits presented by the committee, and they are in order of importance. It is not an exclusive list and has been edited judiciously. He then moved acceptance of the Fringe Benefit List.

"The primary benefit which the faculty of Fort Hays Kansas State College seeks through the efforts of the Administration and the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents is a salary increase adequate to meet the increased cost of living and to provide for bonafide merit pay increases. We are grateful for past efforts on our behalf by the Administration, Senate Presidents, and the Board of Regents. We are aware, however, of a need for increases in fringe benefits to permit our institution and state to compete with other comparable institutions and neighboring states for faculty members of the highest quality. The benefits which we seek are divided into two categories with priorities in each category determined with the aid of a poll of the faculty:

I. Salary and direct benefit requests:

1. Salary increase commensurate with increases of the cost of living and the need to reward meritorious efforts.
2. Increase state contribution to TIAA-CREF to 10% of faculty salaries. This may be satisfactorily accomplished by incremental increases in the appropriations. It should be noted that the increased cost to the state is only 5%.
3. Payment of full Blue Cross/Blue Shield premiums for all faculty members, including family coverage for those with families. Include payment to TIAA-CREF or some other annuity for single faculty members to equalize the cash value of this benefit.
4. Include coverage for dental expenses in the health insurance plan.
5. Negotiation of a disability insurance contract to begin disability coverage after three months for faculty members whose accumulated sick leave does not extend beyond three months.
6. Provide for state payment of term life insurance premiums for some fixed dollar amount with additional insurance available at group rates at the discretion of the faculty member.

II. Benefits related to working conditions and maintenance of professional skills:

1. Provide full payment by the state for professional liability insurance premiums.

2. Provide state funds for salaries for replacements for faculty members on sick leave. This should include payments for faculty members who cover classes on an overload basis for an extended period.
3. Provide state funds to hire temporary replacements for faculty members who are granted sabbatical leave.
4. Provide enough money for out-of-state travel to permit each faculty member to attend at least one professional meeting per year whether or not a paper is to be presented at the meeting.
5. Exempt faculty members from payment of tuition and fees for college classes."

Ms. Pfeifer seconded the motion.

Dr. Edwards asked if the preface might be amended to include a statement encouraging an end to the inequities in funding of faculty salaries among the state colleges. He stated that in most instances FHS faculty salaries were about \$2000 less than counterparts at Emporia or Pittsburg. Last year FHS received one percent higher salary budget so the principle had already been established.

There was general agreement that salary inequities were evident but that the document under consideration was not the place to introduce the matter as it would be carried by Dr. Votaw to a meeting with other faculty senate presidents.

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

Mr. Peier had no report from the Student Affairs Committee.

Dr. Votaw called for Old Business.

There was no Old Business.

Dr. Votaw called for New Business.

Ms. Veed moved to request the Faculty Senate President to report to the Administration the following statement on fringe benefits: "The Faculty Senate encourages an end to the inequity of funding in faculty salaries among the state colleges."

Dr. Robertson seconded the motion.

Dr. Edwards commented that there was no reason not to expect our sister institutions to support FHS in this matter of salary equality.

Dr. Miller questioned whether the alleged inequities actually exist. He studied the salaries across the state some time ago, and it seemed that the average salaries were about the same at the three colleges, only a slight difference. The great diversity in salary came from the preponderance of higher ranks at the other two colleges. There was no \$2000 difference in the average salaries.

Dr. Votaw added that since the recent salary problem between Pittsburg and the Regents that FHS is actually somewhat higher than Pittsburg in average salaries.

Dr. Robertson stated that the real inequity was in the dollar amount per FTE returned to FHS and desired an amendment to Ms. Veed's motion to include the elimination of any funding inequity per FTE at FHS.

Ms. Veed accepted the friendly amendment.

November 8, 1976

Dr. Votaw added that the Regents will decrease funding at the state colleges in relation to decreasing enrollment at the rate of \$220 per FTE. It is now \$240 per FTE at the universities and \$220 per FTE at the colleges. That statement does not mean that our funding will rise to meet the \$220 per FTE.

Dr. Frerer questioned if \$220 was more than FHS now receives per FTE. If so, does FHS still lose funding at that rate, and does that mean that FHS will some day owe money? (Laughter)

Dr. Votaw answered that probably the situation is that FHS will not lose funding until the \$220 per FTE is reached through declining enrollment. However, FHS will not gain funding to reach that amount. The faculty to student ratio of 1 to 20 is a similar situation. FHS is at 1 to 22 but will not gain faculty to reach 1 to 20.

There being no further discussion, Dr. Votaw put the question on Ms. Veed's motion as amended. "The Faculty Senate encourages an end to the inequity of funding in faculty salaries and inequity of funding per FTE among the state colleges." The motion carried.

Dr. Zakrzewski questioned the chair concerning Announcements, 6j, and the President's decision to respond to those actions of the Senate requiring response. Does that decision mean that all those without responses did not require responses?

Dr. Votaw replied that President Tomanek was responding only to those items listed from the Fall Term 1969 to Summer 1975. Dr. Votaw has attended to those items arising since he became Senate President and assumes Mr. Rupp attended to those for 1975-76. Perhaps the President should be approached again about the other items.

Dr. Zakrzewski then inquired about notification to all those parties affected by Faculty Senate actions after approval by the President.

Dr. Votaw stated that there is a procedure under consideration, in cooperation with Dr. Eickhoff, for providing such notification.

Dr. Zakrzewski stated that his query arose from his impression from talking with faculty that once the Senate has approved a course, the department merely offers that course.

Dr. Votaw said the matter of notification of approved Senate actions needs to be clarified. However, courses approved by the Senate must be approved by the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Then the Dean of Instruction, the Registrar and the department chairperson requesting the course would be notified.

Dr. Robertson reported that in regard to the earlier motion on the Tenure Policy Statement and Criteria and its implementation next year, he wished to add that there really is no objection in his committee to its implementation this year if the Administration feels they can and want to implement the procedure.

Dr. Votaw announced there was one more item of New Business. He wished to present to the Senate an instrument for securing the President's approval or disapproval of Senate actions. (See attachment to the Minutes)

Dr. Busch moved acceptance of the instrument as a Standing Rule of the Senate.

Dr. Zakrzewski seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw explained the meaning and procedure in the use of the instrument by the Senate and called for any discussion.

Dr. Robertson stated the President might set any effective date for actions of the Senate if approved. Therefore, the Senate should avoid absolute effective dates and keep all effective dates as "recommended."

Dr. Smith questioned the "origin" part of the instrument. He was unclear on the meaning of that item.

Dr. Votaw answered that "origin" might refer to a committee recommendation or to a particular member if raised on the floor during a meeting.

Mr. Schroder inquired about the Registrar's failure to implement the approved policy on withdrawal dates in the Spring 1977 Schedule of Classes. Would this system prevent such oversights in the future?

Dr. Votaw replied that he hoped it would and that he would bring up the Withdrawal Policy with the President again.

Dr. Smith raised the question of effective dates for policies. Perhaps the Senate should take more definite action on proposed effective dates for its approved policies.

Dr. Miller added that the Senate should avoid mention of all effective dates in recommending policies as they might force the President's disapproval of otherwise acceptable policies.

Dr. Votaw replied that any effective dates in a recommended policy might be struck out under the third category of approval in the instrument, "approval subject to the following alterations." And after all the President's effective date overrides any suggestion from the Senate anyway.

There being no further discussion on the motion, Dr. Votaw put the question to a division of the Senate for a Standing Rule to use the instrument. The motion carried, 28 to 0, which satisfied the two-thirds requirement for a Standing Rule.

Dr. Zakrezewski asked whether the various chairpersons should take the initiative on matters such as Announcements, 6j, which the President has asked the Senate to reconsider or should the committees wait for instructions?

Dr. Votaw said he would wait until the next meeting before taking action on those items referred for reconsideration.

Dr. Zakrzewski moved to adjourn and Dr. Busch seconded the motion.

There being no objections, Dr. Votaw adjourned the meeting at 4:52 P.M.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
Allan Busch, Secretary