

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

2-8-1977

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, February 8, 1977

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, February 8, 1977" (1977).
Faculty Senate. 663.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/663

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

February 8, 1977

The Faculty Senate President, Dr. Votaw, 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: Mr. Mike Walker, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Sue Trauth, Dr. Wallace Harris, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Charles Votaw, Mr. Dale Peier, Ms. Vera Thomas, Mr. Dan Rupp, Dr. Allan Busch, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Ron Smith, Dr. Louis Fillinger, Dr. Bill Daley, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Ms. June Krebs, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Ms. Esta Lou Riley, Mr. Donald Jacobs.

Those members absent were: Mr. Frank Nichols, Dr. Clifford Edwards, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Steven Tramel, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Ms. Ellen Veed, Dr. Stanley Robertson, Dr. John Watson, Mr. Keith Campbell, Ms. Donna Harsh, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Ms. Rose Brungardt.

Also present were: Mr. Ervin Eltze for Veed and Mr. Gary Hennerberg (State College Leader).

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

Dr. Zakrzewski moved that the minutes be approved as distributed. Mr. Schroder seconded the motion and it carried. Dr. Votaw directed the minutes stand approved as distributed.

Dr. Votaw distributed the Faculty Senate President's Announcements and they were entered in the minutes as follows.

Announcements

1. A committee is to be formed to study advising at FHS, what it is, what it should be, and what to do about any differences. The committee will consist primarily of students and faculty. If you are interested, please let me know. (Your input will probably be solicited even if you aren't on the committee.)
2. There appears a very good possibility that a Regent institution with a certain specialty (program, course or other expertise), as recognized by the Board of Regents Extension Officer, may have "right of first refusal" on off-campus offering in that specialty, statewide. Thus it would be well for all our specialties to be recognized, and to be sure those recognized at other schools are really unique to them.
3. I have been requested to get a committee to look into what is being done with regard to allocation of library acquisition funds to the various departments and to suggest, if appropriate, ways to increase faculty involvement in library acquisitions. If you are interested in this job, let me know.

4. I have, after consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, recommended Robert Jennings, Nancy Vogel, John Watson, and John Klier as faculty appointments to the Head Librarian Search Committee. This committee will also contain two students and two people from the library staff.
5. As part of a special agreement between Colby Community College and Fort Hays State promoting coordination of efforts in higher education in our area, a review board is to be established to help in interpreting and executing this agreement. The Colby representatives will be their Dean of Instruction, Alan Scheibmeir, their Dean of Community Services, Jim Grote, and a faculty member, Roger Hale. Our representatives will be John Garwood, Red Huffman and a faculty member. After consultation with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, I have recommended Dale Johansen as our faculty representative on this board.
6. From the minutes of the COCAO - CODDI joint meeting of January 14, 1977: A new policy is reported to have been adopted by the Post-secondary section of the State Department of Education, whereby, in the future, off-campus freshman and sophomore college transfer courses by Community Colleges will not be approved in the general vicinity (25-mile radius) of Regent Institutions.
7. From the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting of January 21, 1977: Fort Hays State has been authorized to spend \$1500 for consultants for advice on the development of a media center for the college. Also, the increases in housing fees at FHS have been approved and similar increases have been proposed at KSCP and EKSC, probably to be approved February 18.
8. The revisions to the Bylaws approved by the Faculty Senate on November 8, 1976, and approved by the Faculty, as reported to the Senate on December 7, 1976, have been approved by the President.
9. The president has approved the interpretation of the catalog statement so that students with a double major in two areas of science need not take an additional 20 hours of science to get a B.S. degree. This was approved by the Faculty Senate January 10, 1977.
10. The President has approved the proposal approved by the Faculty Senate January 10, 1977, that the General Education Committee be discontinued and its functions, other than advising BGS students and hearing initial student academic appeals, be handled by the Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty Senate.
11. A Student Bill of Rights was distributed during Spring enrollment. Copies are available from the Student Government office. Among other things, the document states that judgements of a student's ability and character may be provided without the student's permission if it is obvious that it is to the student's advantage to have these judgements known. (It may be that this is legal only if the information does not come from the student's record.) The Dean of Students Office is to distribute to faculty a document concerning the students' rights relative to the Privacy Act.

12. The next Faculty Senate meeting will be 3:30 p.m., Monday, March 7, 1977, in the Santa Fe room of the Union.

Dr. Votaw then called attention to Announcement No. 1 and stated he would be making faculty appointments to a committee for studying student advisement at FHS. He asked for volunteers and recommendations. He also explained that under Announcement No. 2, Dr. Eickhoff would be presenting FHS specialties to COCAO and that anyone wishing to recommend a specialty of FHS should communicate it to Dr. Eickhoff or Dr. Votaw. He further called attention to Announcement No. 3. A committee will be appointed to study the allocation of funds for the library and faculty involvement in allocations.

Dr. Smith asked if the committee appointments must come from the Senate?

Dr. Votaw answered they need not come from the Senate. Any interested faculty member can be considered.

Dr. Votaw then called for Committee Reports.

Dr. Zakrzewski reported for the Academic Affairs Committee. The committee recommended approval of several new courses in Speech and HPER. Those in the Speech Department are in accommodation of a new faculty member in audiology. Those in HPER are in anticipation of certification in the training of athletic trainers. He moved the following new courses be approved by the Senate:

Speech 660 - Basic Audiology for Nursing and Health Related Professions.

Speech 670 - Application of Audiometric Techniques.

Speech 760 - Orofacial, Structural, and Neuromuscular Dysfunctions.

Speech 869 - Topics in Speech Pathology/Audiology.

Speech 761 - Advanced Audiology.

HPER 675 - Reconditioning and Therapeutics of Athletic Injuries.

HPER 670 - Evaluation and Treatment of Athletic Injuries.

Dr. Busch seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion. There being none, he put the question and it carried.

Dr. Zakrzewski continued his report by recommending the Senate not approve HPER 609 - Sports Psychology, at this time. There is no qualified faculty to teach sports psychology and the certification requirements for the program can be met through cooperation with the Psychology Department. He then moved HPER 609 not be approved at this time.

Mr. Schroder seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion. There being none, he put the question and it carried.

Mr. Ginther reported for the By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee. A question arose in the Faculty Senate Executive Committee over the By-Laws, Article IV, Section 2a: "The officers shall be elected by the Senate as a whole at the first meeting of the academic year, which shall be presided over by the previous

year's president." He proposed the following possible revisions. (1) "The officers shall be elected by the Senate as a whole at the first meeting of the academic year. The election of officers shall precede the committee reports. The previous year's president shall preside over this meeting until the election is completed, and shall then relinquish the chair to the current year's president." (2) "The officers shall be elected by the Senate as a whole at the first meeting of the academic year."

Dr. Votaw stated that Article IV, Section 2a, suggests that the previous year's president should preside over the entire first meeting of the academic year. However, the intent was probably as the revision (1) reads. On the other hand, he felt that revision (2) was entirely in order because the new president is the previous year's vice president and automatically becomes the president. So there is no reason why the new president should not preside over the entire first meeting.

Dr. Busch stated that it would be reasonable to have the new president preside over the entire first meeting because at that time the officers are elected and only that individual is ineligible for any other office. The past president is in fact eligible.

Dr. Votaw said that Dr. Busch's view was compatible with revision (2).

Dr. Zakrzewski suggested that if the revision (2) is accepted that it not be applied until the year after next so that Dr. Votaw would have to attend the first meeting next year. (Laughter)

Dr. Smith asked if revision (2) implied that the new president presided over the entire meeting?

Dr. Votaw answered that was correct because the president-elect is the president at the first meeting. With no statements in the By-Laws to the contrary, that person would preside.

Dr. Zakrzewski said that revision (2) reads simply "officers shall be elected" and most people would think that means all the officers.

Dr. Votaw agreed and added that in fact the president has already been elected.

Dr. Zakrzewski maintained it is misleading.

Dr. Smith moved adoption of revision (2).

Mr. Peier seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw observed that on the question of which officers are to be elected that it should be clear from other sections of the By-Laws that the previous vice president is the president-elect and therefore, the president at the time of the first meeting.

Mr. Ginther stated that the By-Laws do not mention that situation until Section 2e, which follows Section 2a now under discussion.

Dr. Votaw answered that by viewing the By-Laws as a whole perhaps the proper understanding would be there.

Dr. Zakrzewski suggested that rather than the word "officers," perhaps add "other than the president-elect."

Dr. Miller suggested that naming the officers to be elected would solve the problem.

Dr. Zakrzewski then offered a friendly amendment to Dr. Smith, to amend his motion to read: "The vice president and secretary shall be elected by the Senate as a whole at the first meeting of the academic year."

Dr. Votaw asked if Dr. Smith and Mr. Peier accepted the friendly amendment? They accepted.

Dr. Votaw called for any further discussion. There being none, he put the question as amended to a division of the Senate to comply with the two-thirds rule for changing the By-Laws. The change was approved twenty-two to zero.

Mr. Ginther then asked that members encourage faculty response on the change in the By-Laws as the faculty must approve it before it becomes effective.

Mr. Heil reported for the College Affairs Committee in the absence of Dr. Robertson. He said that Dr. Harbin is chairing a committee on sabbatical leave policy. The intention of the committee is to bring together all the written and unwritten rules and Regents' policies to form one policy for the campus.

Dr. Votaw added that COD had discussed the sabbatical leave policy. It has been distributed to COD but they have not approved it yet. Therefore, the Senate should wait until COD has acted. However, the Senate should be aware of what the proposed policy contains.

Mr. Heil then presented the proposed sabbatical leave policy as follows.

Sabbatical Leaves of Absences (Proposed)

What follows meshes the guidelines set forth in the Kansas State Board of Regents' Sabbatical Leave Regulation, adopted in 1961 and amended in 1971, with institutional policies and procedures designed to implement that regulation.

I. Purpose of Sabbatical Leaves of Absence

The purpose of a sabbatical leave, granted only in "strictly meritorious cases," is to benefit the College by granting to faculty members an opportunity to engage in independent activities. These activities are normally limited to pursuing advanced study, conducting research studies, or securing appropriate industrial or professional experience.

II. Eligibility Requirements for Those Seeking Sabbatical Leaves

- A. Only a full-time faculty member on a regular appointment who has served continuously for a period of six years or longer may apply for a sabbatical leave.
- B. Sabbatical Leaves are limited to no more than one for each six--year period of continuous regular employment.

- C. Sabbatical leaves may be granted to no more than 4 percent of the full-time faculty on the faculty roster as of July 1 of the fiscal year for which the leave is granted.

III. Application Procedures for Obtaining Sabbatical Leaves of Absence

- A. The applicant will prepare a formal request (application) for a leave of absence that will contain the following:
 - 1. A prospectus indicating how the applicant expects to use the time granted, what travel his project will mandate, and what he anticipates with regard to outcome.
 - 2. An explanation of the benefits that would accrue to the institution as the result of the sabbatical leaves being approved.
 - 3. Full disclosure of all known or expected funding from sources outside the institution.
 - 4. A list of all previous leaves with dates.
 - 5. A plan for the timely reporting of results of the leave to both the departmental faculty and the administration.
 - 6. The semester or academic year for which sabbatical leave application is made with specific dates.
- B. The formal request shall be filed with the department chairman by November 15 of the year prior to the fiscal year in which the leave is to commence.

Applications shall then be forwarded to the appropriate dean by December 1. The dean, in turn, shall forward the application with his recommendation to the academic vice president by December 15. The latter shall form a screening committee, which he will chair, to study applications and make recommendations to the president no later than January 15. After official action has been taken by the president and/or the Board of Regents, notification of decisions made shall be sent applicants through administrative channels during the spring semester.

IV. Limitations Affecting Sabbatical Leaves

Sabbatical leaves shall not be granted for a period of less than one semester nor for a period of more than one year with reimbursement being made according to the following schedule:

- A. For nine-month faculty members, up to half pay for an academic year, or up to full pay for one semester.

- B. For twelve-month faculty members, up to half pay for eleven months, or up to full pay for five months.
- C. The amount paid during the period of leave shall not exceed 50 percent of the absentee's regular salary, i.e. the salary being paid at the time the sabbatical leave begins.
- D. No faculty member will be granted a sabbatical leave who does not agree to return to the service of the institution for a period of at least two years following the expiration of the period of leave.
- E. Persons failing to return to the institution shall refund all sabbatical pay.
- F. Those failing to remain for the two full years stipulated in the Sabbatical Leave Agreement shall refund that portion of their sabbatical pay as represented by the portion of the two years which they fail to serve.
- G. Preference shall be given to those applying for the full year over those applying for a single semester.

Dr. Votaw inquired if the College Affairs Committee had any reaction to the document?

Mr. Heil replied that there were two areas of concern for the committee, mainly under the purpose for such leaves. One was the limiting of sabbaticals to advanced study, conducting research studies and securing industrial or professional experience. The committee felt that the reasons should be broadened somewhat, as writing books or reading musical compositions might not fit the narrow professional activities list. The other concern was in the giving preference to those applying for the full year over those applying for one semester. The financial hardship of replacement is greater for the semester than for the year.

Mr. Ginther asked about the effective date of the policy.

Dr. Votaw replied that if approved by COD, the policy would be sent to the President and if he approves, it would be effective for those who apply next fall term.

Dr. Smith asked under what circumstances a faculty member would not receive full pay for a one semester leave?

Dr. Votaw answered that if the College or Department could not afford the full salary, one could agree to accept less in order to receive the sabbatical.

Mr. Rupp suggested that an outside source of income, such as a grant, might be another factor.

Dr. Votaw agreed that if one had a grant, the College might make up the difference to give full salary.

Mr. Ginther added that given the new process for sabbaticals the salary agreement would be determined at the time the application was approved or disapproved.

Dr. Votaw saw the new policy to be not much different from what has been applied in the past. The real difference is that now some of the considerations in deciding to grant or not to grant sabbaticals are written.

Dr. Miller asked if the term "advanced study" includes the pursuit of a doctorate?

Dr. Votaw said he did not know.

Dr. Miller said he asked that because he understood that the Regents had a policy in the past against granting sabbaticals to pursue the doctorate.

Mr. Ginther stated that in his application for a sabbatical next year, the only differences are in the dates for submission of application and in the expanded list of reasons for consideration.

Mr. Heil felt that the real change was the procedure requiring very specific information in the request. One can no longer put anything down as a reason and then proceed as one pleases. The conditions must be followed.

Dr. Votaw asked if the College Affairs Committee had further to report?

Mr. Heil said that the committee is attempting to rank possible fringe benefits for a report at the next meeting.

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

Dr. Votaw called for Old Business. There was none.

Dr. Votaw then called for New Business and introduced the matter of Faculty Senate representation. There is some question on how departmental representation is assigned. Depending on how the By-Laws are interpreted some departments could be under-represented and others over-represented.

Dr. Busch moved that the matter of Senate representation be referred to the By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee for study and report at the next meeting.

Dr. Zakrzewski seconded the motion.

Dr. Votaw called for discussion. There being none, he put the question and it carried.

Dr. Votaw then introduced discussion of the Faculty Activities Analysis which will be made next fall term. Some of the complaints with the last analysis have been heard, such as nothing came of the last one, the timing of the analysis in early fall. Provisions have been made to correct some things. It will be done in mid-October next fall. The data will be made available - as raw data - in Kay Dey's office. Summaries of the data will be distributed to the deans, then to the department chairmen and presumably from there to the faculty. However, individual kinds of data will not go beyond the institution; perhaps by departments but not by individuals. Some kinds of comparisons will be made,

for example, the relative costs of English freshman courses across the institutions. The analysis will probably be used for zero based budgeting. There will be an attempt to make the process easier for the faculty. In regard to the complaint about disbelief of figures sent in, the answer was that there were some real errors and it was felt there may have been more. It was not intended as an accusation. However, if the actual amount of time spent is high it should not be toned down.

Dr. Votaw then announced that he would need suggestions of faculty to serve on a search committee for a Memorial Union Director.

Dr. Busch asked if there is not a union director now?

Dr. Votaw said there is an acting union director.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked about the meaning of Announcement No. 6.

Dr. Votaw said he knew no more about it than what the Announcement states.

Dr. Zakrzewski then asked if Dr. Eickhoff and Dr. Votaw had come to an agreement on the procedure for approval of new courses?

Dr. Votaw replied that he believed that they had come to a decision but it has not been published by Dr. Eickhoff.

Dr. Zakrzewski said the Academic Affairs Committee would appreciate the publication as soon as possible.

Dr. Votaw replied that he would speak with Dr. Eickhoff about publishing the rules for approval of new courses.

Dr. Votaw called for further Old Business. There being none, he adjourned the meeting at 4:13 P. M.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan J. Busch, Secretary