

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

4-10-1979

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 10, 1979

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, April 10, 1979" (1979). *Faculty Senate*. 689.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/689

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.

Now Committee 5/2/79

FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

April 10, 1979

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Busch, Faculty Senate President, at 3:34 in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

The secretary called the roll and the following members were present:

Ms. Joanne Harwick, Dr. Sam Warfel, Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Steven Tramel, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Mr. David LeFurgey, Mr. Thaine Clark, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Ed Shearer, Dr. Paul Philips, Dr. Charles Votaw, Ms. Ellen Veed, Dr. Louis Caplan, Ms. Sandra Rupp, Dr. Robert Meier, Ms. Patricia Rhoades, Mr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Ann Liston, Dr. Allen Busch, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Ron Smith, Dr. James Stansbury, Ms. Donna Harsh, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Ms. Sandria Lindsay, Mr. Mac Reed.

The following members were absent: Ms. Virginia Bornholdt, Dr. Nevell Razak, Dr. Billy Daley, Mr. Glenn Ginther.

The following alternates were present: Dr. Al Geritz for Bornholdt, Dr. Bill Robinson for Daley.

Bonnie Parker of the University Leader was also present.

The minutes of the March meeting were approved with the following corrections:

1. In announcement 5 on page two "Jack McCulloch" should read "Jack McCullick."
2. On page 6 of the complementary close above the secretary's name should read "Respectfully submitted" instead of "Respectively submitted."

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Faculty Senate Executive Committee has appointed a special Nominating Committee for the 1979-80 Faculty Senate offices. The committee will be composed of the present and former Faculty Senate presidents now serving in the Senate, Dr. Lewis Miller, chairman, Ms. Ellen Veed, Dr. Charles Votaw and Dr. Allen Busch. The committee will nominate at least two individuals for each office of secretary and president-elect, the names to be reported at the May Senate meeting. Recommendations may be submitted to the committee before May 1st and additional nominations may be made at the May and September Senate meetings. The Bylaws Committee is studying the "nominating committee" concept as a permanent feature of Senate procedure.
2. The President has approved the Faculty Senate's recommendation to eliminate the numerical grade descriptions from the next issue of the FHSU Catalog.

3. The President's Advisory Committee on Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefit Requests for FY81 has completed its report and submitted it to the President. Professor Richard Heil will report on the committee's recommendations at the April 10th Senate Meeting.

With reference to announcement 1 Dr. Busch asked that any questions regarding the special nominating committee be taken up under new business. He announced that Dr. Louis Miller had agreed to chair the committee and that he would welcome suggestions from Senators. Dr. Miller said that he preferred to have recommendations in writing.

Dr. Warfel asked if anyone had recent information on the legislature's actions concerning salary increases. Dr. Veed said that she had read in the newspaper that the conference committee had reached a compromise of 6.5% increase.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE--Dr. Ron Smith, Chair

- M1 On behalf of the committee Dr. Smith moved that Nursing 415 Introduction to Research be approved with the stipulation that the course type be changed to O. (Dr. Miller seconded.) The motion carried.

Dr. Smith also called attention to a notice which had been sent to all Senators concerning a new procedure under which announcements will be sent to all senators regarding new courses which are to be discussed by the Academic Affairs Committee.

In accordance with the rules on attendance Dr. Frerer and Ms. Thomas announced their presence.

BY-LAWS AND STANDING RULES--Mr. Dave Lefurgey, Chair

Mr. Lefurgey reported that ballots and a description of election procedures for Senators have been sent to department chairmen. The committee also sent suggestions that each department elect or appoint an alternate. Response from the chairmen is to be received by April 27.

- M2 On behalf of the committee Mr. Lefurgey moved that the wording of Standing Rule Number 2 titled "Instrument for University President's Response to Senate Actions" to be amended as follows:

Present wording:

An instrument for securing the University President's approval or disapproval of Senate actions was brought before the Senate at the November 8, 1976 meeting. It was adopted as a Standing Rule that this instrument be used for said purpose. (Nov. 8, 1976, revised July 18, 1977.)

Proposed wording:

The following is the instrument by which the University President shall register his approval or disapproval of Senate recommendations. (Nov. 8, 1976, revised July 18, 1977.) INSTRUMENT
(Dr. Caplan seconded.)

Mr. Lefurgey called attention to a handout which had been distributed which reproduced the relevant Senate minutes and included a copy of the instrument mentioned.

Mr. Lefurgey said that the committee had looked into the history of this Standing Rule. One of the major reasons for the development of the form was to prompt the University President to respond to Senate proposals. Dr. Busch interjected that it was also an attempt to regularize the process. Before the instrument the President had to search the Senate minutes for items which required his action.

Dr. Votaw pointed out that the copy of the instrument attached to the handout did not reflect the changes made during the July 18th meeting. Dr. Busch said that the copies he had been using did show these changes.

Mr. Lefurgey said that the motion should be interpreted to include the revised version of the instrument.

Ms. Veed said that she had some reservations about the wording because it is a standing rule of the Senate but requires the University President to do something.

- A2a Dr. Miller moved to amend the motion so that the instrument be labeled Appendix A and that following the proposed new wording in parentheses the statement "See Appendix A" be included. (Mr. Heil seconded.)

Dr. Votaw referred back to Ms. Veed's point about the wording requiring the President to use the instrument. He suggested that rewording would also eliminate the problem with "the following" if the instrument became an appendix.

The motion to amend was defeated.

- A2b Dr. Votaw moved that the motion be amended to read:

The instrument attached as Appendix A shall be used by the Faculty Senate to transmit Senate recommendations to the University President for his approval or disapproval. (Ms. Veed seconded.)

Dr. Miller pointed out that the By-laws do contain a statement which require the University President to do something, namely, call a meeting of the full faculty at the end of the school year. To be consistent perhaps that should also be changed. Dr. Busch pointed out that Standing Rules are for the internal operation of the Senate while By-laws are University policy. This is why By-laws must be passed by the full faculty.

The amendment carried.

The amendment thus became the main motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Lefurgey reported on work that the committee had done on the request that they consider making the nominating committee concept mentioned in announcement 1 a permanent part of Senate procedures.

The committee opposed the creation of a nominating committee for secretary and president-elect for the following reasons:

1. The Senate has had no problems related to nominations in the past which would require such a procedure.
2. The establishment of such a committee would be contrary to Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws which would have to be changed if the proposal were accepted.
3. If the motive behind the request by the Executive Committee is to allow nominees to indicate whether they wish to serve then the proposal is unnecessary because Article IV, Section 2 of the Bylaws already requires that candidates indicate their willingness to serve.
4. There are two problems with having a nominating committee report at the May meeting each year.
 - a. Since new Senators are not elected until the end of the semester the committee would not know who would form the "pool" of Senators from which to choose.
 - b. Newly elected Senators would not have the opportunity to make nominations for the officers with which they would serve since their terms do not begin until September.

Therefore, the committee recommended that guidelines for establishing a nominating committee not be created.

Dr. Caplan asked what this report implied for the nominating committee mentioned in announcement 1. Dr. Busch replied that any committee of the Senate has a right to establish a special committee. The Executive Committee has established a nominating committee and it will proceed unless the Senate chooses to disband it.

STUDENT AFFAIRS--Dr. Ann Liston, Chair

The Student Affairs Committee had no report.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS--Mr. Richard Heil, Chair

The University Affairs Committee had no report.

Old Business

There was no old business.

New Business

Mr. Heil reported on the work of the President's Advisory Committee on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits. The following is the handout distributed as part of that report.

The Committee (Jack McCullick, Chair; Allan Busch; Louis Caplan; Kay Dey; LaVier Staven and Richard Heil) has made the following recommendations to President Tomanek.

1. A recommendation be carried to the Board of Regents requesting a 12% increase in FHSU faculty salaries for Fiscal Year 1981. The Committee suggests that 7% salary maintenance be requested of the Regents through COPS. The remaining difference (e.g., 5%) should be through the program improvement generated by the formula.
2. A recommendation be carried to COPS requesting that the State of Kansas increase its contribution to TIAA/CREF by 1% a year until the state's contribution is 10% of each faculty member's salary.
3. A recommendation be carried to COPS requesting that a detailed study be undertaken to determine if present participation in the Social Security Program by the Regents Institutions provides maximum benefits to its employees.

The President has seen the recommendations and stated that he supported them generally and that he would see what he could do about getting them accepted.

Mr. Heil also gave rationales for the three recommendations.

1. The recommendations for salaries is based on two considerations:
 - a. The behavior of real income over that last 12 years. The real income or purchasing power of the money income received by the typical Ft. Hays State faculty member is essentially unchanged from the 67-68 salary of \$8,686 according to Dr. McCullick's analysis based on the consumer price index and the rate of inflation. The committee recognizes and supports the concept of merit in the determination of faculty salaries. However, the committee feels that meritorious performance warrants salary increments which result in advances in real income.
 - b. Faculty salaries received at our peer institutions. The committee found that the Ft. Hays faculty salaries lag behind when compared with Regents' peer institutions. Using a 9 month average salary for fiscal year 79 at Emporia State and Pittsburg State Universities, Ft. Hays would have had to have received a 5% and 3% increment over and above that received by those institutions respectively to reach equality in salaries. When compared with the formula funding peer institutions the disparity is even greater. If Ft. Hays State were to have reached equality with these peers in the year 1978 an overall increase in faculty's salaries of 9.946% would have been necessary.
2. The recommendations for increase in the state's contribution to TIAA/CREF were based on the following considerations: There seems to be a consensus on all of the campuses that of all the fringe benefits this is number one and the one most likely to succeed. All of the formula funding peer institutions' states contribute more to TIAA/CREF than Kansas.

3. The recommendation that a study be made to see if money presently contributed to Social Security could be better spent in other retirement/insurance programs is based on the following consideration: Various universities (Eastern New Mexico State for example) have found that withdrawal from Social Security and a reallocation of both individual's and state's funds in alternate retirement programs gives better overall retirement benefits. The committee does not at this time urge such a withdrawal. However, it feels rather strongly that the Regents' institutions should investigate the possibility to determine if the legal, administrative, and economic consequences would warrant such a withdrawal.

M3 Dr. Frerer moved that the Senate endorse the report. (Dr. Tramel seconded.)

Dr. Miller asked who was being asked to investigate the advisability of withdrawing from Social Security. Dr. Busch said that if COPS agreed that the investigation should be done, the staff of the Board of Regents would do the study.

Dr. Smith said that he felt that the third recommendation was subject to misinterpretation. It could be read to mean that the committee was concerned that the faculties wanted to be sure they were receiving the maximum benefits that Social Security could give. If the rationale for this recommendation accompanies the recommendation the ambiguity will be resolved.

Dr. Warfel asked if copies of the report were available to Senators. Dr. Busch said that some of the supporting data is privileged as a result of agreements with cooperating institutions. Mr. Heil said that after the President of the University has seen it, it might be released. Dr. Busch added that the committee is a University committee and not a Senate committee.

Dr. Smith asked what the status of formula funding was with the Regents in light of the Governor's reaction to it. Dr. Busch said that the Regents had approved the system and that the Governor and legislature had neither approved or disapproved. Therefore, the institutions were proceeding as though the system were an accomplished fact.

Dr. Geritz asked if the committee had given consideration to changes in the health insurance program. Mr. Heil said that the University Affairs Committee had compiled an ordered list of fringe benefits earlier in the year and health insurance was second or third on the list. The problem with increases in insurance coverage is that all state employees would also have to be covered. Since TIAA/CREF applies only to University professors, an increase in state contribution to it has a better chance of being accepted.

Dr. Frerer asked whether for the purpose of the motion "the report" refers to what was on the handout or to the larger report from which parts had been read. He said that he had intended to get Senate backing for the entire report.

The motion carried.

FORGED DROP SLIPS

Dr. Caplan asked what the university policy on forged drop slips was. According to the Registrar's Office some faculty do not care and some become irate.

After some discussion it was apparent that no one was sure if there was a policy or that if there was what the policy was.

Dr. Busch asked the Student Affairs to look into the issue and report back to the Senate at the May meeting.

DISOLUTION OF NOMINATING COMMITTEE

- M4 Dr. Frerer moved to direct the Executive Committee to dissolve the special nominating committee. (Dr. Tramel seconded.)

Dr. Smith asked that the Chairman of the By-laws Committee speak to the issue of the legality of such a committee since that issue had been raised during the report earlier. Mr. Lefurgey said that the major problem was that all of the nominations would be made by the May meeting which would eliminate the involvement of Senators who do not take office until the fall. Dr. Votaw pointed out that the procedure set up for the special nominating committee allowed for further nominations from the floor at both the May and September meetings.

Dr. Tramel said that the proposal for a permanent committee and the procedures given for the special committee were not the same. The proposal which the By-laws committee had considered did not allow for nominations from the floor in September.

Dr. Busch explained the reasons for the establishment of the special nominating committee and for the request that the By-laws Committee consider permanent changes in the procedures.

1. It seemed reasonable that Senators have advance notice of nominees that they could think over their vote and discuss the options with their constituents.
2. It is often difficult to refuse to serve during a Senate meeting. If the question were asked by a representative of a committee it might be easier to refuse and to give reasons which the potential candidate might not want aired before the Senate.

Dr. Caplan said that if people are nominated from the floor they do not have opportunity to discuss with their chairmen the consideration of merit which Senate service will be given in their department. Also under the present system there is no opportunity for Senators to discuss nominees with the people they represent.

Dr. Frerer argued that candidates nominated from the floor would not be treated the same as those nominated by the committee.

Dr. Busch said that any Senator could recommend someone to the committee before it brings in its report. If that person is not nominated by the committee the Senator could still nominate the person from the floor. The committee would then treat that candidate the same as the others.

Dr. Votaw pointed out that under the procedures given in announcement 1 the committee may bring in more than two nominations for each office, additional nominations may be made at the May meeting, and further nominations may be added in September before the vote.

Dr. Frerer said that he had seen nominating committees have undue influence in the selection of officers in other organizations and was concerned that the same might happen in the Senate.

Mr. Lefurgey explained that the proposal which the By-laws Committee had reacted to did not contain the provisions for further nominations at the September meeting.

Dr. Votaw said that before the procedure suggested for the special nominating committee is made a Standing Rule it would be best to wait and see how it works this year. Mr. Lefurgey said that the By-laws Committee had felt the same.

The motion failed.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sam L. Warfel