

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

12-3-1979

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 3, 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, December 3, 1979" (1979). *Faculty Senate*. 697.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/697

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

December 3, 1979

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Louis Caplan, Faculty Senate President, at 3:30 PM in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

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

Dr. James Stansbury, Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Emerald Dechant, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Ms. June Krebs, Mr. Don Barton, Mr. Mac Reed, Mr. Dave Adams, Ms. Virginia Bornholdt, Dr. Sam Warfel, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. Lewis Miller, Mr. Thaine Clark, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Ervin Eltze, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Louis Caplan, Ms. Carolyn Gatschet, Ms. Betty Roberts, Dr. Robert Meier, Ms. Patricia Baconrind, Ms. Sharon Barton, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Ann Liston, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Nevell Razak.

The following members were absent: Mr. Edgar McNeil, Ms. Joanne Harwick, Mr. David Lefurgey, Dr. Al Geritz, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Stephen Tramel, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Ron Smith.

The following alternates were present: Ms. Ellen Schiferl for Harwick and Dr. John Knight for Geritz.

Also present was Mr. Larry Dreiling of the University Leader and Mr. Jim Strong of the Student Government Association.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- 1) The staff at the physical plant will set up tables and chairs for special events on the main campus which do not take place in the Memorial Union. Submit requests to Karl Metzger, Scheduling Officer.
- 2) Contact cards for keeping track of communications with prospective students are available in the office of the Dean's and department chairmen. After they are filled out, they should be returned to the Dean.
- 3) The Faculty Senate Presidents will be meeting with the Governor on December 20. Items to be discussed are faculty salaries, position control, maintaining liberal arts programs at the regional Universities, and TIAA-CREF late deposits.
- 4) The search committee for the Vice-President for Academic Affairs is being formed. The Chairman of the Committee is Cliff Edwards and will be composed of one Department Chairman (Don Fuertges), one Dean (Dale Johansen), one Vice-President (Bill Jellison), one classified employee (Katie Bailey), one student (to be named) and one representative from each school -- Arts and Sciences, Education, Business and Nursing (to be selected by the President from a list of eight submitted by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate).

In reference to announcement 3, Dr. Caplan indicated that late deposits of TIAA-CREF contributions are not a problem at Fort Hays State although this has been a problem at Kansas University.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs - Dr. John Watson, Chair

No Report.

Bylaws and Standing Rules - Dr. Stephen Tramel, Chair.

No report.

Student Affairs - Mr. Mac Reed, Chair

No report.

University Affairs - Mr. Dan Rupp, Chair.

On behalf of the Committee Mr. Rupp moved the following:

M1 "Faculty checkouts will be for one session only (spring or fall or summer semester). Faculty checkouts may be recalled after the initial three (3) weeks checkout upon request of the circulation librarian acting on behalf of a patron. Written notice will be sent to the faculty member. If the book is not returned within one (1) week from initiated date of request, a fine of ten (10¢) cents per day for each delinquent checkout will be assessed. The maximum fine cannot exceed replacement cost of the book.

At the end of each semester, the library will send a notice to all faculty members that all books are due at the end of the semester per this policy. However, this notice will not include a list of books the individual faculty members have checked out. Then any materials not rechecked by the beginning date of the following session will be considered overdue and will be assessed the usual fine of ten (10¢) cents per day until returned or rechecked. Accrued fines are to be paid by the end of the session in which they are assessed.

In order to protect the borrower, the library asks that borrowers recheck books in person. (In the past, the library has had trouble with borrowed or stolen identification cards.) This avoids the confusion caused by having someone else renew books by telephone or campus mail.

All materials which are lost while officially checked out to a faculty member must be paid for at the replacement cost plus a \$2.50 processing fee. (The processing fee would cover only a third of the original \$7.50 cost to the library of getting an item on the shelf.)

Each department faculty member and/or graduate assistance must secure clearance from Forsyth Library before his/her next paycheck may be issued.

This policy will become effective at the end of the semester which follows its adoption, i.e., May, 1980." (Seconded by Schroder).

Dr. Liston raised the issue that since the proposed policy does not require the Library to indicate the specific books checked out to a faculty member the fine for inadvertently overlooked book could become excessive without the faculty members knowledge. Mr. Adams reported that when Dean Willard appeared before the University Affairs Committee he indicated that if the new policy was adopted the Library would furnish a list to every faculty member of all books checked out in that person's name. This would be done in January and that if the books were not returned or rechecked the fine would begin at the end of the semester. Mr. Rupp added that in a few years the Library with new computer capabilities would be able to supply a list of specific books each semester to faculty borrowers. Dr. Liston reiterated her concern that some procedure be developed to notify faculty members when books were overdue. Dr. Watson expressed concern about the vagueness of the proposed Library loan policy. For example, how do you establish the value of the replacement cost of a book if it is out of print? He also felt that faculty borrowers who inadvertently fail to return books should be sent a reminder. It was his impression that student's are sent reminders of overdue books.

Dr. Rumpel inquired whether the information received in the campus mail on the Library loan policy was from the Faculty Senate as part of the Senate agenda. Dr. Caplan responded that it is an agenda item. Mr. Rupp apologized for not identifying the mailing as Faculty Senate business. Mr. Heil expressed objection to that part of the policy that necessitates faculty members returning books in person rather than having this done by a secretary or graduate assistant. This might be an excessive burden if numerous books were checked out. Dr. Liston indicated that was also a matter of some concern also. Dr. Votaw pointed out that the policy asks but does not require that books be rechecked in person. Also, if someone else rechecks the books then the reminder of the number of books checked out will not be as effective. Dr. Votaw was not certain whether students are reminded of overdue books as Dr. Watson had indicated earlier. It was also Dr. Votaw's impression of Dean Willard's presentation to the University Affairs Committee that the fine could be cancelled for inadvertently overlooked books that were returned. The same privilege is extended to students. Dr. Caplan asked if a list of books that are overdue will be sent to the faculty. Mr. Rupp responded that the proposed policy did not provide for such a list. In the future, however, such a list could be provided when the computer technology is available. Mr. Rupp further stated that the intent of the policy was to use the resources of the Library more effectively. Mr. Schroder stated that at the present time without a computer the compilation of a list for each faculty member would be a difficult task. Dr. Liston returned to her point that some procedure should be developed to inform faculty about overdue books before the fine becomes excessive. Dr. Watson moved to amend the motion by inserting the following after the second paragraph (Dr. Votaw suggested the amendment should follow the third paragraph and that was agreed to) "Books which are overlooked inadvertently will be exempted from a fine." (Mr. Rupp seconded). Dr. Miller spoke against the amendment indicating that the effect of the amendment would be to water down the policy so that there would be no policy at all. Mr. Adams also opposed the amendment. Faculty members who keep books checked out semester after semester inhibit the research tools available at the Library. This proposed policy is still more liberal than the Library policy toward students. Dr. Liston reiterated her point that a general notice at the end of the semester that all books are due is not proper notification. Only a list of specific books overdue would be proper notification. Mr. Rupp also opposed the amendment by stating that fines for inadvertently overlooked books could be handled on an individual basis. Mr. Adams added that the fine would not exceed the cost of the book plus \$2.50. The Library wants the book back not additional revenue from the faculty. There was no further discussion on the amendment. A voice vote was taken. The amendment was defeated. There was no further discussion on the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Rupp inquired of Dr. Caplan concerning the status of a proposed disability insurance program for new faculty members who are not covered by the current state disability insurance program. Last year the Faculty Senate made a recommendation to propose this fringe benefit to COCAO or the Council of Presidents. Dr. Caplan responded he was in the process of attempting to discover the status of this proposal. He was not certain if this had been included in the fringe benefit package proposed by the Board of Regents.

Dr. Miller raised the issue of the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and that Statements possible conflict with the new Regents policy on financial exigency. A copy of the 1940 Statement was distributed to all Senate members by mail as a result of a motion passed during the November Senate meeting. Dr. Miller also referred to a 1971 Statement on Financial Exigency and Staff Reduction adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association of American Colleges. The new Regents policy on financial exigency may be in conflict with both Statements. Dr. Caplan indicated that the minutes of the Board of Regents indicate some possible conflict with past Regents policy and the new policy on financial exigency. Dr. Caplan reported that he had enlisted President Tomanek's assistance in clarifying this matter. A phone call to the Regents secretary in Topeka did not clarify the possible conflict. Mr. Rupp suggested that the Faculty Senates or Faculty Senate Presidents should reaffirm endorsement of the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement. Dr. Caplan indicated that the Kansas University Faculty Senate Executive Committee recently passed a resolution asking the Board of Regents to reaffirm, in their minutes, a commitment to the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement. This resolution has been sent to the Regents but Dr. Caplan did not know if the Regents had taken any action on this resolution. Dr. Knight asked if a resolution by the Faculty Senate would be binding upon the Regents if they have changed their policy? Dr. Watson indicated that one legal interpretation of this situation was that faculty members were hired and signed a contract under the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement and that faculty members would have to consent to a change in their contract conditions. Dr. Knight asked if it would be appropriate to urge the Board of Regents to make a definitive statement concerning what previous Regents policy is inoperable? Dr. Caplan responded that it would be appropriate. Dr. Miller made the following motion: "The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University reaffirms its support of the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure and secondly the Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University urges the Board of Regents to make the same commitment." (Seconded by Mr. Rupp). Mr. Schroder inquired how this motion was similar to a discussion in the last Senate meeting on Regents policy? Dr. Caplan responded that one of the main reasons the Faculty Senate disapproved the Regents policy on financial exigency at the last Senate meeting was the absence of a list in the Regents minutes concerning what previous Regents policy would be null and void. Dr. Dechant suggested that it might be more appropriate to ask the Board of Regents to reaffirm their commitment to the 1940 A.A.U.P. Statement rather than making the same commitment. Dr. Miller expressed the view that his purpose for making the motion was to express his preference for the prior Regent's policy on financial exigency rather than the policy adopted in September.

There was no further discussion on the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Rupp presented two items that he felt could be handled by the Faculty Senate President or some member of the Administration. The first item was the use of campus

mail by busi
mailroom
The s

M2

mail by business organizations promoting their activities. Is this a misuse of the mailroom facility? A clarification of the policy on the use of campus mail may be needed. The second item dealt with the pledge cards for the United Fund. Mr. Rupp suggested that the confidentiality of the contribution was threatened because of the practice of listing last year's contribution on the pledge card. Mr. Adams said that this was filled in by the Chamber of Commerce office and that might be the place to raise the issue.

M3 Dr. Warfel moved the adoption of the following resolution: "The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University expresses appreciation to Dr. Harold Eickhoff for his support of and cooperation with the Faculty Senate during his tenure as Academic Vice-President of Fort Hays State University and extends him best wishes for success in his presidency at Trenton State College (Seconded by Dr. Dechant). There was no discussion on the resolution. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Dr. Miller raised the issue of the policy of the Senate in dealing with new course proposals and new program proposals. The question is whether these proposals, if rejected by the Academic Affairs Committee, should be brought to the floor of the Senate? In the minutes of the Academic Council Dr. Eickhoff expressed the view that it was contrary to Robert's Rules of Order to bring rejected committee proposals to the floor of the Senate. Dr. Warfel indicated that he had searched through Robert's Rules of Order but could not find a specific rule on this subject. It was his personal view that since these proposals are sent to the Senate and then referred by the Faculty Senate President to the appropriate committee the entire Senate should consider the proposal even if it was rejected by the committee. Dr. Caplan confirmed that these proposals are sent to the Senate President not directly to the committee. Dr. Miller inquired concerning the procedure in the U.S. Congress. Mr. Heil stated that only about 10% of all bills in Congressional committees even come to the entire chamber for consideration. The committee members are the experts on particular issues. The Faculty Senate could adopt a similar procedure and defer to the judgement of its committees. Dr. Caplan pointed out that the form for Senate action contains one line labelled approval and one line labelled disapproval for the Senate President to sign. If the proposal is rejected by the committee there is no method for the Senate President to sign the disapproval line unless the proposal comes to the floor of the Senate. Dr. Warfel suggested that it would be appropriate to send this issue to the By-laws and Standing Rules Committee for consideration. That committee could further investigate Robert's Rules of Order and consider whether a standing rule should be proposed. Dr. Warfel, therefore, made the following motion: M4 "The By-laws and Standing Rules Committee should investigate and make recommendations to the Senate concerning the policy of course proposal rejections by the Academic Affairs Committee being brought to the floor of the Senate for a vote" (Seconded by Dr. Miller). There was no further discussion on the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Razak asked for information concerning the proposed meetings in regard to academic advising on January 9, 10 and 11. The memo announcing these meetings was not clear concerning the obligations of faculty members during those three days. Dr. Caplan stated that faculty members are expected to be on campus during the Intersession term. In order to maximize attendance at these advising sessions they were scheduled during the last three days of the Intersession. It has not been decided what the schedule for these advising sessions will be at this time.

There was no further new business. The Meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Heil