FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 1, 1980

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Sam Warfel, Faculty Senate President, at 3:30 p.m. in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Ms. Pat Baconrind, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Mr. David Lefurgey, Mr. Dave Adams, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Dan Kauffman, Dr. James Stansbury, Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. William-Robinson, Mr. Dave Ison, Dr. Michael Meade, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Mr. Ed McNeil, Dr. Ann Liston, Ms. June Krebs, Mr. Don Barton, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Ervin Eltze, Dr. Carolyn Ehr, Dr. Lewis Miller, Mr. Robert Brown, Ms. Jane Littlejohn, Dr. Stephen Tramel, Dr. Louis Caplan, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Cameron Camp, Dr. Nevell Razak.

The following alternates were present: Mr. J. Dale Peier, Mr. Richard Leeson, Ms. Clarice Peteete.

The following members were absent: Dr. Garry Brower, Ms. Joanne Harwick, Mr. Larry Grimsley, Dr. Albert Geritz, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Ms. Carolyn Gatschet.

The following visitor was present: Ms. Linda Riedy of The University Leader.

The minutes of the November 4, 1980, meeting were approved with the following changes:

Announcement 8 should read: The Business Education Department will move to McCartney Hall. On page 6, it should indicate that there should be a School Promotions Committee for each of the four Schools.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Division of Budget has recommended several cuts in the amounts of funding requested by the Kansas Board of Regents. The following are the most salient:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RegentsApproved</th>
<th>Division of BudgetRecommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified Salaries</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified Salaries</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Employee Salaries</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits (TIAA/CREP)</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenses</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Bernard Franklin, Chairman of the Board of Regents, responded to the Division of the Budget with a well-supported argument primarily in support of reinstating the Regents' request for 10% increase in unclassified salaries and 2% additional state contribution to TIAA/CREF. The Regents have made these increases the number one priority during this legislative session.

3. The Faculty Senate Presidents met with the Council of Presidents in Topeka November 20. The Council has selected the following items in priority order as their legislative goals: 1) Unclassified salary increases, 2) Other Operating expenses increases, and 3) Enrollment adjustments.

4. The search committee for a new Vice-president for Administration and Finance has completed its interviews and sent three names to President Tomanek.

5. The Faculty Senate Presidents have decided to invite Ed Robran, Organization Specialist of the National Education Association, to speak to the group early next semester.

6. The Board of Regents on November 21 passed a resolution which empowers the administration of the various institutions to withhold paychecks of employees who owe fines, fees, or penalties or to deduct the amount from such checks. Each institution is directed to develop procedures for guaranteeing due process in such cases. These procedures must be approved by the Board before any action is taken.

Dr. Zakrzewski asked about Announcement No. 5. He wondered if the words "organization specialist" were a euphemism for "union." Dr. Warfel commented that it was.

**COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**Academic Affairs—Dr. Max Rumpel, Chair**

Max Rumpel announced that the Graduate Council wants to coordinate activities with the Academic Affairs Committee. They would like to have an observer present at the meetings.

Also he announced four subcommittees. They are: (1) Separate Sections of General Education Courses for Special Clienteles—John Watson, Chair; (2) Double-numbering of Courses—Richard Zakrzewski, Chair; (3) Course Duplication (especially computer language courses)—Bill Daley, Chair; (4) General Education Requirements for BGS degree Program—Ed McNeil, Chair.

Subcommittee 1 is to look into the background of general education courses, the existing policies, and the administration of the policies.

Subcommittee 2 is to look into the existing policies for double-numbering of courses and the current abuse or potential abuse of the numbering system.

Subcommittee 3 is to look into the possibility of flagrant use of course duplication, who reviews the courses, and its policies.

Subcommittee 4 is to look into the experience of general education in the BGS program.
The subcommittees will exist only if there is a need for them.

By-Laws and Standing Rules—Mr. Dave Lefurgey, Chair

Dave Lefurgey gave the history of the Nomination Committee which is an ad hoc committee that nominates individuals for the executive offices. In 1979, it was decided that the ad hoc committee would be tried for three years. At the present time, the By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee sees no reason to change the procedure. Therefore, they are recommending that the Ad Hoc Nomination Committee be used again this year, and next year the By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee would review the past three years. If the results are good, the Nomination Committee and the nomination process would be added to the By-Laws of the Faculty Senate.

Sam Warfel stated that he would appoint an Ad Hoc Nomination Committee in the near future. He also indicated that the Nomination Committee is not in violation of the Constitution because nominations are accepted from the Senate floor.

Student Affairs Committee—Mr. Don Barton, Chair

Don Barton reported that the Student Affairs Committee and the University Affairs Committee are studying the Student Grievance Procedure. Student Affairs Committee is waiting on Student Senate for more information concerning evaluation of instructors.

University Affairs Committee—Dr. James Stansbury, Chair

James Stansbury moved that Faculty Senate approve the following motion:

The Dean of each school, in consultation with the department chairmen within that school, shall determine the size and distributional representation of the school's promotions committee. The school committee will be composed of tenured full professors and/or tenured associate professors who have been promoted within the past four years, excluding department chairmen. Committee members will be selected by a school vote, with all full time faculty members of the school being eligible to vote. Since the school of nursing has only one department, the department promotions committee shall also serve as the school promotions committee.

Max Rumpel made an amendment to the motion. The amendment was made to the second sentence of the motion. The sentence was amended to read: The school committee will be composed of tenured full professors and/or those tenured associate professors who have been promoted within the past four years, excluding department chairmen. Dave Lefurgey seconded it. It passed.

The discussion included the following comments. Richard Zakrewski asked for the rationale behind the time frame. Dr. Stansbury replied that a person is eligible for promotion every five years.
Sam Warfel stated that Elaine Harvey, Dean of the School of Nursing, wrote a memorandum stating that the School of Nursing would have problems with this proposal. Sam Warfel said that the School of Nursing would be exempt from the procedures. Warfel also mentioned that this motion would not be an amendment to the formal document but it would substantiate the document.

James Stansbury moved that the Faculty Senate approve the following motion:

M-W-F classes will be scheduled on the half-hour from 8:30 through 3:30 with the 7:30 and 4:30 periods eliminated.

T-Th classes of 50 minutes will be scheduled on the half-hour from 8:30 through 3:30. 75 minute classes will be scheduled at 8:00, 9:30, 11:00, 12:30, 2:00 and 3:30.

James Stansbury stated that this motion is an alternative to the proposed class schedule where the scheduled classes would be on the hour instead of the half hour. This would still allow for better utilization of space. According to the Committee, the Scheduling Officer proposed the classes on the hour because it would allow for better utilization of space. The Committee is not in favor of this change so the alternative schedule was proposed.

John Watson asked why we have two class schedules on Tuesday and Thursdays. Wouldn't it be more efficient to have one schedule? Steve Tramel said that there would be overlapping of classes if there were two schedules. Jane Littlejohn said 4:30 classes are important to the School of Nursing because the nursing students cannot take courses at an earlier hour because of their program. Ann Liston said that according to the original plan that all 4:30 classes would be eliminated. Dave Lefurgey asked: If we eliminate the 7:30 and the 4:30 classes, why is this a better utilization of space. Dave Adams said that very few classes are offered at 7:30 so 8:30 classes would be bigger. Sam Warfel said that after reading materials on space utilization, it seems that FHSU is ranked in the middle of the other State institutions in regard to space utilization. However, the Administration seems to favor on-the-hour classes. He expressed his concerns. They are: What will happen to total enrollment if courses are offered at a less popular time? What will happen to credit hour production? What will happen to adult enrollment? What will happen to off-campus enrollment? Max Rumpel said that 7:30 and 4:30 classes are forced upon the Chemistry Department, and the Department would have to continue those hours even though they are eliminated from the official class schedule. Steve Tramel said since some departments prefer or are required to have 7:30 or 4:30 classes why couldn't one building be designated for those hours. Lewis Miller asked: Why are we changing the schedule? Is it to make the Scheduling Officer look better at his job? Will this have a cosmetic effect on the Board of Regents? Max Rumpel stated that the Scheduling Officer's bar graph is distorted because a two-hour class is only counted once and that is the first hour of the period. Cameron Camp stated that only a small percentage of the departments offer 7:30 and 4:30 classes. Lou Caplan said that originally the document was to change the class schedule to start on the hour, but the motion on the floor is to strike a happy medium. Dave Adams said that a change in class schedule is coming if we like it or not. Sam Warfel said that the schedule change has been delayed. The schedule will not be changed for the fall semester, but it might be changed for the spring semester. Sam Warfel's concerns are: We need to consider
the students. Is it good for the students? How many working students are enrolled at FHSU? What impact will the class schedule have on working students? Steve Tramel said that Karl Metzger should add the number of courses to his handout. Dave Ison said that it seems to him that it is counterproductive to eliminate 7:30 and 4:30 classes. In the past, we offered 7:30 and 4:30 classes to serve the community. John Watson suggested that Metzger's graph be redone to show the lab hours as two hours instead of one hour. His concerns are: How many students find it necessary to quit school early in the day in order to work? Lewis Miller asked: Who will benefit from the change in scheduling?

Lewis Miller moved to table the motion until Karl Metzger is here to answer questions. Ann Liston seconded it. It passed.

Richard Heil moved that the Faculty Senate does not approve of the course schedule change proposed by the Scheduling Officer and recommends retention of the present class schedule on the half hour. John Watson seconded it. A voice vote was taken. A division of the house was called for. It passed.

Lou Caplan suggested that Metzger would prefer to respond in writing to questions. The purpose of tabling the motion is to get a response from Metzger. Nevell Razak asked the following: What influence does Faculty Senate have in the long run? We need discussion to keep the topic alive. We need to give our concerns. Richard Zakrewski said that we need more information. Ann Liston asked: What effect will this have on the food service? Cameron Camp asked: Will the minds stay the same? If we bring Metzger to the meeting, will this "buy time." If we vote the same after the presentation as before the presentation, why have him come to the meeting.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Ed McNeil asked the question: What if they ignore us? Sam Warfel responded that they are listening. Lewis Miller said that we need to keep the interests of the students in mind.

Lewis Miller moved that Karl Metzger address the Senate and present the rationale for the proposal. Richard Heil seconded it. A voice vote was taken. A division of the house was called for. The motion was denied.

Discussion included the following comments. Lou Caplan said that it was necessary to ask specific questions, or it would be a waste of time. William Robinson said that it would be a waste of time. Steve Tramel asked: Why don't we ask Metzger to respond to the questions in the minutes. Dave Lefurgey asked: If questions are asked by the Senate members, won't Karl respond? Sam Warfel responded that Karl Metzger would probably prefer to respond in writing.

Other new business included a "thank you" from President Sam Warfel to Richard Heil for distributing the Parliamentary Procedure Handout. If there are questions about the handout, direct the questions to Richard Heil.
Carolyn Ehr asked if the Faculty Senate had a parliamentarian. Sam Warfel responded that the Vice President, Richard Heil, is the parliamentarian. Carolyn Ehr asked: Why doesn't he make the decisions concerning parliamentary procedures. Sam Warfel said that the chair makes the decisions and appeals go to the Parliamentarian.

Steve Tramel moved to adjourn. Richard Heil seconded it. It passed. Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patricia Baconrind
Faculty Senate Secretary
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