

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

12-9-1986

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 9, 1986

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 9, 1986" (1986).
Faculty Senate. 777.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/777

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 9, 1986

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

ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dr. Brent Spaulding, Mr. Frank Nichols, Dr. Zoran Stevanov, Dr. Robert Nicholson, Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Jack Logan, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Delbert Marshall, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. John Ratzlaff, Dr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Billy Daley, Dr. Art Hoernicke, Dr. Mike Horvath (alternate for Dr. Ninia Smith), Dr. Paul Gatschet, Mr. David Ison, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Dr. Mark Giese, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. John Klier, Mr. Glen McNeil (alternate for Dr. Merlene Lyman), Mr. Jim Walters, Mr. Marc Campbell, Dr. Jeffrey Barnett, Dr. Ronald Sandstrom, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Mary Anne Kennedy, Ms. Eileen Curl, Dr. Paul Faber, Dr. Larry Gould, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Phyllis Tiffany, Dr. Gerry Cox (alternate for Dr. Nevell Razak).

Members absent: Dr. Jim Rucker, Dr. Roger Pruitt.

Also present: Dr. James Murphy.

The minutes of the November 3, 1986, meeting were corrected for the following:

Page 4: seventh line from the bottom, change "standing" to "new".

There being no further corrections, the minutes were approved.

Dr. Giese said that the executive committee decided that in the future when a senator wished to embellish on the minutes recorded, the parliamentarian would be charged ^{with} keeping everyone straight on the proper procedure.

Announcements:

Announcements are included in Attachment A to the November minutes. Dr. Giese said that Dr. Nancy Vogel will serve on the UPPC Committee for a 2-year term. Mr. Frank Nichols is resigning from the Sabbatical Committee because he will be applying for one himself.

Senators received copies of the Role and Scope Statement summary through campus mail.

President Tomanek responded orally and in writing to the Role and Scope Statement, presenting two or three modifications. Final action by the Board of Regents will be at the December 18-19 meetings.

Dr. Murphy commented on the Role and Scope Statement:

1. He believed the statement on limiting research to the three largest universities will be softened.
2. He believed that the statement on limiting accreditation to the three large universities and Pittsburg State which is in the process of accreditation

of Business programs.

will be softened, which will allow another type of review for accreditation for FHSU.

Dr. Giese said regarding the statement that there is some sort of thread from the introduction through each school and to the recommendations. There are differences between campuses.

Dr. Murphy commented that the document is really a five-year plan over eight years. It is subject to review at any time, but in five years they will start a formal review process. Anything that we do that is not encompassed in some way within the document we will have to justify very strongly any deviation from that. The specific programs indicated in the summary were chosen at the staff level. FHSU suggested that they not be so definitive but identify a few examples of programs that we have saying such as...rather than being so specific. Dr. Murphy felt that the MFA being included in the Role and Scope summary may be in a protected area. Dr. Horvath was concerned about the effect that the statement about research would have on such things as tenure, promotion and federal grants. Dr. Murphy said that the statement there now could have some negative effects, but he felt that it would be softened to the point where it won't have any negative effects.

Dr. Horvath also said that he and his colleagues thought that the statements in the first two sentences of our mission statement (p. 6) made no sense to them. Dr. Horvath asked Dr. Murphy what the mission of the University is. Dr. Murphy said that the primary emphasis is a global emphasis of the liberal arts institution which encompasses all four areas specifically listed. Dr. Murphy did not see any problem with the sentence order. Agriculture was specifically included because there have been some points in time where the discussion has included eliminating agriculture and putting it all at Manhattan.

Dr. Murphy said that we are designated primarily as the liberal arts institution in the state. Other state institutions have other designations.

Dr. Giese mentioned about research that there will not be heavy state dollars given here for research. Those will go to KU, but that is not saying that as grantspeople we cannot go out and hustle up whatever we can do on an entrepreneurial basis. Dr. Murphy added that they did not want the other institutions to place their major resources in the research area. Dr. Giese commented that KU states that their major mission is in the graduate programs and research.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS:

Dr. Sandstrom directed attention to Attachment B. He thanked sub-committee members Dr. Tiffany, Chairman, and members Mr. Logan and Dr. Pruitt and Dr. Razak who wrote the motion for their work. Dr. Sandstrom stated that the committee envisions that in the near future we are going to see lots of courses come through the committee with the general title Computers in...the most honorable area. This statement is to put the departments on notice that they would like the content of those courses to concentrate on the most honorable area, not on skills in computers, the hardware or the software. The statement

does not say that they are not going to consider other courses, but this is one of the ways they are going to look at them, and by providing departments with this statement there will be some consistency in the committee deliberations this year and next year.

Dr. Hoernicke was concerned that two of the courses listed had prerequisites and would limit someone in course selection if that person did not have the prerequisites. He was also concerned on how this would affect the 773 (Problems) courses. Dr. Sandstrom commented that the academic affairs committee does not look at the titles of the 773 courses; it only looks at the institutionalized courses and the content of the 773 courses will include what the department deems appropriate for one of those courses.

Dr. Sandstrom also commented that at least three of these courses are basically continuing to evolve in regard to the microcomputer and also the mainframe.

After additional discussion, Dr. Tiffany said that one of the purposes of the committee was to provide adequate opportunity to deal with the problem of accessibility of equipment, etc., and scheduling problems as well. The committee is not committed to the list of courses as it exists. If there are courses that people feel should not be on the list or others that should be, that is appropriate. The point here is to get away from every department coming back to academic affairs and saying we are going to teach our students skill training on the computer. Dr. Tiffany agreed to change the last line of the motion to read "existing courses including those below".

The motion up for vote is:

In order to prevent the proliferation of courses in computer skill training, the AAC committee recommends that departments needing such training for their students consider one of the courses listed below. The AAC committee will advise departments that the committee will find it difficult to approve departmental requests for courses which have as a goal the provision of computer skill training if it is apparent that this training can be provided by existing courses including those below.

DPIS 101 Introduction to Data Processing
BEOA 250 Word Processing Applications
MATH 363 Introduction to Computing Systems
MATH 161 BASIC Programming

The motion passed.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS:

Dr. Markley passed out copies of the revised Student Grade Appeals Policy. He commented that the essential changes are:

1. The document is rewritten to specifically deal with undergraduate policy.
2. Graduate references have been deleted.
3. Grammatic and cosmetic changes.

Dr. Miller moved that we table vote on the motion until the next monthly meeting of the Senate. Seconded by Dr. Frerer. Motion passed unanimously.

STUDENT AFFAIRS:

Dr. Shapiro reported that the committee had completed its evaluations for Who's Who. Fifty-six names were submitted and accepted.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: No report.

BY-LAWS AND STANDING RULES: No report.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Klier commented further on the effect of the latest budget cuts on the library. Dr. Warren will address the Senate on the issue in February. Dr. Klier commented that the situation will get worse over time. Books not bought this year probably never will be bought.

Dr. Murphy commented that the administration recognizes the concerns about the library situation. There are several factors that complicate the situation. In the recession process alone, the library was not reduced to the extent that everyone else was reduced; the proportions were less. He commented that he wished they did not have to take place at all.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Frerer made the following motion:

If possible, administrators salaries for the period of the summer session should sustain similar cuts to those sustained by the faculty.

Seconded by Dr. Marshall.

Discussion centered around whether the 5% cut for summer school will mean less people at the same pay or a cut in each summer school faculty member's salary. Dr. Rickman said that since administrators have contracts at least through part of the summer period, he wondered how their salaries could be cut. Dr. Frerer said that the motion was one of feeling and sharing. Dr. Markley said that he would recommend the administrators take the option of cutting courses, because the notion of teaching at 75-80% of normal pay is setting a bad precedent. The motion failed.

Dr. Horvath presented some questions on the budget cuts. There are four areas of concern:

1. Why ~~do~~ do we have to read the newspaper and watch television to find out what's happening at FHSU? Why can't announcements come to us before information is released to the media?
2. Why do the cuts seem limited to OOE and summer faculty salaries? What happened to the \$200,000 in OOE that was held back at the beginning of the year? Is the administration immune from budget reductions and shouldn't everyone share equally?
3. Will there be more cuts and if so what will be the nature of those cuts?
4. Why wasn't the faculty part of the decision-making process with regard to the budget cuts?

Dr. Horvath gave cuts in his department as examples of cuts made across campus.

Dr. Horvath presented the following motion:

Because there is precedent for Faculty Senate involvement in matters which affect the welfare of the faculty, and because the faculty was not involved in the recently mandated budget cutting process, and because budget cuts directly affect faculty welfare,

The Faculty Senate wishes to express its concern that faculty were not consulted on policy decisions which adversely affect their ability to function.

Motion seconded by Dr. Ratzlaff.

Discussion: Dr. Murphy said in this instance that the timing was such that the administration had over Thanksgiving vacation to pull everything together and get it to the Board of Regents. Once the decisions were made, they made every effort to get the information in the faculty mailboxes and that ended up being the day before Thanksgiving. The information could not be kept from the media until all faculty were notified. Some of the OOE monies set aside were set aside so that we would have the capabilities of offering continuing education courses in the spring semester. The remainder which was approximately \$125,000 became part of the OOE recission. Administrators are not immune. Dr. Murphy said he did not think there will be further cuts because if the recission is approved by the legislature, there is a cushion and the feeling is that there will not be a further reduction. For departments as it relates to summer session, use the same procedure that you use to develop the regular summer session, you have X number of dollars and it is up to your department to determine whether you are going to reduce the positions or take an across the board reduction, so there may be differences. In terms of OOE reductions, the administration said we have to have these amounts of monies to give back to the state. For the most part they have put the decisions at the school and department levels to determine where they will cut in student labor, OOE funding and out-of-state funding. The faculty wasn't involved primarily because of the timing.

Dr. Gould said he is in favor of the shared governance, but given the time constraints he doesn't feel that there was anything else the administration could do. Some faculty were in fact involved.

Dr. Klier said that he is sympathetic to what is said, but we should keep in mind that any time cuts occur either under duress or in the longer term, the faculty have to perhaps be better informed than they are.

The motion passed.

Dr. Ratzlaff asked for clarification of the statement that no names of candidates have been or will be announced until the new president is named in April. Dr. Gould passed out copies of the Presidential Profile to be shared with other faculty members. The Search Committee has completed a Presidential Profile. Dr. Gould stressed that the Committee does not choose a president. The Board of Regents will appoint the next president of FHSU. The Committee will narrow the search down to three to five candidates and the Board will interview them and ultimately make the appointment. The Committee will indicate to the Board who they would prefer to be the next president of

FHSU, despite the fact that they do not have the opportunity to rank candidates. The Committee has established a timetable. Interviewing will begin in February. The interview structure has not been established. There will be an opportunity for faculty to talk with these candidates. A screening methodology has been determined. The Committee is now receiving applications and nominations, acknowledgements are being made, etc. There are now 20 applicants and 13 nominations. Dr. Gould said in the charge to the Committee that ranking of candidates was not part of it.

Dr. Gould said that the profile would not change to reflect more closely the mission statement. Teaching research is not prohibited by the mission statement. The ancillary programs statement reflects that you have a liberal arts institution with a band of professional programs around the liberal arts core. Agriculture fits into the liberal arts core since it is in the liberal arts core.

Dr. Giese also indicated that the profile will not be changed.

Dr. Gould said that if the Regents didn't like any of the candidates the search could start over.

The Committee is looking for a president who will be able to manage change here, someone who knows he is not coming into a very appealing economic situation in the state of Kansas, the Board of Regents is streamlining the system, and all problems that will have to be contended with, but at the same time they are looking for a man or woman of vision.

The Alumni Board voted permission for Dr. Giese and Mr. Pflughoft to look into a new award, The Fort Hays Faculty Scholar Award, taken from nomination of peers, the announcement would be made at graduation and the teacher would serve the next year as a Fort Hays Scholar. There will be a cash stipend with no strings attached except that a presentation would be expected sometime during the year. This is a way to acknowledge faculty who would like to do research but probably wouldn't be chosen by students for their research and grants.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Rumpel, Secretary
Faculty Senate