

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

12-3-1990

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 3, 1990

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, 1990" (1990). *Faculty Senate*. 825.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/825

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, 1990

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Pioneer Room of the Memorial Union on December 3, 1990 at 3:30 p.m. by President Robert Markley.

The following members were present: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. John Watson (for Dr. Fred Britten), Ms. Martha Holmes, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. William King, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. James Hohman, Dr. Serjit Kasior, Dr. Willis Watt, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. John Ratzlaff (for Dr. Paul Phillips), Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Raymond Wilson, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Ronald Sandstrom, Dr. Mohammad Riazzi, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Richard Hughen, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Kenneth Olson, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Arturo Hoernicke (for Dr. Michael Kallam).

The following members were absent: Mr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. John Zody, Mr. Glen McNeil, and Mr. Kevin Shilling.

The minutes of the November 6, 1990 meeting were approved with the following correction: at the bottom of page 2 in President Markley's second announcement the term "Department of Theatre" should be changed to "Theatre Emphasis".

ANNOUNCEMENTS

With regard to the printed announcements included with the meeting notice President Markley had the following comments and corrections:

1. On the results of program review (announcement D-b-4) the Board of Regents voted 5-2 (instead of 6-2) to continue the three programs under review.
2. In response to a question from Dr. Miller regarding the proposed reduction in permissible retirement age from 60 to 55 (announcement D-b-7) President Markley said that the Board of Regents is proposing only a change in the permissible retirement age, not a change in the availability of medical coverage or any other specific change.
3. The state Budget Director's "bare-bones" budget (announcement D-b-3) will be the subject of a meeting between the Governor-elect and the presidents of all the universities in the regents' system in early December. This will mark the beginning of the appeal process. This "bare-bones" budget proposal is essentially the "A" proposal in the current budget reduction plan.

The money from the proposed Engineering Fees (announcement D-

b-5) will be used to buy equipment, particularly computers, for the Engineering schools. Neither the Regents' staff nor the Council of Presidents recommended approval of this proposal.

There was considerable discussion of this proposal. Dr. Witten asked if the Board discussed what would become of the lab fees currently being assessed of every student, and President Markley said that he had heard nothing about that. Dr. Gatschet commented that several years ago the Board came out in opposition to special fees being charged for libraries and that this current proposal is the aftermath of that action. President Markley stated that the engineering equipment available at the three universities affected by this proposal was shoddy. He also said that in his opinion there were two problems with special fees: first, almost any department could find reasons why they should be allowed to charge special fees, and second, any money added by a special fee might be canceled out by a reduction in the base budget by the legislature. He remarked that the second reading of the \$15 Engineering Fee proposal would be at the next Board of Regents meeting, and that some presidents were proposing a \$2 fee for all students which COCAO is preparing as an alternative to be considered at the meeting. Faculty Senates were being asked for their opinion on this issue, and the Executive Committee had already expressed some support for the \$2 fee increase for all students as opposed to the \$15 fee for just engineering students. The Committee did not consider the options of no change in the fees or the proposed tuition increase. The only Faculty Senate that has officially considered this issue has been that at Emporia State, and they did not come to a decision. The Executive Committee at the University of Kansas has come out in support of the \$2 fee increase, while at Kansas State they did not vote on the proposals. At Pittsburg State they are informally opposed to any fee increase at their school, as they are at the Kansas College of Technology. In response to a question from Dr. Stephenson President Markley stated that the money raised by the proposed \$2 fee increase would go into a restricted use fund that could only be used to buy instructional equipment. If tuition were raised, on the other hand, the money could be used for any purpose. Dr. Jennings asked if the schools could individually decide on how to raise the money, and President Markley replied that any increase would be system-wide if the \$2 fee increase or the tuition increase is enacted and at all three engineering schools if the \$15 fee proposal is enacted. Dr. Witten commented that these proposals really opened a can of worms in that other departments would ask for special fees, and that there were no assurances that money raised by a special engineering fee would go to engineering. Mr. Ginther asked if money raised by a \$2 equipment fee would go back to the department or to the school, and President Markley responded that it would go back to the school, possibly for strategic planning. Mr. Ginther said that he didn't see any reason to support such a fee increase and that it wouldn't be any different from raising the tuition if it would not be earmarked for any special purpose. Dr. Jennings asked about the fee assessed years ago to help pay for Gross Memorial Coliseum and Dr. Markley replied that it was within a year or two of being paid off. Ms. Koerner stated that

a lot of that money was put into housing. Dr. Heil asked if there was a "magic percentage" that the Board was looking at in terms of an increase, and President Markley said that that was his impression and that there was a "corridor" within which the Regents' Tuition Committee was working based on comparisons with tuition rates in other states. Tuition rates in Kansas are considered to be relatively low compared to other states and to peer institutions. Dr. Sandstrom moved that the Faculty Senate support no fee increases and Dr. Ratzlaff seconded the motion. Dr. Miller asked if the motion included tuition increases and Dr. Sandstrom said no, only fee increases.

Motion carried with one "No" vote.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. No report.
2. University Affairs. Presented by Ms. Holmes.

The committee hasn't yet had a chance to look at the report from the Computer Advisory Committee about a policy concerning proprietary rights to software developed by faculty. President Markley indicated that the report could be handed out and discussed immediately or left with the committee, and Dr. Hassett said that there needed to be time to consider this issue. President Markley suggested that copies of the draft proposal be handed out immediately but that action be postponed until the committee had a chance to vote on it.

3. Student Affairs. No report.
4. Bylaws and Standing Rules. No report.
5. External Affairs. No report.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

President Markley handed out a Program Evaluation Proposal for the consideration of the Senate. This proposal from the Council of Presidents would allow for qualitative factors to be considered when reviewing old academic programs or proposing new ones, allow for importance-weighting to be included for the criteria, and also allow for compensatory weighting of criteria (a low score on one criterion could be compensated for by a high score on another criterion). Senators are asked to look over this proposal and give their opinions to President Markley so that he can pass this information on to COCAO. Dr. Huguen asked about the term "critical mass of students" mentioned in the proposal under Program Criteria, and President Markley responded that this

was purposely left rather vague and that a larger number of students would presumably be rated higher. Dr. Watson commented that the Regents originally set up rules that were more stringent when adding a program than when reviewing a current program. Dr. Hassett asked about the deadline for responding to this proposal and President Markley replied that he would like to have the Academic Affairs Committee act on this by the following week. Ms. Rumpel asked that any comments be directed to her or to Dr. Britten by Wednesday, December 12 so that the committee would be able to consider them.

LIAISONS

No report.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

James Hohman, Secretary
FHSU Faculty Senate