

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

1-13-1992

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, January 13, 1992

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, January 13, 1992" (1992).
Faculty Senate. 837.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/837

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.

Minutes of the
Faculty Senate
of Fort Hays State University
January 13, 1992

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Trails Room of the Memorial Union on January 13, 1992, at 3:30 p.m.

The following members were present: Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Mr. Michael Madden, Ms. Martha Holmes, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. Dale McKemey, Mrs. Joan Rumpel, Mrs. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Serjit Kaur-Kasior, Dr. Stephen Shapiro, Dr. John Durham, Dr. Carl Parker (for Dr. Ralph Gamble), Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Carl Singleton (for Dr. Pamela Shaffer), Dr. Gary L. Millhollen, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Helmet Schmeller, Mr. Glen McNeil, Mr. Herb Zook, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Ron Sandstrom (for Dr. Mohammad Riazi), Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Richard Huguen, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Phyllis Tiffany (for Dr. Kenneth Olson), and Dr. Mike Rettig.

The following members were absent: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. Ralph Gamble (sabbatical leave), Dr. Pamela Shaffer (sabbatical leave), Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Dr. Mohammad Riazi, Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. Kenneth Olson (sabbatical leave), and Dr. Nevell Razak.

Also present were Dr. James Murphy, Dr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Virgil Howe, Grant Bannister of the Student Government Association, and a representative of the Leader.

The minutes of the December 3, 1991, meeting were approved. Dr. Hassett asked that the title of the Instructional Media Committee on the agendas and minutes from September through December be changed wherever appropriate.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. President Watt reported that the December Board of Regents meeting was somewhat uneventful. Meaningful information was summarized on the agenda.
2. In reference to the agenda announcement 1.b., Dr. Witten asked if Kansas State University was the only institution in the Regents system with low faculty salaries. President Watt responded that KSU was the only university which did a study of faculty salaries; Dr. Markley noted that KSU makes an annual report. President Watt informed Regent Sampson during his recent visit to FHSU that faculty salaries at FHSU continue to be a priority.

Dr. Markley recommended that FHSU should also make a study of faculty salaries. It was pointed out that such a study of FHSU

faculty salaries was done for several years but was stopped when Dr. Hammond arrived and the Margin of Excellence began.

3. Dr. Huguen asked for more information about the concerns of the North Central Accreditation team (agenda 3.a.). The chair of the accreditation team told President Watt that the areas of general education, assessment, and faculty development were areas of particular interest to the team; President Watt reported activities in these areas at FHSU. The chair did not express any opinions about FHSU; he was simply seeking information about these topics. They talked about the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee. President Watt expressed his concern with the deadlines for the review; the chair of the team indicated that at his school a similar review took six years. They also discussed the need for a consistent definition of faculty development and what activities FHSU uses to support this area. He did not mention any actions that the team would pursue.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. Presented by Dr. Britten.

Dr. Britten gave no formal report, only an informational item: there are three forms for changes in courses, new courses, and new degree programs, available in Dr. Murphy's office.

2. Bylaws/Standing Rules. Presented by Dr. Votaw.

The committee is not yet finished with the review of the Faculty Handbook but no substantive changes have been found so far.

3. External Affairs. No report.

4. Student Affairs. No report.

5. University Affairs. Presented by Ms. Koerner.

Ms. Koerner presented the Recommendations on Technology (software, hardware, etc.) Royalties.

Dr. Votaw pointed out that if an employee of a company developed something similar as a part of their job, the company would expect to participate significantly in the royalties; why is this not included here for the university if this is developed as a part of our 60/20/20 agreement? That does not fit under extraordinary support. The implication seems to be that the university is entitled to nothing. Dr. Markley pointed out that this was one of the perks of taking lower salary. Dr. Huguen said that it was similar to a faculty member writing a textbook; the rights belong to the faculty. President Watt replied that the university is not like a business; we have multilevel activities and different types of research, and these recommendations recognize the differences and allow for a

negotiation process.

Ms. Koerner said that one of the key elements of this document is that it puts the responsibility on the faculty member to negotiate the percentage of university participation; in other words, the proposal provides for clarification of a faculty member's position. Dr. Schmeller asked if it was the intent of this proposal to cover interactive video lectures where taped also. Dr. Hassett believed that these lectures would be covered by this proposal. Ms. Koerner pointed out that the proposal referred to "other creative and intellectual efforts." Dr. Durham affirmed that regardless of the medium used, everyone would be treated equally.

Dr. Huguen moved that the Faculty Senate accept this document. The vote on the motion was unanimous to accept the document; the proposal will be forwarded to Dr. Murphy.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Ron Sandstrom presented the report of the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee. This is very much a committee report, a distillation of 40 meetings of the committee; he recommended it to the Faculty Senate. Dr. Durham asked if the Ad Hoc Committee had reviewed the articulation agreement with the community colleges and had considered the effects of these changes on transfer students from the community colleges. Dr. Sandstrom responded that the proposed changes would not affect transfer students if they have completed the Associate of Arts degree; in that case, the only requirement that transfer students would have to meet would be to take the upper-division integrative course.

Ms. Koerner said that faculty she had spoken to would like more time to look over the report and to submit questions to Dr. Sandstrom. President Watt pointed out that the original deadline for the report was May 15, 1991, and that Dr. Murphy wants the Senate to move quickly with the discussion. Ms. Koerner suggested that the Faculty Senate call a special meeting in two weeks devoted solely to a discussion of the report. At this time, no action was taken on Ms. Koerner's suggestion.

Dr. Murphy presented his response to the CRC document; he expressed his concern that we are delayed in the process. The review of undergraduate graduation requirements was only the first phase; the second phase, a review of major programs, was to begin after the first phase was accepted. The entire review is scheduled for completion this Spring, 1992. He suggested a compromise which would allow more discussion by Faculty Senate but would also allow chairs to begin a review of the major programs.

Dr. Murphy recommended several variations to the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee's report. Dr. Murphy said that all of the recommendations, the entire general education component, should be reviewed by a new general education committee once it has been determined what will go into the process and the rationale; he is recommending that the Dean of Arts & Sciences be the chair of the new

committee. He is recommending that this committee be constituted quickly so that a review especially of the Basic Skills courses could begin and a finalization of these courses could occur as quickly as possible. In that way, the majors would have something to begin working with in reviewing their programs. His recommendations are discussed in the following paragraph.

For the Basic Skills section, he would accept the committee's recommendations concerning English Composition I and II and College Algebra or Fundamentals of Mathematics; he would change the credit hours from 2 to 3 for Principles of Critical Thinking, Fundamentals of Oral Communication, Introduction to Computer Information Systems/Computing Systems, and Wellness. He would move World Geography into the Basic Skills section and would add 1 credit hour, making it a 3 credit hour course. He expressed concern that the Critical Thinking course not be statistically based. He said that many faculty had expressed strong feelings about the Oral Communications course; many faculty desire a "pure" oral communications course and not a marriage of Interpersonal Communication and Fundamentals of Speech. He suggested that the Introductory Computer courses include a component for accessing information systems including data systems, the library structure, etc. The total hours in the Basic Skills would be 24. Dr. Murphy believed that the Basic Skills section and the major programs could be completed by May 15, 1992 with the first offerings in Fall, 1993. The final approval of Basic Skills would occur in Summer, 1992. Dr. Rumpel asked what part of the university will turn into a pumpkin, to refer to a fairy tale, if we miss a deadline. Dr. Murphy replied that the part you have not acted on -- those would be the pumpkin perhaps. Dr. Murphy observed that there is no agreement among institutions about how many hours are in a general education program; this program may have 55 or 52 hours. The final Liberal Studies section could be completed later by the General Education Committee. His suggestions for Liberal Studies section would also change the CRC proposal. Dr. Murphy is persuaded that we have a better curriculum if we have components across the curriculum rather than having separate classes. He suggests that each course in Basic Skills and Liberal Arts should address writing, critical thinking, oral communication, mathematical skills, computing, cultural diversity, and global issues as appropriate for that subject area. For that reason, he proposed to remove the required World Civilization course. He also suggested that all students be required to take an integrated course in each of the divisions of Humanities, Mathematics and Natural and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences; to allow students to choose 6 hours or 2 instead of 3 courses in each division and to allow each department, included in each division, to offer 2 instead of 3 courses. Each department could participate in the integrated courses.

Dr. Miller pointed out that the Ad Hoc Committee had discussed integrated courses for many hours and felt it was impractical from the point of finding faculty to teach them. Dr. Huguen asked if departments from different divisions could create an integrated course; Dr. Murphy said that would be possible. Dr. Murphy stated that he wanted to provide a framework so that the review of majors could begin while discussion goes on. Dr. Markley remarked that Dr. Murphy's proposal was an alternative to the CRC proposal. Dr. Murphy

stated that he would provide senators with a written document. Ms. Koerner asked when he would send his proposal out to the departments; he stated that it would probably be this week. Ms. Koerner commented that students do not believe that they have to work if they receive no credit for the lab sections of Critical Thinking, Oral Communications, and Introduction to Computers; Dr. Murphy's proposal would address this problem. Dr. Gatschet asked if Dr. Murphy would continue to require the upper division integrated course at the end of CRC proposal. Dr. Murphy proposed abandoning this course and substituting three integrated courses.

Dr. Markley and Ms. Koerner asked for clarification of the time line for approval of the CRC proposal and for review of the major programs. Dr. Murphy replied that he would like the Senate recommendations by February.

Dr. Markley moved that the Faculty Senate receive the document from the Ad Hoc Curriculum Review Committee. Dr. Schmeller seconded; the vote was unanimous.

President Watt asked the Senate if the senators wanted a special meeting to discuss the report. The motion was made and seconded to hold a special Faculty Senate meeting on January 28, 1992, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m. for the purpose of discussing the CRC report. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Huguen asked for clarification of the "Summer Session Purpose and Procedures" document sent out by Dr. Hammond. Dr. Huguen pointed out that the document states that, on the one hand, faculty are contracted for instruction only and, on the other hand, faculty will perform any duties assigned by the department chair and the Dean. Ms. Koerner noted another area of faculty concern; the document states that evaluation of summer teaching will not be used for annual merit, tenure, or promotion purposes; she believed that this statement changed Appendix O. President Watt indicated that he would confer with Dr. Huguen on the document; Dr. Huguen made the motion that the University Affairs Committee study the document. The motion was seconded and unanimously passed.

NEW BUSINESS

President Watt gave the following charge to the University Affairs Committee: based upon concerns of several faculty members, he asked the committee to examine the concept of teachers' unions and to make a report on the advantages and disadvantages of unionization at Fort Hays State University. He would like University Affairs to look at a document concerning the union at Pittsburg State. Ms. Koerner requested that the charge be written; the charge is included at the end of these minutes. Dr. McKemey recommended that the wording be changed from unionized to "organized for collection bargaining purposes."

President Watt reminded senators that he was still accepting comments until January 24 on the Regents draft document called "Faculty Performance Evaluation." Dr. Murphy will take responses to COCAO on

January 31. This document is the result of the Task Force appointed last year.

President Watt explained the draft of a "Definition of Visiting Faculty" which he had sent out to all senators. Dr. Don Hoy will speak to the Executive Committee about this; it is a concept he has developed after attending a meeting. President Watt pointed out that this designation would make a temporary position more marketable by enhancing the status of such a position and would perhaps make it possible to attract to FHSU some outstanding people in a field. Dr. Murphy is seeking the Faculty Senate's response. Dr. Martin Shapiro asked if this position would be one-year only; President Watt announced that this status would be for a maximum of twelve months; after that, the position might become a regular temporary or tenure-track position. Dr. Markley noted that this would not replace temporary positions but would add a different category of temporary positions. This position could be a business person who would teach for a time. The rank could vary also. Dr. Schmeller asked if this type of position would fall under Affirmative Action Guidelines; Dr. Murphy replied that ordinarily it would unless there was a late retirement or resignation. Dr. Britten recommended that the senators think about this issue and vote upon it at the February senate meeting.

LIAISON REPORTS

1. Classified Senate. Presented by Dr. Votaw.

The Classified Senate is concerned about the proposed budget cuts and has decided to demonstrate a united front at Lobby Day in Topeka this Spring.

2. Computer Advisory Committee. No report.

3. Instructional Media Committee. No report.

4. Library Committee. Presented by Ms. Koerner.

Ms. Koerner reminded senators that there is discretionary funds available for which faculty may apply. Library liaisons in each department have the information about procedures.

5. Student Government Association. No report.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Holmes, Secretary
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate

DATE: January 24, 1992

TO: Ms. Dianna Koerner
Chair, University Affairs Committee
Faculty Senate

FROM: Willis M. Watt
President, Faculty Senate

RE: Charges to the Committee

As stated in the FHSU Faculty Senate's January meeting, two issues need to be studied by the University Affairs Committee. For clarity of understanding I have written the two charges to your committee below:

- #1. UAC should investigate issues surrounding the process of faculty organizing for the purpose of collective bargaining. The committee should review the available literature on "collective bargaining at institutions of post-secondary education in the United States." Additionally UAC should examine the Agreement Between Pittsburg State University/Kansas National Education Association and Pittsburg State University, dated 1991-1992. The committee is asked to report to the full senate on the strengths/weaknesses of organized collective bargaining by the May 1992 Faculty Senate meeting.
- #2. UAC should study the new 1992 Summer School policy approved by President Hammond. A report of the study is to be made to the Faculty Senate by the May 1992 Senate Meeting.

UAC should explore both items in detail and to their complete satisfaction. If I may be of any assistance please feel free to contact me.

cc: President Hammond
Provost Murphy
College Deans