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Minutes of the
Fort Hays State University
Faculty Senate
September 14, 1992

Dr. Richard Hughen called the meeting to order in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union on September 14, 1992, at 3:35 pm.

Those members present were Dr. Robert Stephenson (for Dr. Jean Geleichsnser), Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Zoran Stevanov, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Dale McKinney, Mrs. Joan Rumpel, Mrs. Sandra Rupp, Dr. Max Rumpel, Mr. Lance Lippert, Dr. Stephen Shapiro, Dr. John Durham, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Dr. Albert Geritz, Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Dr. Evelyn Toft, Dr. Gary L. Millhollen, Dr. Tom Kernes, Dr. Greg Tandy (for Dr. John Zody), Dr. Merlene Lyman, Mr. Herb Zook, Mrs. Anita Gordon-Gilmore, Dr. Charles Voitaw, Dr. Mohammad Riaz, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Arthur Moore, Dr. Zoran Stevanov, Dr. Fred Britt, and Dr. Mike Mattig.

Those absent were Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Jean Geleichsnser, Dr. Michael Madden, Dr. Mary Romjue, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Joel Schnell, Mr. Lewis Miller, and Dr. Richard Hei.

Guests of the Senate included Dr. Edward Hammon, Dr. Fred Ruda, Dr. Gary Hulet, Dr. Bill Rickey, Mr. Gary Gilmore from Classified, and a reporter for the Leader.

The minutes of the July 6, 1992, Faculty Senate meeting were corrected to show that Dr. Carl Singleton represented the English Department. The name of the new Chair of the Board of Regents is Mrs. Shirley Palmer. The minutes were approved as amended.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Dr. Hughen introduced the new Faculty Senators. Election of the President-elect and Secretary followed; the nominees for President-elect were Ms. Dianna Koerner and Dr. Ralph Gamble, and nominees for Secretary were Dr. Gerry Cox and Dr. Stephen Shapiro. There were no additional nominations. The senators elected Ms. Dianna Koerner as President-elect and Dr. Gerry Cox as Secretary.

2. Dr. Hammond spoke to senators about the process of program review and the decisions reached. The Board of Regents wanted to achieve two objectives in the institutions' mission statements: to develop a uniqueness for each school and to eliminate duplication of programs. As a part of this strategic planning at FHSU, campus committees evaluated every academic program and every administrative service. Final recommendations from the committees were due in Dr. Hammond's office that day. On Wednesday (September 16) Dr. Hammond will announce the decisions that have been made; he is announcing the decisions now so that there will be full disclosure, no surprises, and errors corrected if there have been mistakes. He will present his report to the Board of Regents on November 20. The changes will take place, beginning in 1993 through 2002. The aspirations document lists new degree programs such as Social Work and Speech Disorder programs which the university would like to institute; the Regents insist that new programs be financed partially by the reallocation of resources. The recommendations are to eliminate some undergraduate and graduate programs; some changes in administrative areas have already taken place. Institutional Research and Budget Planning have merged; the second position of Vice-President for Student Affairs has been eliminated.

The Board of Regents will officially accept the reports from the universities at the December 17 meeting. The Board staff may recommend other changes also. The Board will tell the university presidents to process all recommendations. The FHSU administration will follow procedures for eliminating programs outlined in the Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Hughen asked what actions would be taken to minimize impact on students and faculty. Dr. Hammond replied that programs will be eliminated slowly. The programs will not disappear immediately; FHSU has an obligation to students and faculty. Dr. Hulett noted that earlier errors had been found in the documents and that this early announcement of decisions will allow us to find errors and make sure that the President has all information before he reports to the Board. Dr. Hammond added that an early date for the report causes the Board staff to put their decisions out ahead of May so that the universities will have adequate time to respond.

3. Dr. Hughen reported on Mrs. Shirley Palmer's visit to the campus in August. He indicated that she was concerned about the quality of student advising.

4. In reference to the announcement on performance funding (#4 on September agenda), Dr. Hulett asked if the Faculty Senate Presidents had drafted a response. Dr. Hughen answered that the presidents had not done so yet but probably would at their next meeting. Dr. Hammond recommended extensive study of the proposal. COCOA strongly opposes this.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. Presented by Dr. Britten for Ms. Holmes.

Motion 1, a change of departmental name of Department of Industrial Education to the Department of Technology Studies, was approved unanimously. Dr. Ruda indicated that this change reflects a national trend.

Motion 2, renaming twenty courses in the Department of Home Economics, was approved unanimously.

Motion 3, new courses, were approved unanimously with the following corrections or explanations (see September agenda):

a. The department prefix should be Mkt, not BUS ADM.
b. & c. Dr. Rickman indicated that these courses were required in the respective majors, but do not add hours to the majors.

d. & e. Dr. Rumpel asked what the hegis numbers were for these courses. Dr. Britten replied that the courses were type-O.

2. Bylaws and Standing Rules. Dr. Votaw announced the results of the elections; see announcement #1 above.


4. Student Affairs. No report.

5. University Affairs. Ms. Koerner deferred to Dr. Hughen, Chair of the subcommittee which conducted a survey on remuneration of teaching summer courses. Dr. Hughen presented a report of the committee's findings (Attachment #1) and asked the senators to discuss it with their constituencies; if a faculty member wishes to read the detailed survey, they may contact Dr. Hughen.

Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that the remuneration for teaching summer courses should be adjusted to the level of 90% of 1/24 of a faculty member's nine-month salary for each credit hour taught. The funds for the restoration of summer faculty salaries should be taken from future merit raises incrementally when the merit raise exceeds 3 percent, until summer funds are adequate to fully fund at 90%. All funds allocated for summer faculty remuneration but not paid to faculty must be placed into a general pool for faculty development.

The senate will vote on this motion next month. In the past few years the 9-month salary pool has received summer salary merit increases; as a result, the summer pool is only large enough to pay 75% of 1/9 of a 9-month salary; Dr. Hammond wanted equity for all faculty teaching in the summer and could only achieve it this way.

Ms. Koerner indicated that this subcommittee's work was a result of a discussion with Dr. Hammond last spring when faculty were dissatisfied with the summer salary plan. Dr. Durham asked if this action would be legal; Dr. Hughen responded affirmatively. Dr. Morin asked why the subcommittee did not recommend 100% remuneration. Dr. Hughen said that 90% of 1/24 is about the same as 100% of 1/27 anyway and Dr. Hammond and the Regents were more likely to accept 90% than 100%; Dr. Hammond will continue to argue that faculty are not paid to do additional research in the summer. Dr. Riazi pointed out that 77% of the faculty responded negatively to the summer raise if it meant loss of a raise in regular salaries (last page of Attachment #1, question #6). Dr. Olson added that total faculty salaries would not be decreased or increased; merit would be .2% less. Ms. Koerner encouraged faculty to call or FOPS Dr. Hughen if there were any additional questions.

6. Executive Committee. Dr. Hughen brought a motion to the Senate for discussion.

Motion: The Senate recommends that the External Affairs Committee be changed to the External Affairs and Faculty Salary Committee. The additional duties of the Committee would include the responsibility for keeping the Faculty Senate informed regarding FHSU faculty salaries in relation to our peer institutions and in relation to FHSU administrative salaries also as compared to our peer institutions. Faculty salaries comparisons would include benefits and remuneration for summer teaching and continuing education courses.

Dr. Hughen is recommending this motion because he believes that the faculty need a salary committee to compare FHSU faculty salaries and fringe benefits with other Regents and peer institutions. The Senate will vote on this item at the October meeting.
6. General Education Committee. Ms. Holmes indicated that the committee has begun refining the goals and objectives of CRC document approved by Faculty Senate last spring.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Holmes, Secretary
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate

ATTACHMENT #1

Motion from the University Affairs Committee regarding summer salaries.

MOTION: The Faculty Senate recommends that the remuneration for teaching summer courses should be adjusted to the level of 90% of 1/24 of a faculty member's nine-month salary for each credit hour taught. The funds for the restoration of summer faculty salaries should be taken from future merit raises incrementally when the merit raise exceeds 3 percent, until summer funds are adequate to fully fund at 90%. All funds allocated for summer faculty remuneration but not paid to faculty must be placed into a general pool for faculty development.

Explanation: In January of 1992 a subcommittee was formed to study the new 1992 Summer School policy approved by President Hammond. In response to this charge, the subcommittee developed a survey to determine faculty attitudes regarding the new summer school salary policy and the subcommittee met with President Hammond twice in an attempt to find a workable solution. A summary of the results are attached for your information. The survey very clearly expresses the dissatisfaction of the faculty with President Hammond's decision, and it might be helpful to amplify on the perceived problem. President Hammond's Memorandum of December 17, 1991 transmitted the new summer school policy and the memo stated four challenges that were met with this new policy.

Hammond's Challenge 1 - Horizontal Equity: The new procedure will reimburse all faculty members the same percentage of their nine-month base contract regardless of college or department.

Response: Obviously, horizontal equity is important, but remuneration at 100% for all faculty also achieves horizontal equity. The fact that there was not enough funds in the summer 'pot' to reimburse at 100% was due to past administrative decisions to ignore that 'pot' when raises were available; it was not a faculty decision.

Hammond's Challenge 2 - Vertical Equity: The procedures create a more level playing field between faculty members who are contracted for summer session employment and those that are not in terms of pursuing promotion, tenure, and merit.

Response: This challenge is met by not allowing summer performance to impact annual merit review, promotion or tenure decisions. This challenge has nothing to do with remuneration rate for summer teaching. It should be noted that 63% of the faculty seem quite certain that there are additional expectations for service for those faculty that teach in the summer. It may be that anyone who does not recognize this additional expectation has probably not taught a summer course.

Hammond's Challenge 3 - Meet Student Needs: There are two parts to this challenge. The first is to meet student needs, implying that there were not enough funds in the summer 'pot' to reimburse faculty at 100% and to offer all needed courses. The second part, and purportedly the most important, is that the reduction to 75% remuneration will make it possible for FHSU to survive without reduction in a self-funding auxiliary environment.

Response: The first part of this challenge is addressed above under Challenge 1. The shortage of summer funds in the 'pot' was an administrative decision and not a faculty decision, and in fact, the vast majority of the faculty were not even aware of the decision. In response to the second part of the challenge, it is suggested that if the Kansas Board of Regents should ever decide that summer sessions must be self-funding, then it would probably be necessary to reduce to 75% remuneration, but the reduction could be done at that time - there is no need for reduction in advance of a future possibility. Challenge 3 does not justify a reduction to 75% remuneration at this time.

Hammond's Challenge 4 - Clarify Expectations: This challenge is to clearly specify that summer contracts are for instructional and related activities and that there are no additional expectation for research or service.

Response: This has been addressed above and Challenge 4 does not adequately explain or justify the reduction in the remuneration for summer salaries. Regarding the suggestion that there is no additional service in the summer, there is one additional comment. Faculty that remain on campus and teach one or more courses in the summer are generally sacrificing time that could be spent on research and professional development that could be personally beneficial regarding annual merit, tenure or promotion - that sacrifice within itself could be taken as a service to their department and to FHSU.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION:

1. When you hire a professional you hire the 'whole' person and not 60% of this or 20% of that. Failure to recognize this is to degrade the professional.

2. The pressure to reduce the summer reimbursement rate to 75% was the result of two administrative errors. The first was the failure to upgrade the summer 'pot' when the monies were available, and the second was the reduction of summer faculty remuneration to compensate for the first administrative oversight.

3. The explanation and justification of the reduction of summer reimbursement offer by President Hammond in his four Challenges is weak and unconvincing.