

3-2-2004

# Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 2, 2004

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all)

---

## Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 2, 2004" (2004). *Faculty Senate*. 80.  
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/80](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/80)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate  
Minutes for Regular Meeting on Tuesday, March 2nd, 2004

The meeting was called to order at 3:34 P.M. by President Carol Patrick. It was digitally recorded for public record.

**1. Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting**

1a. February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2004 minutes (see Attachment A) and sign-in roster (see Attachment B)

- Some changes were made to the minutes that were not in the version circulated to the faculty prior to this meeting. Carol Patrick requested that Secretary Richard Lisichenko identify those changes to the Faculty Senate.
- February 2<sup>nd</sup> 2004 minutes and roster approved. Motion to approve made by Senator Jerold Stark, seconded by Senator William Stark.

**2. Announcements and Information Items (no action required)**

2a. Information from the Kansas Board of Regents: Carol Patrick

- The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents has finalized and will send a Faculty Moral Survey in the next month. It will be uniformly distributed amongst faculty at every regents institution. The survey has been finalized and will be distributed from Emporia State College. Confidentiality is assured and the data collected will be analyzed at Emporia State. The Board of Regents has expressed a significant amount of interest in this survey.
- In the past the Board of Regents has evaluated college/university CEO's without formally including faculty input in this process. This year the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents has requested that faculty play a role in this process. The Board of Regents approved the request, but input will be provided in a agreed upon format.

2b. Report from the President's Cabinet: President: Carol Patrick

- The proposed state budget allocates a 3% pay increase, and funding provided for senate bill 345 (faculty salary enhancement) totaling \$200,000 for FHSU. Provided the budget passes, these increases will take place next year. Implications of this budget for FHSU includes a \$1.37 million discrepancy between mandated new costs and funding. The approach towards rectifying this is through the use of one-time application monies. This should cover the shortfall on a one year basis.
- Regarding International Students, a new regulation from the Student Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) states that postsecondary international students taking courses within the US can take no more than one class or three credit hours per session (term, semester) on-line or through distance education that does not require the student's physical attendance. Students can take more than one on-line course, but those credits cannot count towards the course load SEVIS requires. Faculty are requested to take note of this when scheduling courses for on-campus international students.

2c. Campus Fund Drive: (No report)

2d. CEO Evaluation: Carol Patrick

- The Board of Regents will factor in Faculty Senator input regarding the evaluation of President Hammond this year. The format of this will comprise three open-ended questions that will be sent to all Faculty Senators. Each senator is asked to gather input from their respective departments for each question posed. The nature of these questions are: 1) What is President Hammond doing well?, 2) What are some areas of concern or improvement?, and 3) How can the faculty work with President Hammond to address these areas of concern? The results will be consolidated into a one-page summary. This final document will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee prior to submission.

2e. University committee representatives from Faculty Senate: Carol Patrick

- The Faculty Senate has the duty of appointing faculty members to various university committees. Anyone interested is encouraged to contact President Patrick. The openings are:
  - Commencement Committee (3 people)
  - Conflict of Interest Committee (3 people)
  - Library Committee (3 people)
  - Reassigned Time Committee (2 people: one from Arts and Sciences and another from Health and Life Sciences)
  - Advisory Committee For The Virtual College (3 people: one from Education and Technology, one from Business and Leadership, and one from Health and Life Sciences)

### 3. Reports from Committees

3a. Academic Affairs: Martha Holmes

**Recommendation 104-026:** MLANG 112 (Great Works in Translation) See attachment C

- This is a General Education course that was approved through Academic affairs with a vote of 8-0-0. Approved by the Faculty Senate unanimously.

**Recommendation 104-027:** MUS 401 (Band Materials and Techniques 1) See attachment C

- This is a non General Education course that was approved through Academic affairs with a vote of 8-0-0. Approved by the Faculty Senate unanimously.

**Resolution 104\_028:**

The Faculty Senate supports the University’s existing academic advising Mission Statement, “The primary purpose of the FHSU academic advising program is to assist students in the development of meaningful educational plans that will be compatible with career aspirations and contribute to the process of preparing for a life of change, challenge, and individual fulfillment. At FHSU, academic advising is based on a system of shared responsibility between student and advisor, and a process of continuous improvement, clarification, and evaluation with the aim of furthering institutional advising goals and desired student outcomes.” (FHSU Catalog 2002-2005, pp. 55). Under the new student information system all four-year and degree seeking students must confer with their advisors during each semester regarding their academic plan. After conferring, advisors will release a registration hold or input a code that will allow the advisee to input their courses. Once courses are entered by the four-year and degree seeking advisee, the advisor will be notified electronically of the registration. The academic advising process should be made available to all students, however the new student information system will allow non-degree students to register and enroll without requiring advisor input or assistance.

- Senator Holmes requested that this resolution be approved. Prior to this, Senator Holmes recognized a friendly amendment that changes the wording in the last line: “The academic advising process should be made available” to “The academic advising process is available.”
- Resolution approved with one abstention.

3b. Student Affairs: Robert Howell

- The Big Creek cleanup project is scheduled for April 17<sup>th</sup>. On March 11<sup>th</sup> the Student Affairs committee will meet the Student Government to find out how the Faculty Senate can help out.

3c. University Affairs: David Goodlett

- The committee has continued work on revisions to the Values Statement.
- A sub-committee has been formed to study campus emergency procedures.
- A resolution was presented that is designed to recognize the professional job FHSU Public Safety officers do. It reads:
  - The faculty senate wishes to express appreciation for what we perceive to be a remarkably professional job performed on a daily basis by the Fort Hays State University campus police.
- The resolution was approved unanimously.

3d. By-Laws and Standing Rules: Dan Kulmala

- The committee discussed Resolution 104\_025. The results of that discussion are noted in the “Old Business” section of the minutes.

3e. Marketing and Strategic Academic Partnerships: Win Jordan

- Survey data derived from several virtual college instructors was analyzed. The findings were compiled and submitted to President Patrick for use by President Hammond.
- During analysis several questions were raised. A lunch meeting will be set up with the surveyed virtual college instructors in order to help answer them.

3f. Ad hoc Teaching Evaluation Committee: President Patrick

- The committee is continuing its review of peer/self teaching evaluation methods.
- The committee has completed its recommendations for student evaluations.
- A document is being compiled that will describe the process of decisions that has taken place over the past year and several months regarding this issue.

3g. Ad hoc Good Teaching Practices Committee:

- The report is almost completed and will be available soon.

3h. Ad hoc Retention Committee: Robert Howell

- A considerable amount of input has been provided towards the development of the survey. It will be tested soon and available shortly. The survey will be delivered to both current and previous faculty.

3i. Executive Committee: President Patrick

**Resolution 104\_029:** The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays state University opposes the changes to faculty/staff parking proposed by the current SGA plan.

- John Huber has noted that regarding the presentation made to the Faculty Senate at the last meeting, only one piece of the proposal has been approved: Lot E has been redesignated as zone two parking. It was also noted that due to stipulations set forth by the governor, the wheels for the proposed transportation cart cannot be purchased for another year or two.
- Carol Patrick clarified the Executive Committee's stance on the agenda by first offering kudos to the Student Government for taking positive steps towards solving the parking problem. The proposed plan has many merits, but the faculty respectfully disagrees with the issues concerning the removal of zone one parking privileges for faculty members. The following reasons follow:
  - There have been 663 permits issued versus only 502 spaces, producing a difference of 161 spaces. President Patrick noted that differences between SGA figures and Faculty Senate numbers can be attributed to when the data was collected.
  - The reason faculty have not been designated reserved parking spaces is the fact that when most faculty are here versus times when they are not. Zone one parking is a means of meeting faculty parking needs when spillover occurs.
  - The issue of university growth is also a concern.
  - There are times when the faculty member has to be off-campus and return at various times. The consequences for a faculty member not finding parking and being late for class has greater impact versus students.
  - There may be traffic flow problems when trams are present during heavy traffic times.
- Senator Jordan noted that if faculty were to lose zone one parking privileges, the required additional faculty spaces should be designated.
- Senator Drabkin inquired as to why there is a parking issue considering the Cunningham Hall/Coliseum parking availability? John Huber's response was that there is a strain during days when there are events at the coliseum.
- The resolution was unanimously approved.

**Resolution 104\_030:** The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University recommends that departments use teaching evaluations from Spring 2003/Fall 2003 for merit consideration for AY 04.

- President Patrick noted that this resolution addresses change for calendar year merit evaluations to academic year. This has raised concerns on campus considering the implications of the inclusion of teaching evaluations (TEVALS).
  - Faculty are supposed to have their information to their department chairs by April 1<sup>st</sup>.
  - Some departments have interpreted this as meaning that TEVAL information must also be in by April 1<sup>st</sup>. Some faculty are concerned that evaluations performed too early will not be conducive towards properly evaluating teaching.
  - President Patrick noted that Provost Gould stated that it may not be advisable to include this Spring's evaluation on this year's academic merit. Aside from the issue of providing too short of an evaluation period, it conflicts with an item in the faculty handbook. It states that faculty shouldn't get evaluations back until grades have been submitted to the registrar.
  - The resolution is designed to help departments avoid dealing with the above mentioned issues for this year only.
- 
- Provost Gould submitted copy of the following email:

Colleagues:

I have been asked to respond to several inquiries about the adoption of the academic year as the new time period for annual merit review and why it might be more attractive than the calendar year. Although I refuse to spend your time and my efforts arguing what party initiated what item in unit negotiations because it only minimizes the **shared** experience of faculty, students and administration in the negotiation process, I will try to provide some clarification for those who may be interested in the issue. Keep in mind that the advantages and disadvantages of "academic versus calendar year" have been discussed and debated since 1988 at FHSU when the substance of the current annual merit evaluation process took shape. There was no definitive answer at that point in time, but it has become clear over time that the actual/de facto process does not fit the calendar year time period with as much precision and efficiency as the academic year. Let me try to illustrate this observation by offering a series of brief points and the actual timelines that have been constructed for each time period.

Point One – Most faculty contracts are based on the academic year. Nine-month faculty begin their contracts in August. None that I know begin in January and continue to the end of the calendar year. I suppose there have been exceptions, but I'm not privy to any. It would seem to make sense that faculty and administrators performance are measured over the time period of their contract.

Point Two – Legislative allocations and Regents assignments of institutional monies have always occurred at the end of the academic year, especially in recent times. We used to know in April about merit increment decisions, but this has been pushed back to late April at best and sometime in May at worse as the Legislature wrestles with complex budgets and lengthier agendas than in past years. The correspondence of budget allocations and academic year evaluation procedures has grown closer and closer.

Point Three – The use of the calendar year required a number of procedures to be completed in the December – February time period that never really got completed in most, if not all, departments. The idea of stopping the evaluation period on December 31 and preparing a new annual statement of responsibilities (ASR) while gathering materials the last Monday in February to submit to the department chair for assessment seemed to "bump" into all the other things that happen at the end of the Fall and the beginning of the Spring semesters. In reality, new ASRs and the submission of evaluation materials often occurred (with exception) more toward the middle of the Spring semester. Final evaluations were completed anywhere from four-five months after the "official" end of the

evaluation period on December 31. The following timetable and set of procedures based on the calendar year represents the so-called ideal which was followed unevenly at best across campus.

College Procedures/Timeline for Annual Merit Review  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Faculty Merit Evaluation Process  
Procedures/Timeline for Annual Merit Review

Calendar Year

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
1. Faculty develop and review responsibilities and priorities for next calendar year.	August – October
2. Faculty prepare annual statement of responsibilities (ASR) with expectations and priorities for next calendar year (see attachment)	November – December
3. Chair reviews and negotiates ASR for next calendar year with faculty.	December – January
4. Faculty prepare evaluation materials for current calendar year and submit to chair by last Monday in February	December – February
5. Chair reviews faculty evaluation materials and prepares chair evaluations.	February – March
6. Chair discusses faculty member's evaluation materials and chair's evaluation with faculty member. Preliminary evaluations are sent to the faculty member and dean.	March
7. Chair submits final evaluations of in April faculty to dean with merit salary increment. If actual increment is unavailable, a projected increment may be used.	First Monday
8. Dean forwards merit recommendations to Provost within 10 working days of receipt of all evaluation materials and advisory opinions.	

Point Four – It should be noted that the calendar year does not “officially” allow materials in the Spring semester to be included in the evaluation materials. In fact, some departments have permitted the inclusion of Spring evaluation materials (a new book, juried exhibition, published article, conference paper, book review, teaching evaluations, etc.) and some did not. Officially, these materials should not be included to avoid giving some faculty advantage over others in the packet/listing submitted to the chair. **A point to be made in light of recent inquiries is that the administration has never mandated that materials, especially Spring teaching evaluations, could not be included. This choice was left up to faculty and chairs and decided by department choice. You can see, however, that the “deadline” of the last Monday in February makes it almost impossible to legitimately include Spring teaching evaluations under the calendar year time period and works against getting a conference paper or other evaluation items completed in the Spring into the process.**

Point Five – The adoption of the academic year better mirrors the actual work period of faculty and permits wider discretion for getting more evaluation materials into the process. Most

importantly, there is no difference between the two time periods for inclusion of teaching evaluations, the current point of contention for some. The decision to include Spring teaching evaluations is still left up to individual departments, chairs and faculty. In reality, the movement of the “deadline” for getting evaluation materials to the department chair from the last Monday in February to April 1 provides time to get teaching evaluations into the process. This is especially attractive for those who believe it is better to administer TEVALS/other evaluation instruments in the middle of the semester to allow for mid-term adjustments in pedagogy, pace of course work, time management, student productivity, and so on. **The critical point is that neither time period requires the use or administration of teaching evaluations by some preconceived deadline mandated by anyone.** The academic year, however, provides an added two months for those who might prefer to use Spring teaching evaluations that the calendar year does not. Again, the choice is left to individual departments just as it was under the calendar year. Further, if someone wanted to get Spring teaching evaluations into the process, nothing would stop a chair from getting everything else from a faculty member by April 1 and factoring in more materials while waiting for the actual salary merit increments from the Legislature and Board of Regents. The new timeline developed to accommodate the academic year time period illustrates that possibility.

**Fort Hays State University**  
College and Department Procedures/Process/Timeline for Faculty  
Annual Merit Review

Based on Academic Year

<u>Procedure</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
1. Faculty review personal development plans and priorities for next academic year	By March 15
2. Faculty prepare evaluation materials for current academic year and submit to chair	By April 1
3. Chair reviews faculty evaluation materials and prepares evaluations. Chair discusses evaluation materials and chair’s evaluation with faculty	By April 30
4. Chair submits final evaluations to dean with signed merit salary recommendation forms. If actual salary increment is unavailable, a Projected increment may be used on the form.	By May 1
5. Faculty and chair consult regarding annual statement of responsibilities (ASR) for next academic year.	By May 8
6. Chair reviews and finalizes ASR for next academic year with continuing faculty.	By May 15 for Continuing Faculty
Consultation and ASR for new faculty to be completed by end of second week in September.	By September 15 for New Faculty

Point Six – Although neither time period is ideal based on the “rhythms” of the faculty work cycle and the constraints of the holiday break between semesters, an analysis seems to come down in favor of the academic year for many of the reasons noted. On a different note, as much as the Faculty Senate plays a role in shared governance, faculty did decide to transfer issues related to “working conditions” to the AAUP bargaining unit. We begin to look like “silly governance” in Topeka and elsewhere if we simply respond to negotiated positions with “knee-jerk, ping-pong” like reactions to change positions within weeks of a completed MOA. The administration of

teaching evaluations is still controlled by department requests and faculty needs, and the adoption of the academic year provides some options not previously available.

Peace, LG

- Provost Gould clarified that whether the calendar or academic year, there has never been a mandate to require TEVALS in the Spring semester. Furthermore, there has never been a mandate requiring the use of TEVALS at any point regarding calendar or academic year evaluations. The reason for this is that some departments have issued other types of evaluations other than TEVALS in the middle of the semester. There is the opportunity to utilize evaluations provided mid-semester towards making adjustments then. This transition from calendar to academic year went through a process of four months of deliberation. It was shared with department chairs and shared through the Provost's office. Regarding the Faculty Senate handbook, it moves into the area of prohibitive practices when it's suggested that the Faculty Senate handbook says it cannot be done while 188 members are in the unit that are not under the auspices of the Faculty Handbook. These members fall under the direction of the MOA. When TEVALS are compiled they go to the department chairs and faculty, and there is no necessity to have them ready for April 1<sup>st</sup>.
- President Patrick stated two options towards the resolution:
  - Vote on the resolution as it stands.
  - Treat it as a quasi-announcement item (basically table).
  - Not to act upon the resolution based on the conflict of prohibitive practices. Provost Gould noted that this resolution isn't a problem but rather the next due to the calendar year versus academic year was a point of negotiation.
- Fred Britten noted that perhaps the resolution could be amended to read that "departments may use teaching evaluations." Vice President Goodlett stated that this would change the nature of the resolution.
- Senator Squires noted that emphasizing that it is an "option" if departments choose to use it, and yet it could be a prohibitive practice.
- Senator Stark noted that in theory the chair sits down with the faculty and decides how the year would be evaluated. This therefore is an issue between the chair and departmental faculty.
- Provost Gould stated that he could put a hold on the distribution of TEVALS until the Faculty Senate deliberations on this matter are concluded. Traditionally thereafter they are sent to the department chairs.
- The motion to table the resolution was made by Senator Stark, seconded by Senator Siegrist. President Patrick added that it would be provided as an informational item to faculty. It would clarify that Spring 2004 evaluations do not have to be as the Spring 2004 academic year merit process.
- The motion was unanimously approved.

**Resolution 104\_031:** The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University recommends a return to calendar year merit evaluations.

- President Patrick stated that it makes little sense to have teaching evaluations done on a calendar year and everything else on the academic year. Contracts are issued using the academic year, and generally when merit is computed it comes mid-semester. The problem of overlapping activities noted in the '03 evaluation period into the '04 evaluation year may occur. The Executive Committee felt that faculty may find this confusing.
- After discussing the nuances associated with calendar and academic year merit evaluations, President Patrick suggested that the wording of the resolution read: "The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University recommends that the AAUP and the administration consider in the next deliberation a return to the calendar year evaluations."
- Senator Drabkin made a motion to indefinitely table the resolution and provide it as an informational item to faculty.



- The motion was approved with one abstention.

**Resolution 104\_32:** The Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University recommends that the following revision of the university values statement be adopted (see Attachment D)

- President Patrick noted that deletions respective of the previous draft are in brackets, and additions in italics. Vice President Goodlett offered to answer any questions.
- Provost Gould clarified that an objective is to assure that the various statements associated with FHSU are in place.
- Senator Jerrold Stark made a motion that the statement be amended with the following change to sentence one: “Fort Hays State University is committed to being one of the nation’s outstanding comprehensive liberal arts and professional institutions.”
- Due to a lack of a quorum, the motion was tabled.

#### 4. Reports From Liaisons

4a. Instructional Technology Policy Advisory Committee: Gavin Buffington

- No report

4b. Internationalization Team: Josephine Squires

- The affinity diagram for International Studies was revised and sent to Provost Gould for approval.

4c. Virtual College Advisory Committee: Sue Jacobs

- No report.

4d. Classified Senate: Tom Martin

- Classified Senate did not meet last month, but sent representatives to “Information Day.”

4e. AQIP and Institutional Effectiveness Committee: Chris Crawford

- President Patrick read the following report from Chris Crawford:
  - Report for AQIP/Institutional Effectiveness: We are working forward on the Systems Portfolio. We have had one feedback forum and very good turnout, and have another scheduled for March 18. At the second forum we’ll be discussing the draft chapters of the SP.

4f. Report from AAUP liaison: Douglas Drabkin

- The next round of negotiations will be initiated shortly.

4g. Student Government: Robert Howell

- A discussion centering on keeping midterm grades occurred.

4h. General Education: Martha Holmes

- President Patrick was informed by Senator Holmes that there was no meeting since the last senate meeting.

4i. Faculty and Staff Development Committee: Sandra Thies

- No report.

4j. Library Committee: Douglas Drabkin

- No report.

4k. Graduate Council: Steve Trout

- Graduate Council will meet next week.

4l. Research Environmental Task Force: John Heinrichs/Carol Patrick

- Work is moving along regarding the development of the AQUIP Matrix for the research goal.
- Provost Gould mentioned the submission of 41 staff applications for a quarter period. He has a limited budget and is doing his best to allocate the resources as fairly as possible. The Provost recommends that the Executive Committee create a resolution asking the administration to increase the budget by \$25,000 or something to that nature.

4m. Faculty Research Association: Steve Trout

- No report

## **5. Old Business**

Resolution 104\_025 - Report from By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee: Dan Kulmala

- The By-Laws and Standing Rules Committee noted that the content in Resolution 104\_025 is not found in the by-laws or standing rules.

## **6. New Business**

## **7. Adjournment of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:15