

5-4-1992

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, May 4, 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, May 4, 1992" (1992). *Faculty Senate*. 844.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/844

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.

Minutes of the
Fort Hays State University
Faculty Senate
May 4, 1992

President Watt called the meeting of the Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate to order in the Trails Room of the Memorial Union on May 4, 1992, at 3:35 p.m.

Those members present were Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Michael Madden, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Zoran Stevanov, 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, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Carl Singleton, Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Dr. Gary L. Millhollen, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Helmut Schmeller, Mr. Glen McNeil, Mr. Herb Zook, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Charles Votaw, 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. Phyllis Tiffany, and Dr. Mike Rettig.

Members absent were Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. Robert Markley, and Dr. Nevell Razak.

Guests included Mr. Michael Leikam, Dr. James Murphy, Dr. Larry Gould, and a representative of the Leader.

The minutes of the April 7, 1992, Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. President Watt encouraged constituents to attend the reception at Farmer's State Bank on May 8 after the all-campus faculty meeting.
2. Ms. Koerner indicated that she had read the recommendations of the Faculty Evaluation Task Force (item 1.c under Regents announcements). She wanted a definition of "extension" which was mentioned in the Task Force report. President Watt thought that the word referred to programs such as at Kansas State University which sends out extension classes, seminars, etc.; it was specific to Kansas State. Ms. Koerner asked President Watt to find out exactly what was meant.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. Presented by Dr. Britten.

The Academic Affairs Committee presented six motions for approval by the Faculty Senate:

Motion 1: To approve BSAH 414 Medical Imaging Clinical Preceptorship.

Dr. Rumpel asked if the course would be offered more than once.

Dr. Britten responded in the affirmative. The motion passed with one abstention, the rest approving.

Motion 2: To approve course change for MGT 508/708 The Deming Management Method.

There were no questions; the motion passed unanimously.

Motion 3: To approve 11 course changes in the Radio-Television-Film Area of the Communication Department.

Dr. Britten explained that the changes reflected better current practices in the field. The motion was approved unanimously.

Motion 4: To approve COMM 528/728 Media Law and Contemporary Society.

Dr. Rumpel asked if the faculty member who would teach this course was competent to teach a course on law. Dr. Britten replied that the Academic Affairs Committee had discussed that question; Dr. Britten pointed out that there were a few courses on law presently taught by faculty holding no legal degrees; in those cases, the faculty have access to competent, trained support. Mr. Michael Leikam indicated that the course did not instruct specifically on law, but rather teaches journalists about the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States; the course is not meant to ask the students to make analytical decisions. The motion passed unanimously.

Motion 5: To approve COMM 523/723 Beginning Video Production.

Dr. Britten explained that this motion represented primarily a title change, but there was enough content change that this course is presented as a separate motion. The credit hours were inadvertently left out of the description; Dr. Britten indicated that the course is a 3-hour course. President Watt asked about the use of "beginning" for a 500/700-level course. Mr. Leikam indicated that he had no objection to dropping that term from the title. Dr. Hassett suggested a friendly amendment, to drop the word "beginning"; the amendment was accepted. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Britten indicated that a motion to approve COMM 248 Beginning Audio Production had been left off the agenda; he asked to present it as Motion 5b. His request was allowed; there was no discussion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Motion 6: To approve CHEM 112 General Chemistry I, CHEM 112L General Chemistry Laboratory I, CHEM 114 General Chemistry II, and General CHEM 114L Chemistry Laboratory II.

Dr. Britten said that these courses replaced CHEM 102 and lab, replacing a 5-hour sequence with a 6-hour sequence. He indicated that students would be permitted to test out of 112 if they had a good high school course. Ms. Koerner asked if both courses were proposed as general education courses; Dr. Britten replied that they were proposed as general education courses. Ms. Koerner

asked if students must take both labs; Dr. Britten replied that both were co-requisites. Dr. Zody asked what mathematical proficiency was necessary; Dr. Rumpel replied that a basic knowledge of Algebra was sufficient. Dr. Parker asked if a student took College Algebra, would the student be prepared for these courses. Dr. Rumpel replied "yes." Dr. Hassett asked if a student could enroll concurrently in one of these courses and College Algebra. Dr. Rumpel replied that a student could be enrolled concurrently in College Algebra but not in Basic Algebra. The motion passed unanimously.

Since Dr. Murphy had come into the meeting since Ms. Koerner's question about the Faculty Evaluations Task Force report, Ms. Koerner asked Dr. Murphy what was meant by "extension." Dr. Murphy answered that this referred specifically to Kansas State University.

President Watt announced that he would like to change the order of Standing Committee Reports so that Dr. Martin Shapiro, who must leave early, could present a report from the University Affairs Committee.

2. University Affairs.

a. Final Exam Schedule Change. Presented by Dr. Martin Shapiro.

Dr. Shapiro presented the following motion: Because of the problems that often arise when final exams are scheduled at times and/or on days different from the regular class meeting time, the Faculty Senate proposes the adoption of the Final Exam schedule submitted to the Senate on April 7, 1992.

Dr. Shapiro reminded senators that the change had been distributed at the last Faculty Senate meeting, commented that he had heard only favorable responses, and asked if anyone had any questions. Dr. Gatschet mentioned that students support it. Dr. Zody asked if it affected the Saturday schedule for mathematics exams; Dr. Hughen replied that the math exams would not be affected. Dr. Stephen Shapiro asked if Friday would be the day for students with more than 3 exams on a day to take those additional exams; Dr. M. Shapiro replied "yes." The motion to adopt a new final exam schedule was passed unanimously.

The question was asked when the new schedule would go into effect; Dr. Shapiro replied that Spring 1993 would be the earliest. Dr. Witten pointed out that students have so many examinations during the last week of classes that the Faculty Senate should pass a resolution against this practice. Dr. Murphy replied that exams could be given during the last week of classes if the exams were unit exams and not final exams.

b. Policy for the Administration of Student Evaluations. Presented by Dr. Hughen.

Dr. Hughen informed senators that a Regents' Task Force on Faculty Evaluation had presented a report to the Regents, who had accepted the report. The report stated that (1) faculty evaluations were a popular source of information on faculty effectiveness on a national level; in a survey of 600 liberal arts institutions, 71% of the academic deans use them; (2) student opinion was important for evaluations; and (3) student evaluations do not seem to be subject to significant bias. The Student Advisory Committee has requested that the Board of Regents direct the administration of each university to administer evaluations in such a way that student anonymity will be protected. Dr. Hughen explained that the policy offered a controlled standard policy for administering evaluations.

Dr. Hughen pointed out that the policy was essentially the same one presented last year. Two changes have been made: since the present summer school policy rejects summer school performance from the merit process, the requirement to administer evaluations in summer school was removed; the second change (paragraph 3) recommends evaluation of all courses as the ideal, but does not require it because of possible problems.

In the discussion which followed, several observations about faculty evaluations were made. Dr. Miller observed that deans favored them more than faculty did. Dr. Durham commented that as culture changes, biases change and recommended that Item 6 should reflect this; he also recommended that evaluations be given at the beginning of the class period so that instructors could not "manipulate" the results. Dr. Parker and Mrs. Barton pointed out the difficulty for some departments to type up student comments. Dr. M. Shapiro pointed out the problem for departments of storing evaluations; Dr. Hassett observed that it might be necessary legally to retain the evaluations for 5 years. A few senators recommended that students do the evaluations outside of class for the purpose (among others) of typing their own comments. Mr. Wilson pointed out that taking them out of the room would allow abuses such as students making copies to turn in; Dr. Rumpel indicated that only a small percentage of students would turn the evaluations in. Ms. Koerner indicated that the reasons for developing a policy were the inconsistencies with which evaluations had been administered in the past, the lack of use by some faculty, and student requests for uniformity and anonymity.

Dr. Miller asked why full professors should not be exempted; Dr. Hughen replied that chairs need the data for merit decisions and that persons change over the years. Dr. Miller observed that evaluations do not sufficiently answer those concerns; Dr. Hughen indicated that evaluations were only one method to be used for such purposes. Dr. Rumpel commented that evaluations were valuable feedback for one's performance; Dr. Gatschet agreed. The question was asked why student evaluations should be taken before finals' week; Dr. Hughen answered that students believe the evaluations have more validity if taken earlier in the semester than on

finals' day, but not too early, when the students want to leave the room quickly.

Dr. Durham recommended two amendments to the policy:

1. to add to item 6 the following: "Research on factors which affect results of student evaluations is an ongoing process; these factors may change over time. Accordingly the above list of factors is illustrative only; the actual factors to be considered may need to be changed as applicable research indicates." To summarize, "as culture changes, we need to adapt to that." Dr. Britten seconded; the motion passed unanimously.
2. to add to item 5, after first sentence: "These instructions should include, where appropriate, instructions concerning the manner in which the evaluations should be administered." Ms. Koerner seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Singleton recommended to item 3 that a sentence, "student evaluations will not be weighted more than 50% of the teaching component for the teacher's merit evaluation," be added to the policy. Dr. Durham seconded. Dr. Parker said that the statement would force administration to consider other methods beyond subjective evaluations for determining quality of instruction. Dr. Huguen and Ms. Koerner stated that this statement would be more appropriately included in Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook than in a policy for administration of faculty evaluations. The motion failed on a vote of 12 for, 19 against, and 0 abstentions. The question was called.

The motion to approve the Policy for the Administration for Student Evaluations passed on a majority vote with 1 negative vote and 0 abstentions.

Dr. Tiffany recommended that the University Affairs Committee should look at the question of Dr. Singleton's amendment. President Watt encouraged the Committee to discuss this with the Provost also. Ms. Koerner asked President Watt to find the students' recommendation on this issue also.

c. Policy for Misconduct in Research. Presented by Dr. Rumpel.

Dr. Rumpel explained that the policy was developed at the request of Dr. Forsythe, Graduate School Dean, because many external funding agencies require a policy such as this one before the university can compete for funding. Dr. Rumpel indicated that the American Association of Universities had been consulted for requirements which such a policy should meet.

The proposed policy has two stages: (1) a low profile, enquiry stage and (2) a more formal investigation stage. The policy does not deal with class situations of student

papers but rather with research intended for publication. Dr. Forsythe and Dr. Murphy have reviewed it. Dr. Murphy indicated that he would send the policy if approved to the Graduate Council for review. Dr. Gatschet asked if the Graduate Council should review it and give input before the Faculty Senate acts on it. Dr. Rumpel indicated that Dr. Forsythe was anxious to get some sort of policy in place as soon as possible, and the Senate has been working on it for a year. President Watt wondered if the Senate would have a quorum during the summer; if not, the policy would be put off until next fall. Ms. Koerner recommended that the Senate act on it so that Dr. Forsythe could act on it. Dr. Britten pointed out that the Graduate Council would want to know what the Faculty Senate had decided. Dr. Zody recommended that the motion to approve the Policy for Misconduct in Research be tabled. The vote was 17 to table and 10 not to table. The motion was tabled.

President Watt asked Dr. Rumpel to discuss the proposed policy with the Graduate Council.

Dr. Huguen asked if the Senate should adjourn since the time was almost 5:00 p.m. and reconvene the following week. Ms. Koerner suggested that the Senate continue to discuss the agenda until 5:30 p.m. Seeing no objections to continuing, President Watt asked Ms. Koerner to continue the University Affairs Committee report.

d. Changes to Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook. Presented by Ms. Koerner.

Ms. Koerner explained that both changes were precipitated by Judith Siminoe's visit to Fort Hays State University at Dr. Murphy's request. Ms. Siminoe is the Regents' counsel for Fort Hays State.

Motion 1: This motion would create three levels of committees for both tenure and promotion. The vote was unanimously in favor.

Motion 2: The intention of this motion is to make the policy clear that faculty may appeal at any point in the process. Dr. Stevanov asked if faculty could be present at a hearing; President Watt responded affirmatively. The vote was unanimously in favor.

3. By-laws and Standing Rules. Presented by Dr. Riazi.

Dr. Riazi reported that all departments holding elections for senators had reported; those elections and changes not yet reported to the Senate are Dr. Singleton, alternate for English; Mrs. Sandra Rupp, senator, and Dr. Jean Sellers, alternate, for Business Education; Dr. Huguen, senator, and Dr. Tramel, alternate, for Philosophy; and Dr. Stevanov, senator, and Mr. Jilg, alternate, for Art, representing an exchange of responsibilities.

Dr. Riazi also reported that the Nomination Committee had met and

Appendix A

It is moved that the following change be made on Page 17 of Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook:

Max Rumpel, 1 CAC Liaison for Faculty Senate
May 4, 1992

On page 17, Line 6. The following sentence is deleted:

The provost will not serve on the committee.

On Page 17, Line 6 of Chapter 3 of the Faculty Handbook be inserted after ...from each of the colleges to serve on the committee.:

Committee members shall select a recorder who will prepare the recommendations that will be sent to the provost. 1 The committee will be chaired by the provost who serves on the committee in an ex-officio capacity and therefore does not vote. The provost may be present for all discussion. If the committee members feel that a written ballot be used, the recorder will tabulate the results.

Appendix B

COMPUTER ADVISORY COMMITTEE Activities: 1991-92

The Computer Advisory Committee (CAC) considered several broad topics as well as some specific issues in the past year. The more noteworthy are indicated here.

Role of the Committee and the nature of the decision process for computer-related developments at FHSU. Interrelations of the Library Committee, the Media Committee and the CAC were discussed in the light of the suggestion of a more global committee on Processing Information.

The Geographic Information System (GIS). The CAC discussed the capabilities of the system to provide and facilitate use of numerous geographically-related databases. The truly multidisciplinary applicability of the System was pointed out. The CAC endorsed efforts to obtain GIS and lent its backing to proposals for funding via on-campus and external means.

Local Area Networks (LANS). The CAC reviewed LAN activities on the campus and lent its support to further development of LANS on the campus, in a planned manner.

Site licensing status and policies on campus. Discussion is in progress. A survey of the campus community to assess need is being planned.

Technology royalties policy. The CAC is reviewing the recommended policy after discussions with the Provost and the Board of Regents legal staff.