

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

4-8-1980

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, April 8, 1980

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, April 8, 1980" (1980). *Faculty Senate*. 702.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/702

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

April 8, 1980

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Louis Caplan, Faculty Senate President, at 3:30 p.m. in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

The Secretary called the roll and the following members were present: Dr. James Stansbury, Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Emerald Dechant, Ms. Orvene Johnson, Mr. Edgar McNeil, Ms. Joye Witten, Mr. Mac Reed, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Mr. David Lefurgey, Dr. Sam Warfel, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. Lewis Miller, Mr. Robert Brown, Dr. Stephen Tramel, Mr. Thaine Clark, Mr. Elton Schroder, Dr. John Watson, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Richard Zakrzewski, Dr. Ervin Eltze, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Louis Caplan, Ms. Betty Roberts, Dr. Robert Meier, Ms. Sharon Barton, Mr. Daniel Rupp, Dr. Ann Liston, Mr. Richard Heil, Dr. Ron Smith.

The following members were absent: Mr. Don Barton, Ms. Joanne Harwick, Dr. John Knight, Dr. Al Geritz, Ms. Carolyn Gatschet, Ms. Patricia Baconrind, Dr. Nevell Razak.

The following alternates were present: Ms. Ellen Schiferl for Harwick and Mr. Dale Peier for Baconrind.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate has selected the nominating committee for next year's Senate elections. The committee members are: Patrick Drinan, James Forsythe, Lewis Miller, Daniel Rupp, and Charles Votaw. The committee will nominate a minimum of two for Vice President of the Faculty Senate and a minimum of two for Secretary of the Faculty Senate and will report to the Senate at the May meeting. If you have any suggestions, contact any member of the committee. Additional nominations from the floor will be accepted at both the May and September meetings of the Senate.
2. The Senate President has selected the following faculty members for the Torch Award Committee: Elaine Beason, Garry Brower, Louis Caplan (ex officio), Albert Geritz, and Larry Grimsley.
3. The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents met with the Council of Presidents on March 20 in Topeka to discuss faculty salaries for Fiscal 1982. A second meeting is scheduled for April 7 in Emporia.

Faculty salaries were discussed at the RICC meeting on March 20. The request for 7 percent salary increase plus 1 percent for promotions requested by the Board of Regents was based on Presidential Guidelines in existence when the Fiscal 1981 budget was prepared. When asked if they had gone back to the Governor or the Legislature with an amended request based on the new Presidential Guidelines, the answer was "no." The Board did go back to the Legislature requesting that unclassified salaries be given the highest priority, but it was admitted that the Board of Regents and the Regents Staff have never seen the Guidelines.

4. President Tomanek will address the May meeting of the Faculty Senate and report on the salary and OOE budget for Fiscal 1981 and the budget being proposed to the Board of Regents for Fiscal 1982.

5. An ad hoc committee (Richard Heil, John Watson, and Sam Warfel) is in the process of preparing a request to President Tomanek for clerical help (definition 2 in Webster's New Collegiate) for the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

6. The University Affairs Committee is studying the policy of handicapped parking spaces as opposed to reserved parking spaces for non-handicapped faculty with physical disabilities.

Dr. Frerer asked for clarification concerning announcement No. 6. Dr. Caplan responded by stating that the policy in the past was that there were certain reserved parking spaces on campus. These spaces have been replaced by handicapped parking spaces. The latter requires a handicapped license plate.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs - Dr. John Watson, Chair

On behalf of the Committee, Dr. Watson moved the adoption of the following motion:

M₁ "Up to two (2) hours of the four (4) hour Physical Education requirement may be satisfied with either the first two years of ROTC courses or with the ROTC summer camp" (seconded by Dr. Zakrzewski).

Mr. McNeil objected to the motion for two reasons. First, by giving credit for ROTC courses, the HPER Department will lose student credit hour production. Second, Mr. McNeil did not believe that participation in ROTC would develop physical skills to be used later in life comparable to those taught in the HPER Department. Mr. McNeil inquired whether this proposal means the students will receive credit without having to pay tuition. Dr. Watson responded that the students still have to take 124 hours to graduate, and they would pay tuition for the ROTC courses. Dr. Warfel pointed out that those persons with military service are currently exempted from two hours of Physical Education credit.

Dr. Frerer inquired whether it has been determined whether Fort Hays State will actually receive the student credit hour production for the ROTC program. Dr. Watson said that it had been checked several times, and Dr. Chalender was engaged in further investigation. It was Dr. Watson's interpretation that Fort Hays State would receive the credit hour production.

Dr. Votaw asked for clarification concerning whether there were two specific ROTC courses that would replace physical education credit, or would the entire two-year program have to be completed? What does "the first two years of ROTC courses" mean? Dr. Watson pointed out that transfer students would come to Fort Hays State without the basic courses but would participate in ROTC summer camp. Participation in this summer camp would receive physical fitness training. Students in ROTC during their first two years at Fort Hays State would receive a total of four hours of credit. Two of those four hours would apply, but no more than two hours. Dr. Votaw suggested that the wording of the motion might be changed to clarify

its meaning. For example, if a student takes three semesters of ROTC and then drops out, do they receive any credit? Dr. Caplan asked Dr. Votaw if he would prefer if the motion read "either of the first two years." Dr. Votaw said "no."

Dr. Liston suggested that the wording of the motion was creating confusion. The student who completes the first two years of ROTC courses or attends summer camp is not given two hours of physical education credit but is exempted from taking two hours of physical education courses.

Dr. Warfel indicated that motion meant that four hours of ROTC courses should satisfy two hours of physical education credit. Dr. Watson agreed with Dr. Liston that the student would not receive two hours of physical education credit but would be exempted from two hours of the total of four hours. Dr. Miller asked if a veteran receives two hours of credit for military service, does he still have to take 124 hours to graduate? Dr. Warfel said that the veteran receives two hours of credit toward the 124 hours. It is not an exemption. Dr. Caplan asked if participation in marching band counted in lieu of physical education requirements. Dr. Warfel indicated that it did. Dr. Miller elaborated that a student may not take marching band and another physical education course in the same semester. Also, marching band is offered only in the fall semester, and credit can be obtained for only two semesters. Mr. McNeil indicated that the HPER Department did not object to marching band in lieu of physical education credit, but he reiterated that the HPER Department does not feel students should be given physical education credit for participation in ROTC. Dr. Zakrzewski stated that the course descriptions for the ROTC courses and many of the new course proposals recently approved by the Faculty Senate in the HPER Department are very similar, such as rifle shooting and orienteering.

Dr. Smith asked for further explanation of the rationale of this motion by those who supported it. Dr. Watson stated that the position of those who favor this motion was that if two hours of credit was given for military service, then two hours of credit should be given for taking two years of ROTC courses or participation in the summer camp. Dr. Frerer stated that this was common practice on other campuses he was familiar with. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The chair was uncertain of the vote and called for a show of hands. The result was 14 votes in favor and 11 opposed. The motion was adopted.

Bylaws and Standing Rules - Dr. Stephen Tramel, Chair

Dr. Tramel reported that notices have been sent to the departments that have Senators whose terms are expiring and the departments were reminded of the need to elect alternates. The Senators were urged to see that their departments notify the Committee of its actions.

Student Affairs - Mr. Mac Reed, Chair

No report.

University Affairs - Mr. Dan Rupp, Chair

M₂ On behalf of the Committee, Mr. Rupp moved the adoption of the following Promotion Procedure. (Note: What follows is the Promotion Procedure as amended by the Senate at this meeting. The four amendments were changes in language rather than substance. Therefore, what follows is the version approved by the Senate.)

PROMOTION PROCEDURE

All recommendations for promotion must be reviewed at the department level, the school level, and the university level. Promotions are normally initiated by the department; the promotion may be initiated at the request of the individual. The chairman of each department will submit to the dean of the school a list of all the individuals recommended by the department for promotions. The list will be accompanied by the procedures and criteria followed at the department level in making the recommendations for promotion; and likewise, all promotion records and supporting evidence for each recommendation will be forwarded to the dean. While the departments should not be required to submit the recommendations in order of priority, they may be allowed to do so with accompanying reasons for such ranking. The dean of the school will then review each recommendation and submit the procedures and criteria used in the review of the department's recommendations and include all promotion records and supporting evidence to the Academic Vice President. Department and school procedures and criteria are in addition to, and will not be inconsistent with, university policy on promotion. The Academic Vice President will distribute all of the recommendations and supporting documentation from the departments and schools to the Committee on Academic Promotions, chaired by the Academic Vice President. The Promotions Committee will review each of the recommendations and documentation and submit a recommendation on each to the President of the University. The President will make the final determination on each recommendation to be made to the Board of Regents and communicate those decisions, including the reasons why the promotion was not awarded, down through the channels to the individual recommended for promotion.

For each nominee for promotion, supporting evidence in each of the following categories, whichever are relevant, must be submitted:

1. Teaching
 - A. Instruction
 - B. Evaluation of student performance
 - C. Academic advising
2. Research, scholarship, or creative activity
3. Professional development
4. Public and administrative service related to the academic discipline of the individual

Professional development, and professional, public, or administrative service should strengthen a case for promotion. However, those criteria are typically subordinate to excellence in teaching and scholarly or creative activity. Likewise, teaching excellence or scholarship alone should rarely be sufficient for promotion from assistant professor to associate professor or from associate professor to professor.

A professor with little or no record of teaching excellence or of scholarship or creative endeavor could easily grow stale. Professors should remain very much aware of the developments in their disciplines which usually requires their taking an active part in that discipline. Typically, promotion to associate professor or professor must involve some scholarly or creative effort. However, excellence in teaching, significant scholarship, and distinguished service cannot all realistically be expected in each case; promotion decisions should be compensatory, i.e., some weakness in one area may be offset by particular strength in another. Nevertheless, when the important aspects of teaching excellence, the creation of new knowledge through scholarship or creative artistry and service are visually absent, it is highly unlikely that promotion to associate professor or professor will be awarded. Therefore, all recommendations for promotion to associate professor or professor must be accompanied by documentation of the nominee's excellence in teaching and the names and addresses of scholars in the nominee's discipline, both from within and without the university, who are in a position to comment on the nominee's past and current work.

DEFINITIONS OF RANK

Instructor

An instructor is an individual who ordinarily does not possess a terminal degree or the equivalent in the field.

Assistant Professor

An assistant professor is an individual who normally possesses a terminal degree or the equivalent in the field, i.e., CPA, M.F.A., etc.

The rank of assistant professor can be a beginning level appointment for one who holds the terminal degree or its equivalent in the field, or it can be a rank achieved after service in the rank of instructor.

I. Qualifications:

- A. Education and experience: promotion from instructor to assistant professor should normally follow achievement of the terminal degree or its equivalent in the field.
- B. Additional school and department qualifications may be required.

Associate Professor

An associate professor is an individual who normally possesses a terminal degree or the equivalent in the field and appropriate professional experience.

I. Qualifications:

- A. Education and experience: promotion from the rank of assistant professor to associate professor requires noteworthy contribution and definite potential for further major contribution to the field and the university; and a minimum of five years of service in the rank of assistant professor.
- B. Additional school and department qualifications may be required.

Professor

A professor is an individual who normally possesses a terminal degree or the equivalent in the field and who has demonstrated meritorious teaching, scholarship, and service in the field as defined by the individual's department and school. "The rank of professor shall be awarded only to those who are proven masters of their field and outstanding in it and whose general attributes of culture are recognized by their fellows; such determination to be made by administrations and faculties in the traditional manner" (Board of Regents, State of Kansas, Policies and Procedures, Page 37).

I. Qualifications:

- A. Education and experience: promotion from the rank of associate professor to professor requires demonstrated major contribution to the field and to the university; and requires a minimum of five years of service in the rank of associate professor.
- B. Additional school and department qualifications may be required.

CRITERIA FOR PROMOTIONS

*These criteria are recommended for departmental use and are not mandatory.

I. Evaluation of Teaching

A. Methods and Procedures to be Used

- 1. Evidence of classroom performance at various levels
 - a. Student evaluations using department approved evaluation forms
 - b. Professional-scholarly opinions held by colleagues, including class visitations

- c. Materials used in courses: syllabi, types of work required of students, evidence of systematic evaluation of students
- d. Course Management: instructional techniques employed, degree of rapport with students, student counseling and conferences, evidence of student response beyond minimal course requirements, special activities and projects

- 2. Graduate thesis or undergraduate honors independent project advisement, including responsibilities both as director of thesis or project and committee member

B. Minimum Satisfactory Performance

The department judges minimum satisfactory performance to mean that a teacher meets his classes regularly and punctually, covers the material specified in the catalog for each course that he teaches, regularly and systematically evaluates class performance, maintains regular office hours for conference with students in his classes, is relatively current in the scholarship in those areas in which he teaches, and receives acceptable student evaluations.

C. Some Merit for Teaching

May apply either at graduate or undergraduate level, or both. Distinctive characteristics of this rating, in addition to those for minimum satisfactory performance are:

- 1. Evidence of effort to improve classroom performance
- 2. Willingness to assume teaching responsibilities outside of the regular departmental offering in the individual's field, but within general fields of competency, honors classes, multidisciplinary courses, and extension courses.

D. Considerable Merit for Teaching

May apply either at graduate or undergraduate level, or both. Distinctive characteristics of this rating, in addition to those for "Some Merit" are:

- 1. Student evaluations indicate consistently high level classroom performance
- 2. Evidence of course revision to include new scholarship in the field, new instructional methods and materials
- 3. Willingness to assume teaching responsibilities of new or experimental courses, honors courses, graduate or undergraduate independent study beyond the ordinary departmental teaching load, and demonstrating qualities of leadership, imagination, and initiative in developing these courses

4. Direction of graduate thesis or undergraduate honors independent project, including direction of thesis or project or serving as committee member

E. Unusual Merit for Teaching

Should apply at both undergraduate and graduate levels, except in extraordinary cases. Distinctive characteristics of this rating in addition to those for all other ratings are:

1. Student evaluations consistently show exceptionally high-level classroom performance
2. Evidence of critical self-appraisal and course revision to maintain exceptionally high-level classroom performance, and to keep courses continually stimulating and relevant
3. Recognition by colleagues of influence on students to develop enthusiasm for the subject and lead them to high levels of academic achievement
4. Unusual responsibilities or achievements in the direction of theses

II. Evaluation of Scholarly Productivity

A. Methods and Procedures to be Used

1. Information on personal data sheets
2. Research grants
3. Publication or definite acceptance for publication of scholarly books or articles
4. Public presentation of creative activity such as musical concerts, dance concerts, theatrical works, paintings, sculpture, athletic team performance, and the like
5. Honors or distinctions conferred as recognition of scholarly achievement or creative artistry
6. Weighing of scholarly publications
7. Participation at scholarly meetings

B. Minimum Satisfactory Performance

1. Evidence of research and writing for dissertation for non-Ph.D.'s

C. Some Merit for Scholarly Productivity

1. Evidence of continuing research or writing intended for scholarly publications

2. Public presentation of creative activity

3. Attendance at scholarly meetings

4. Receiving a university research grant

D. Considerable Merit for Scholarly Productivity

1. Progress on research project, including research in special library or manuscript collections in the United States or abroad

2. Submissions of manuscripts for publication by scholarly presses or journals

3. Public presentation of creative activity of exceptional quality which enhances the reputation of that program and the university

4. Participation on the program at a less important scholarly meeting

5. Receiving an external research grant

E. Unusual Merit

1. Publication of a scholarly book or monograph

2. Acceptance for publication of one or more scholarly articles

3. Receiving prestigious external recognition for high scholarly achievement or creative activity

4. Participation on the program at a major meeting

III. Evaluation of Service

A. Minimum Satisfactory Performance

Accepts fair share of departmental duties

B. Some merit: Staff member assumes more committee responsibility or administrative responsibility than usual, or develops contacts with colleges, schools, or other professional bodies which require extra time and effort

Examples: Membership on departmental committees with more extensive duties (curriculum, library, tenure, recruitment), planning of new programs, or participation in honors program

C. Considerable

Merit: Staff member assumes offices or duties in the college department which involve important responsibilities and considerable time and work, and which are indicative of confidence placed in the individual by the administration or his colleagues.

Examples: Faculty Senate and related committees, Graduate Council, and university task forces to develop special programs, and chairmanship of a departmental committee involving substantial duties

D. Unusual

Merit: Accomplishments which bring the individual unusual distinction beyond the confines of the college or the community, and thus add lustre and visibility to the college and the department

Examples: Chairmanship of a major university committee, presidency of the Faculty Senate, consultation work with a major press, membership on the editorial board of a professional journal, election to office of a state, regional, or national organization--an office with more than nominal duties and which is a sign of professional distinction

IV. Professional Advancement

A. Substantial increase in salary for completion of Ph.D.

B. Substantial increase in salary for continuing professional development, including such activities as post-doctoral education and professional experience directly related to the academic discipline of the individual

Dr. Warfel asked for a summary of the major differences between this Promotion Procedure and the one distributed at the last Senate meeting. Dr. Frerer stated that the last paragraph in the original document was deleted since it appeared to contain several provisions that were criticized at the last Senate meeting. Also, this proposal incorporates the criteria for promotion contained in the Faculty Handbook. The new proposal also recommends five years in rank instead of three before promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. Finally, examples of considerable merit and unusual merit in the evaluation of service were made more specific.

A 1 Dr. Miller moved "to amend the motion by striking the phrase, 'and clearly tied to,' from the second sentence of the third paragraph" (seconded by Mr. Rupp). The sentence read, "However, those criteria are typically subordinate to, and clearly tied to, excellence in teaching and scholarly or creative activity."

Dr. Miller expressed the view that since the purpose of the sentence is to

isolate excellence in teaching and scholarly or creative activity from the other criteria, the phrase "and clearly tied to" detracts from that emphasis. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The amendment was adopted.

Dr. Miller referred the Senate to the second paragraph, category B, Evaluation of Students (amended to read, "Evaluation of Student Performance"). Dr. Miller thought that phrase should read, "evaluation by students," but he had consulted with Dr. Frerer and was told it was not referring to students' evaluation of the teacher, but to the teacher's method and success in evaluating students. Dr. Miller suggested the word "grading." Dr. Warfel suggested that the phrase, "evaluation of students," will be misinterpreted unless it is changed. Dr. Tramel pointed out that the use of instruments by which students evaluate instruction is discussed later in the document. Dr. Votaw moved "to amend section B of paragraph two to read, 'evaluation of student performance'" (seconded by Dr. Stansbury). Mr. Schroder preferred the term "grading" as a more specific category. Dr. Votaw expressed the view that this category should be defined more broadly than the term "grading" implies. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The amendment was adopted.

Dr. Smith suggested that the category 1, C., Academic Advising, in paragraph 2 (as a part of teaching), was in conflict with academic advising listed as the first two words of paragraph 3. He suggested that it would clarify matters if academic advising were either left as 1, C., as a part of teaching to be evaluated and then removed from the third paragraph or else it should be given the status of a separate category. Dr. Frerer moved "to strike the first two words, 'academic advising,' from the third paragraph" (seconded by Mr. Reed). Dr. Miller asked if the intent of the amendment was to remove academic advising from category 1, C., under teaching. Dr. Frerer said that was not the intention of the motion. The category 1, C., would remain. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Tramel pointed out that the listing of categories does not mean they are all of equal weight when, in fact, teaching is the predominant factor. Dr. Caplan said that was correct although when you look at a list, there is a tendency to give the items equal weight. Dr. Tramel pointed out that the practice has been to weigh teaching at 60 percent with 20 percent to research and 20 percent to service. Dr. Caplan felt that varied between departments. Dr. Frerer commented that in revising the Promotion Procedure, he did not include the percentages from the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Caplan expressed the view that the criteria for faculty salary increases in the Faculty Handbook was not written by the Faculty Senate. Mr. Rupp said that it had been approved by the Senate. He felt that the idea was to establish some overall guidelines but to allow some autonomy in the departments. Mr. Rupp recalled that it was presented to the various deans and department heads, and there was considerable discussion about it. Dr. Tramel pointed out that last year, Vice President Eickhoff asked all the chairmen to follow the guidelines very closely, including the percentage factors in writing justifications for salary increases. Mr. Rupp suggested that the Senate might want to clarify its position on the use of the percentages. Dr. Warfel wondered if the importance of teaching as a criteria for promotion should not be more clearly stated in the document.

Dr. Miller suggested that the language was rather awkward and moved "that sentence 5 in paragraph 3 be amended to read, 'Professors should remain very much aware of the developments in their disciplines which usually requires their taking an active part in that discipline'" (seconded by Dr. Frerer). Dr. Frerer agreed that

the amendment improved the language. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The amendment was adopted.

Dr. Caplan raised the issue of whether the Faculty Senate preferred a minimum of three years or five years in rank before promotion is considered. It does make a financial difference whether faculty are promoted rapidly or slowly. When one is promoted, there is a financial adjustment that accompanies that promotion, and that increase becomes a base for further salary increases. Dr. Warfel stated that in speaking with another faculty member, it was felt the the Faculty Senate often "cut its own throat" in matters such as this and would do so again by establishing five years for promotion rather than three. Dr. Votaw disagreed saying that in theory, if everyone was promoted every three years, they would make more money; but in practice, that is not the way it works. A few departments promote every two or three years, and others wait five to eight or more years. The departments that would be most affected by a five-year limit would be those which base promotion on time rather than on merit. Dr. Caplan agreed that the present difference between departments is unfair. The question is whether the Senate wants the time limit uniformly fast or uniformly slow. Dr. Liston stated that if the trend in most departments is for slow promotions, then what we are seeking is more uniformity and more equity. Dr. Caplan indicated that in most departments, it is the exception to be promoted in three years; but that in a few departments, it is the rule. Mr. Lefurgey stated that he preferred the three-year position, but he suggested that the time was not as important as whether the individual involved likes you as a person or not. Dr. Frerer pointed out that departments that promote every three years could appoint someone to full professor before they acquire tenure. Dr. Caplan agreed that that has happened. He further indicated that some professors have been promoted before being denied tenure. Dr. Miller pointed out what he sees as an obvious and perhaps unspeakable point behind this discussion. The fewer people that are promoted, the more money that is available for people in higher ranks. This has a tendency to polarize senior faculty and junior faculty. It is an unfortunate reality. Mr. Heil asked if a three- or five-year rule would reduce this polarization. Dr. Miller said it would not make any difference. He said that his point was that it is to the economic advantage of the senior professors to keep the period longer and to the economic advantage of the junior faculty to make the period shorter. Dr. Caplan agreed with that interpretation. Dr. Liston saw the problem not so much as top versus bottom among faculty as it was the matter of equalizing departmental promotions policies. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken on the motion to approve the Promotion Procedure as amended. The motion was adopted.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Rupp indicated that it had come to the attention of the University Affairs Committee that the membership of the Promotions Committee consisted of the Deans and the Director of Institutional Research. He suggested that the Senate might want to discuss this topic. No Senator responded so Mr. Rupp moved that "the Promotions Committee shall have one faculty representative from each of the four schools" (seconded by Dr. Zakrzewski). Dr. Caplan asked how these persons should

be appointed. Dr. Zakrzewski asked about the procedure for other appointments to committees. Dr. Caplan indicated that the Senate President makes the appointments. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate is consulted if time allows. Dr. Smith stated that he thought that the Academic Affairs Committee was involved in the selection of the Tenure Committee members. Dr. Caplan pointed out that that was only one year when the Senate President was up for tenure consideration. Dr. Zakrzewski proposed a friendly amendment (agreed to by Mr. Rupp) to add the words, "as selected by the Faculty Senate" to the motion. There was no further discussion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was adopted.

Dr. Frerer asked why the Director of Institutional Research served on the Promotions Committee. Dr. Zakrzewski said that she provided information for other members of the committee. Dr. Caplan stated that she could be a non-voting member.

Dr. Frerer also asked about a Senate policy approved several years ago that a criteria for promotion was the possession of a terminal degree and that this would apply to persons employed after a certain date, but that it was not to be a retroactive policy. It was his understanding that this interpretation is not shared by the administration. He suggested that possibly a note should be sent from the Senate President reminding those persons affected that the criteria were intended to apply to persons hired after that date. Dr. Caplan asked for a motion on this matter, but none was made. Dr. Votaw suggested that such a note should clearly state the Senate's policy. The policy was actually established by the President, and he may want it to apply to everyone. Dr. Caplan agreed.

Dr. Caplan, in response to a request by the Registrar, asked to insert in the minutes that the Faculty Senate approved a policy last year which states that the adviser is supposed to sign the drop slip, and the instructors should not sign as advisers for students who are not their advisees.

There was no further new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard P. Heil

eb