

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

1-12-1988

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, January 12, 1988

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, January 12, 1988" (1988).  
*Faculty Senate*. 790.  
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/790](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/790)

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

January 12, 1988

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

### ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dr. Brent Spaulding (for Dr. Mike Gould), Mr. Dale Ficken, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Robert Nicholson, Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Jack Logan, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Jim Rucker, Dr. Delbert Marshall, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. John Ratzlaff, Dr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Ninia Smith, Ms. Donna Harsh (for Dr. Michael Horvath), Dr. Paul Gatschet, Mr. David Ison, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Mark Giese, Dr. John Klier, Dr. Merlene Lyman, Mr. Jim Walters, Mr. Marc Campbell, Dr. Ron Sandstrom, Dr. Jeff Barnett, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Carolyn Gatschet (for Ms. Marian Youmans), Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Paul Faber, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Larry Gould, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Phyllis Tiffany ( for Dr. Richard Schellenberg), Dr. Nevell Razak.

Member absent: Ms Leona Pfeifer.

Also present: Ms. Marsha Pfannenstiel, Ms. Leslie Eikleberry, Mr. David Burke, Mr. Greg Crawford, Dr. Leland Bartholomew, Dr. James Murphy.

The minutes of the December 7, 1987, meeting were approved after making the following correction: On page 4, Item 2 under University Affairs, the third word in line 7 should be "maximum" rather than "maxium."

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no additions to the Regent System Items. Dr. Gould indicated that the Governor in his budget recommendations is suggesting 7.8% faculty salary increases, 4% increase for OOE and 0% for program enhancements.

Dr. Gould announced that there are three tickets available for the basketball game this evening provided by Dr. Hammond. See Dr. Gould after the meeting if you are interested.

The February meeting of Faculty Senate will have an extensive agenda. Learning Assessment, reassigned time and State-assisted scholarships are among the items up for consideration.

### COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: No report.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: No report. There is a matter that will come up under new business.

STUDENT AFFAIRS: Dr. Shapiro withdrew the motion from Student Affairs

regarding the University Cultural Experience. He was unable to attend the Executive Committee meeting last week and the motion was put on the agenda. The committee will continue to solicit input and will present one proposal to the Senate at a later time.

BY-LAWS AND STANDING RULES: No report.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: No report.

#### NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Faber is seeking a "sense of the Senate" resolution regarding revision of Appendix O of the Faculty Handbook. The University Affairs Committee met too late to have a resolution come from the Committee. The following resolution was presented:

The University Affairs Committee will proceed to develop criteria for faculty evaluation under the assumption that student credit hour production will not be used as a criterion, unless the Senate directs otherwise.

Seconded by Dr. Frerer.

There was a lengthy discussion in favor of passage of the resolution. Dr. Frerer commented that it is almost impossible to come up with a number that makes sense, but that sometimes numbers are meritorious. Dr. Miller commented that it is an issue of fairness; new faculty particularly have little control over the size of their load. Dr. Giese asked if there are any AAUP guidelines to follow. Dr. Gould said no, that AAUP has never addressed the Student Credit Hour/Full Time Equivalent issue (information provided by Jon Knight at AAUP headquarters).

Dr. Murphy said that the issue is "What is a teaching load?" You talk about about the average type student in a typical classroom. The President was using those figures as a starting point. In the latter part of his letter which was distributed there was reference to the actual assignment of the teaching load which begins at the department level and indicates the wide variety of activity level in the teaching component and other components in the University that the departments have. It is imperative then that the department as well as the school and the University agree on what it is that a certain department ought to do in terms of establishing a frame of reference within which they can assign teaching loads or faculty responsibilities. Before reassigned time can be defined you have to first know what a full load is. In the department you look at the document that was agreed upon by everybody and you determine what a load actually is. Until you reach the point where you know an individual has a full load you have a problem with reassigned time. Dr. Giese commented that the number could be used as a reference point for establishing "workload" rather than for evaluation purposes. Dr. Razak said he could not make much sense of a reference point. Dr. Murphy said that the reference point was designed for lecture-type courses. The assignment of the teaching load predirects a little bit the judging of the quality. The size of the class would make some variance on the way you would be judged. Dr. Klier summed up that for reassigned time we

need a norm for a full load but not for evaluation purposes. Can we say that at a later time the Faculty Senate will define a full load, but not at this time. Dr. Klier asked if Dr. Murphy would have any problem with the Senate saying they would put aside the issue of "full load" for the time being and it will address it later, but for the purposes of the particular committee they are not going to deal with it. Dr. Murphy said that was a reasonable approach. We do need to get down the line and start evaluating the faculty as you perceive faculty ought to be evaluated; if the SCH/FTE issue is a stumbling block put it aside for a time. It will have to be dealt with in the issue of reassigned time. It is up to the wisdom of the Senate to decide whether these things ought to come forth in the same document or not.

Dr. Bartholomew said he personally thought faculty workloads and faculty evaluations should be treated separately. The faculty load measurement should be worked out beginning at the grass roots level (the department). He envisions a process where the department would work out between the chair and the faculty a scheme for weighting the different types of teaching activities that go on in that department and developing a system for measuring the teaching load of each faculty member. This proposal would then be submitted to the dean and the chair would work it out on sort of a bargaining basis, negotiate and eventually arrive at something that is acceptable to both the department and to the dean. This would then be sent to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and to the President. It is mindboggling to think that any one person or group could come down with one formula that would measure everybody's teaching load. Mr. Ison said he is concerned with having a certain number of hours represent only 60% of the faculty member's university commitment. Dr. Bartholomew said the most productive way of dealing with this whole vast issue is to deal separately with what is a 1.0 teaching load and then with the 60-20-20 or whatever set of percentages.

Dr. Gould called attention to Dr. Hammond's document. There are a couple of important points that were made by both Dr. Murphy and Dr. Bartholomew.

1. The first paragraph of Dr. Hammond's memo mentions that from the written comments received by faculty members before his arrival, along with feedback he and Dr. Murphy have received from a number of meetings with faculty members pointing out a perceived lack of clarity in the process of faculty evaluation at FHSU.
2. Dr. Hammond asked the Faculty Senate to recommend a method of evaluation which contains clear definitions and responds to the mission of FHSU, school and department goals and the role of the individual faculty member.

Dr. Gould said if you read the mission statement of FHSU, the role at FHSU is primarily instructional and that instructional role along with research dedicated to that instructional role and economic development is specifically what the Regents are looking for. The number is probably not the way in which we should be evaluating individual faculty members. It is probably more appropriate at the departmental level. We are perhaps committing the level of analysis problem here. We are probably making a mistake of evaluating the individual faculty members when we are really talking about departments, chairs and other such things. He directed to the University Affairs Committee to please pay attention to the mission statement of FHSU and if it does not feel it is necessary to include a number in Appendix O, don't include it. Dr. Hammond is looking for a recommendation. The Committee can proceed without



having a particular sense of the Faculty Senate. If you would like one, there is no problem, but the memo indicates a clear direction that whatever is felt to be appropriate by the Committee should be brought forth to the Senate for its consideration whatever the Committee feels is the most appropriate instrument.

Dr. Frerer withdrew his second to the motion.

Dr. Markley seconded the original motion.

Dr. Gould pointed out once again from the memo that it noted that benchmarks and scales derived by them may be adjusted by department chairmen in managing his or her resources, to meet department goals, school goals and the University mission, and such scales will be used by chairmen in determining with the individual faculty member what his or her assignment will be and criteria for achieving these assignments. Note that there is a negotiation process being carried out between the faculty member and chair. There should be a great deal of flexibility created all the way around.

Dr. Faber commented that recognizing President Hammond specified this negotiation process and that the 60-20-20 or 80-10-10 or whatever division of responsibilities is a separate issue, the Committee is well aware of the importance of these other elements of Appendix O or revision to Appendix O. The resolution, though recognizing that negotiation will go on between chairman and faculty member which will lead to some deviation from the benchmark figure, is saying we should not have a benchmark figure for average number of students in a class or average number of student credit hours generated for purposes of evaluation.

Ms. Koerner called for the question. The motion passed unanimously.

#### REPORT OF THE VICE-PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Dr. Murphy commented briefly in two areas:

1. The Regents staff is interested in the Learning Assessment area and will be setting up a timeline for the universities to begin responding to assessment. The administration will be working with the Assessment Committee, the General Education Committee and everyone else involved in doing the best that we can in utilizing this in the best interests of the University.
2. The interview process will begin shortly with the candidates for the Director of the Library. Dr. Murphy commented on the lack of flexibility in the Library budget and the small amount of funds available for new books and binding--about \$18,000 for new books and about \$20,000 for binding. There has to be a decision made between book requests from departments and acquiring reference books. Dr. Klier and Mr. Ison both emphasized the need for keeping up the reference collection.

Dr. Gould asked Dr. Murphy to comment on the status of University 101. He said that it will be coming to Faculty Senate as part of the normal routine. Mr. Ison that there should be a report on it at the regular February Senate meeting.

Dr. Faber asked about the progress on the computer literacy course. Dr. Murphy said that it will come out in the spring. Mathematics and the School of Business have been asked to look into whether perhaps some changes can be made to courses already in place.

#### REPORTS FROM LIAISONS

Dr. Klier reminded members that candidates for the Director of the Library will be coming on campus for the interview process beginning Friday. He encouraged faculty members to let the students know the candidates will be here and urged everyone to try to visit with as many of the candidates as possible.

Dr. Gould requested that Dr. Murphy and Dr. Bartholomew carry the message forward to Dr. Hammond in terms of the emphatic way in which the Faculty Senate seemed to indicate that 300 or 420 SCH or whatever the figure may be was not preferred by them. It will certainly be in the documentation, but the discussion pretty much clarified the position.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Rumpel, Secretary  
Faculty Senate