

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

3-8-1988

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 8, 1988

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, March 8, 1988" (1988). *Faculty Senate*. 794.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/794

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

March 8, 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), Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Loren Garlets (for Dr. Robert Nicholson), Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. Jim Rucker, Dr. Delbert Marshall, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Bill Watt (for Dr. Fred Britten), Dr. John Ratzlaff, Dr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Ninia Smith, Dr. Mike Horvath, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Mr. David Ison, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, 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. Mary Hassett, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Paul Faber, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Larry Gould, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Richard Schellenberg, Dr. Nevell Razak.

Members absent: Mr. Dale Ficken, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Tom Kerns.

Also present: Ms. Leslie Eikleberry, Ms. Marsha Pfannenstiel, Mr. David Burke, Ms. Deb Graff, Dr. Edward Hammond, Mr. Kevin Amack, Ms. Cheryl Towns.

The minutes of the February 8, 1988 meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Under Regents System items, Dr. Gould emphasized the accomplishment of the Select Committee on Learning Assessment. He called attention to Attachment I, a letter from Dr. Martine Hammond of the staff of the Board of Regents, praising the committee for its work. Dr. Gould said that from a political point of view this provides us with an element of advantage in comparison to the other universities, as they have not proceeded as far as we have at this point in time. It may be useful to the Chief Academic Officers of the Regents universities who are trying to slow the process down a little bit and give us a little more time. The final report of the Select Committee will be out shortly. (Members of the committee are Bob Markley (chairman), Bill Daley, Jack Logan, Dianna Koerner, Dick Shellenberg, and Mark Giese.)

In Item 5, the Appropriations Committee last Wednesday approved \$350,000 for Fort Hays State University. We are the only institution in the Regents system that received what is now being called "catchup" money. It is not for mission enhancement. It was approved 13-9 in committee. A great deal of credit goes to Rex Hoy and those individuals on the legislative subcommittee. As it now stands, it seems that that money is to be used entirely for OOE. It has now been approved on the House floor and has moved to the Senate Ways and Means Committee. It will probably have a little rougher sledding but hopefully we will be able to keep most of it intact. Dr. Gould thanked the administration, the students and a variety of people who have been instrumental in lobbying for this part of the mission and they are to be congratulated because it looks like

they have made some real progress.

At the Regents meeting this time around the Universities will be evaluated in terms of progress toward meeting their mission statements. There will also be an intermediate report on assessment and a final report in April on Learning Assessment in the sense that the Regents staff wants to know what we are doing at this point in time in terms of assessment activities. There is a matrix that is being filled out by COCAO and sent to the Regents staff with a preliminary report this time around and the final report in April. The selective admissions, or what was called in Regents form qualified admissions is basically dead in terms of the Regents proposal. However, there is a faint heartbeat from a proposal called selective admissions. That proposal basically embodies the Regents preparatory curriculum being phased in by 1992 and the foreign language requirement being phased in by 1994. That proposal is still in committee.

Thanks to all who were involved in making a Faculty Senate office available. University Affairs will report in item 3. Welcome to Mary Hassett who is replacing Marian Youmans.

Presentation by President Edward Hammond: Copies of a memo sent to Dr. Gould by President Hammond were distributed. President Hammond wished to discuss FS Bill 87-88/XII regarding the academic evaluation recommendations. President Hammond, thanked the Senate for the work done on the issue. The memo is a formal response both to the Senate and to the Council of Deans. His analysis of the recommendation that has been submitted, the Deans' concerns, our current policies and practices, and from conversations leads him to believe that there is still some lack of clarity, but that major progress has been made. He is approving substantial portions of the recommendations of the Faculty Senate and as of March 7 changing Appendix O of the Faculty Handbook to coincide with the recommendations that are being made as well as some of the changes that he has made. Starting at the bottom of page one of the handout is the new policy statement that will appear as Appendix O. The wording is the same as Faculty Senate recommendations except for minor changes in wording; the general principles are the same. Part II, Duties, Criteria and Evidence, underlies the basic principle of the recommendation of Faculty Senate that is something he believes in, the role of the chairperson of each department. In reality no individual faculty member may be at the "base agreement." There needs to be a base from which to negotiate up and down. In the part on weighting of the duties, he has provided a constant baseline which can be negotiated up or down without any parameters on the window, leaving it entirely up to the department chair. Some people could interpret from the Senate document that you had to fit within the parameters, and he wants to leave it entirely up to the department chair to deal with the specific things. He feels that we need a baseline standard. Picking 80/10/10 and negotiating from there was unacceptable to him because he believes the faculty at FHSU is significantly different from that of a community college faculty, and that is the general community college standard. In (2)(b) on page three, "service" should be changed to "scholarly." From page 1 to the end of (2)(c) on page 3 the material is essentially in place. From there on, more work needs to be done.

In order to do that work, he is establishing the following procedural activity:

1. We will develop very shortly as soon as the Board of Regents approves

our revised mission statement, mission-related objectives, and those will be developed and reviewed each year and will be used to provide direction for assignment of faculty duties and department and school goals.

2. Statements will be developed describing mission-related objectives and goals for each school and department. They will be approved by the department chair, the dean of the school and the Provost and will include designation of the percent of effort for faculty in that department. This again recognizes the department chair's role in saying we need to make some changes from the baseline.

The statement will be the structural core for a planning process to take place each year to clarify objectives and goals. Dr. Murphy will chair a select committee which will make recommendations to him and to the faculty concerning the following:

1. Criteria and procedures for tenure, promotion and annual evaluation, including a timeline for each and a clarification of appeal procedure. The appeal procedure especially needs to be looked at.
2. A specific acknowledgment of off-campus instruction in the faculty effort weighting structure. That was not specifically addressed in the Faculty Senate recommendation.
3. Development of procedures for the annual departmental and school statements of goals and objectives in a timely fashion so that departments and schools may complete the statements prior to the fall semester 1988. We need to have academic plans by academic departments and those plans need to be signed off on and they need to fit some overall strategy to implement the mission statement. Those plans would then be the criteria that would be used in evaluating departments and schools. It would also be the basis for negotiations with faculty.

In setting up this committee what is being done is to try to put into process what it is hoped will be an ongoing planning event each year. After the budget is approved, then an academic plan can be set up for each department for what it will plan to accomplish in the coming year. That would be the basis for faculty negotiation. The committee will consist of Dr. Murphy, a dean appointed by the Council of Deans, a department chairman appointed by Dr. Murphy, and two faculty members appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate with the advice of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. The process should be quick, clear and concise in terms of meeting objectives and can be done every year.

Dr. Hammond said the plan each year should be comprehensive and include some new initiatives hopefully. Most departments' roles are pretty clear cut. There may or may not be changes in a given year; the dean will sign off and say yes, that is what we want the department to do; then there is no question at the end of the year when evaluations are being done that the department did not know what was a priority to get done.

Dr. Giese asked how the dollars would come down from Dr. Hammond's office. Dr. Hammond said the way it will be done this year and the way it may be done next year are two different things. His agreement with the deans and department chairs is that they don't want to tamper with any of the negotiations that have taken place this year or any of the evaluations regarding this year. The money

has been divided on a percentage basis to appropriate vice presidents who on the academic side have divided it proportionately to schools, and then it would be divided to the various different departments. The end result would be that each department would have a proportionate amount that it would distribute in salaries based on merit evaluations. Dr. Giese asked if we are to assume that the money which trickles down will be performance based. Dr. Hammond said yes. Accountability will apply in the distribution of scarce resources within the institution. Dr. Faber said that in the statement of policy it is clearly laid out that "clear, precise and careful enumeration of the duties of the member...must be made known to the faculty member prior to commencement of activity to be evaluated." The merit pay increases can very well look at the accomplishments of the past year. Promotion and tenure, however, both look at the longer period of time. If we are really to be consistent with that statement of policy some of the decisions made by the select committee will not become operative for all faculty members for quite a few years yet. He asked if that is the way Dr. Hammond envisions it. Are we prepared to abide by that policy for promotion and tenure? Dr. Hammond said yes, that he is. He will be interested to see what the committee decides. He does not believe that there is as much ambiguity as some faculty members have talked about in the current promotion and tenure policies and criteria. He thinks the problem is more the exceptions that have been made to the standards that are articulated over the years than problems with the current standards. He depends very much on what the Faculty Senate recommends in these kinds of matters. Even in places where the Senate's wording isn't quite the same as what he would like, he has tried to use it because he is assuming it wouldn't have been recommended it to him in the first place unless it was meant that way. He will be interested in the select committee's recommended criteria and procedure. He understands the point, and that is are we going to grandfather in those people who are currently in the process. Dr. Hammond's feeling is that we have to. If you hire a faculty member on tenure track and you lay out some standards and they are proceeding with those standards to come in at midstream and say, ok instead of swimming two hundred yards downstream you now have to swim two hundred yards upstream is not quite fair, even to the strongest swimmer. Dr. Hammond was asked if it was his intention that a year from now we'll be working under this new scheme of evaluating faculty, departments and schools (Dr. Hammond said yes), and if so what time period will be incorporated, this spring and next fall, is that the year? Dr. Hammond said no. The way he sees the planning process working on the academic side is that we first have to know what our budget is because it is silly to hold a faculty responsible or a department or school responsible for things that the state's not going to give us the money to do. As soon as we have a budget approved for fiscal 88-89, it would be his intent (and by this time we should also have our mission statement approved by the Board of Regents and institutional goals and objectives), then over the summer the department could do the planning necessary for the coming year so that it would be approved prior to the beginning of fall semester. The period that would be evaluated would be as much of academic 88-89 as possible before we get into evaluations. Dr. Hammond said one of the charges to the select committee will be to look at time lines because it is a gray area and we need to have consensus on that as well. It will be that way every year. The time line problem is one that every state university has when you don't know what your budget is going to be until May 1. It was suggested that the problem could be alleviated by using the calendar year as a basis for evaluation and then the year would be completed for

a faculty member and the department chair in the fall. Dr. Hammond said that is that is the recommendation he ends up getting that would be fine with him.

Dr. Gould said he assumed Dr. Hammond foresees the recommendations of the select committee coming back through the Faculty Senate for eventual consideration.

Dr. Hammond said as soon as he gets the committee's recommendations he is assuming that it will come back to Senate and the Senate will provide advice to him in the same way that advice was provided to him on the document so far. Where he can agree with the Senate, he will.

Dr. Hammond said the select committee can look at other issues. If the Senate feels that there are other issues in this general area that need to be looked at he is willing to broaden the charge and he is sure the committee will be willing to look at them. He thanked the Senate again for its hard work.

Dr. Hammond announced that as of a week ago Room 336 in Rarick has been designated as the new Faculty Senate Office. There will be a phone answering system so that the Faculty Senate President can always be reached. He will be interested in seeing the evaluation after a year of how this works.

Dr. Hammond announced that after the April 29 faculty meeting there will be a reception for all members of the campus community to celebrate the ending of the semester. That will be at and sponsored by the Farmers State Bank as a way of saying thanks to the University community. It will be from 4:30 to 6:00 p.m.

It was noted that computations for determining next year's salary said five percent. Dr. Hammond said that figure was used because that is the base maintenance salary. Department chairs will be given a lump sum to distribute for faculty salaries that is equivalent to five percent. When the final amount of money is known, they will come back with a hopefully larger lump sum of money and then adjustments can be made. The feeling is that the way the five percent was distributed will be pretty close to the way the larger amount will be distributed. It will probably be some time in late April before we know where we stand for sure.

Dr. Gould said he asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to recommend what we should do about the two members of the committee that Dr. Hammond talked about and tentatively their advice was to place Mr. David Ison, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee and Dr. Paul Faber, Chairman of the University Affairs Committee on the Select Committee. The charge is a little broader than what he originally assumed, so if they have any interest in backing out or if there are other suggestions please let him know.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: The committee had two motions and four mini-reports to present.

Motion 1: To approve ENGLISH 448/748: Theories of Rhetoric and Composition-non/general education-Prerequisite: ENG 446 (Advanced Composition)-cannot be repeated-3 hours credit.

Motion passed.

Motion 2: To approve HPER 547/747--Instrumentation in Exercise Physiology-non/general education-Prerequisite: HPER 390 (Exercise Physiology)-cannot be repeated-3 hours credit.

Motion passed.

Report 1: Some question has come out about concerning removing a course from the catalog. For various reasons the committee decided to delete ENG 447, Advanced Technical and Business Writing. The committee approved its removal although that is not something the committee routinely has been charged to handle. Information about its removal has been circulated by Dr. Edwards to Mr. Kellerman and Dr. Bartholomew.

Report 2: There was a document which was approved by the Board of Regents titled Qualified Minimum Admissions Standards and Provisions that has to do in part with the junior college articulation agreement. The committee's charge had been simply to review this and see whether there were any discrepancies and problems in the way this will work and its relation to the new junior college compact. The committee found none and recognizing that it had already been approved by the Board of Regents the committee nodded its head in agreement.

Report 3: In regard to the course proposal for University Foundations 110, the course had been sent back to the committee, and the committee asked for additional input on assignment of that course as a School of Education course rather than a University course. Information on the course was circulated to all of the Deans and the committee began gathering additional input. At this point the committee is not ready to bring a report to Senate on this course. The committee has received a considerable amount of additional input from a variety of sources. A recommendation should be brought to Senate in April.

Report 4: In regard to the reassigned time policy, Dr. Klier presented a brief report. Dr. Klier said the proposal will go to all the administrators, deans and chairs who will presumably distribute it to all departments and then input will be provided. There will be a two-tier system. One tier will be externally generated reassigned time; members of departments who get reassigned time will receive funding from the University to hire someone to replace that amount of time. Internally generated is going on in departments already, where departments pass research around or distribute it. One of the complaints is that sometimes the policies for awarding reassigned time in departments are not well known or not fairly utilized, so the committee is proposing is that all departments develop clear objectives of reassigned policies to ensure all faculty have equal opportunity to compete for reassigned time. The administration is being asked to assist in any way that is appropriate concerning internal reassigned time. Please make any suggestions known to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Regarding the University Foundations course, Dr. Gould said that there were some misunderstandings regarding procedures with that course and that led to putting it on the April instead of the March agenda. Cheryl Towns was asked to make a

brief statement regarding the input that the committee is receiving. Ms. Towns said the committee welcomes any input and would be happy to visit individually with anyone who has concerns or questions about the proposal. The committee will be meeting again. She will be happy to let you know the date of that meeting when it is set or visit with Ninia Smith or Dick Schellenberg about the course.

Dr. Gould said that in regard to the problem in terms of protocol he indicated to President Hammond that perhaps a formal procedure should be developed for the formulation, distribution and approval of university-wide courses, and that Dr. Hammond agreed with that, that is that there be university-wide representation on those committees and that the Faculty Senate process is followed with regard to application for a new course. One of the Faculty Senate committees perhaps ought to develop a one or two page set of procedures to deal with university-wide courses so that everyone knows what the procedure is. There is another university-wide course already in the mill, the computer literacy course or courses and there may be some difficulty with that in terms of the way in which we are conducting the process. In order to avoid those kinds of problems in the future, procedures need to be developed.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: Dr. Murphy requests input from the faculty about desired or desirable early retirement benefits for those who choose to take early retirement. Dr. Faber passed out what is mentioned in the agenda. Dr. Murphy would like the information back to him by March 30. University Affairs was asked to serve as a conduit to get the information back to him. Dr. Horvath has volunteered to receive and organize the suggestions. There will not be a formal report from the committee to the Senate; it will be an informal report to Dr. Murphy also. This is not an attempt to encourage early retirement but an attempt to improve the faculty working conditions. The handout lists the early retirement benefits that currently exist. At this point in time there are no particular benefits for full early retirement. Dr. Faber asked that this be brought to the attention of those who might be considering early retirement in the next few years. Dr. Gould commented that Dr. Murphy is on a Personnel Benefits Committee for the Regents institutions and this is why he has asked us to see what we would like compared to what we now have.

STUDENT AFFAIRS: Dr. Shapiro presented the following motion:

Motion: Recognizing that attendance at cultural events can greatly enhance the value of the undergraduate educational experience, the Faculty Senate of Fort Hays State University moves adoption of the following three-part program:

1. All faculty members are strongly encouraged to support attendance at campus (and community) cultural events by personal example and by encouraging their students to attend. The instructors of culturally-related General Education courses are especially encouraged to include discussion of these events in their classes before and/or after they take place.
2. All student admission charges for these events should be waived, with the sponsoring organizations compensated through externally funded grants.
3. Attendance at four or more cultural events per semester should be recognized on the student's transcript with an indication of attendance in a non-credit

course, "University Cultural Experience." The specified events to be included in this program shall be selected by a student-faculty committee.

Dr. Shapiro said there would be portable scanners at events to scan student identification cards. Dr. Gatschet asked if there was any input from Student Senate. Kevin Amack from Student Senate passed out a proposal from one of their committees. The Student Senate is proposing an optional new course.

Dr. Giese moved that the motion be postponed. Seconded by Dr. Frerer. Dr. Markley said he saw no reason to postpone. Dr. Shapiro said that Kevin had discussed the student proposal with the committee. Dr. Markley said he saw no problem with the registrar's office. It could be on the transcript without a grade. Dr. Frerer said we should work with the students to see what can be worked out. Dr. Klier asked if the proposal would allow University Cultural Experience to appear on the transcript as many as eight times. Dr. Shapiro said yes. The motion to postpone passed.

BY-LAWS AND STANDING RULES: No report. Dr. Gould noted that the committee has made some modifications to the by-laws and faculty will be receiving information about that before the next meeting.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: No report.

NEW BUSINESS

No report from the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

No reports from Senate Liaisons.

Dr. Gould said that the Chamber of Commerce has been very cooperative in sending out information on the Margin of Excellence and we have already received letters back from merchants in the Hays business community who have sent letters to various members of the Kansas Legislature.

Dr. Klier said that the \$350,000 that the Fort Hays sub-committee of the House passed included a rider encouraging some of these funds be used for Forsyth Library. The appeal for the necessity for these funds was instrumental in getting it passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jack Logan, Acting Secretary for Joan Rumpel