

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

7-12-1988

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, July 12, 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, July 12, 1988" (1988). *Faculty Senate*. 799.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/799

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

July 12, 1988

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Ron Sandstrom, 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. Bill Daley, Dr. Mike Gould, Mr. Dale Ficken, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Manton Gibbs, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Jim Rucker, Dr. Vincent Giannamore (for Dr. James Hohman), Dr. Bill Watt (for Dr. Lloyd Frerer), Dr. John Ratzlaff (for Dr. Paul Phillips), Dr. Bill Rickman, Mr. David Ison, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Mark Giese, Dr. Merlene Lyman, Dr. Ron Sandstrom, Dr. Jeff Barnett, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Mary Hassett, Dr. Paul Faber, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Jack Barbour (for Dr. Larry Gould), Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Phyllis Tiffany (for Dr. Richard Schellenberg), Dr. Nevell Razak.

Members absent: Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. Bill Powers, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Dr. John Klier, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Mr. Marc Campbell, Mr. Kevin Schilling, Ms. Dianna Koerner.

Also present: Ms. Leslie Eikleberry, Mr. David Burke.

The minutes of the June 13, 1988 meeting were approved after striking "said" in the next to the last paragraph on page 2.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Sandstrom said that the Wichita Eagle reported the ranges in salary increases was from 40% down to 2% for the Regents universities overall and from 30% down to 2% for Fort Hays State.

Dr. Larry Miller has been appointed Vice-President for Institutional Advancement and Dr. B. James Dawson has been appointed Vice-President for Student Affairs.

Committee assignment sheets are coming in.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: No report.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: No report.

STUDENT AFFAIRS: No report.

BY LAWS AND STANDING RULES: No report.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: No report.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Faber reviewed the background on the revision of Appendix O. Two parts of the revision were accepted by the Faculty Senate and the President. The "procedures" revision was rejected by President Hammond. President Hammond established two principles: First, there will be a University-wide statement of

mission with related objectives. Second, there will be School and Department-related mission goals and objectives. In light of that, Dr. Faber made the following resolution:

The Faculty Senate endorses the following three general principles for use in the development of departmental criteria for faculty evaluation in regard to merit, tenure and promotion:

- a. That all university departments generate evaluation criteria by department committee;
- b. That all departmental criteria reflect the departments' and university's missions and/or goals;
- c. That all criteria must apply only to faculty members' negotiated loads.

Seconded by Dr. Miller.

Dr. Miller asked if "load" meant more than just class assignment. Yes it does. He then offered a friendly amendment changing "loads" to "duties". Dr. Rickman asked why the word "only" was used in part c of the resolution. Mr. Ison said that there are criteria to which value points might be assigned that are not included in negotiated duties. Dr. Faber stated that the "criteria" used need not be uniform in all departments or schools, but a precise format will be used. Dr. Tiffany commented that she had a hard time dealing with Item 1 of the report from the Ad Hoc Committee without first dealing with Item 3. Dr. Faber said that Item 3 is not official; it is only for the benefit of him and Mr. Ison for their committee meeting tomorrow.

The resolution passed unanimously.

Regarding Item 2, the following resolution was made.

The Faculty Senate favors the implementation of the time table and appeals process contained within the Procedures Leading to Decisions Related to Tenure. (The document was previously distributed to Faculty Senate members.)

There are two innovations in the document:

1. a timetable which makes explicit the times for getting documents together
2. The current system has relatively little place for faculty member's input or appeal: the new document makes it possible for the applicant to appeal at every step along the way.

The document makes it clear that the Provost is a nonvoting member when chairing the committee.

Resolution seconded by Dr. Rickman. If the resolution is approved the committee will try to incorporate it into the revision of Appendix O.

It was asked why, on page 1, item 3 of the timeline, the department committee vote is recorded and the university committee vote is not. It was moved by Dr. Markley that there be a period after "recommendation" in item 3. Seconded by Dr. Tiffany. After some discussion the motion to amend was defeated.

Mr. Ison moved that in item 9 of the timeline "and shall indicate the committee vote" be added after the second "recommendation." Seconded by Dr. Barnett. Dr. Markley asked if the Provost is a nonvoting member of the committee are they

going to change to an odd number of members. It was noted that a tie vote is ok. The motion to amend passed unanimously.

Dr. Rickman asked if this timeline is actually a supplement to Appendix O and how it would be worked in. Dr. Faber said that is debatable right now in committee. He expects that it will be incorporated into Appendix O. Dr. Rickman asked if this material will revise or delete any existing material in Appendix O. Dr. Faber said that only the position of the Provost on the committee will be changed. A similar timeline is also being developed for non-academic faculty. A timeline will be developed later for promotion.

Dr. Rickman asked if, in step 5a, there is a file closing date at this point except for the Dean's recommendation to the Tenure Committee. Does this apply only to the applicant? Dr. Faber replied that yes, that is the way he reads it; it applies only to the applicant. It has not been discussed much in committee. Dr. Razak said that the step was put in to stop the debate at some time.

Dr. Sandstrom said there is some concern that the document does not say what are the rights of the appeal committee in terms of the materials in the file.

The resolution was approved.

Dr. Faber briefly explained the six parts of Item 3, six possible ways to distribute merit salary increases.

- A. There is a university-level pool, and it will be distributed to individual faculty members according to a uniform system of faculty evaluation.
- B. There is a university-level pool, and there is no uniform system of faculty evaluation.
- C. There are school-level pools (so the provost has flexibility in making distributions to schools), and they will be distributed according to a uniform system of faculty evaluation (uniform at least within each school).
- D. There are school-level and department-level pools (so the provost and deans have flexibility in their distributions), and there is a uniform system of faculty evaluation (for the whole university).
- E. One-half of the merit salary increase will come from a university-level pool and be distributed according to a uniform system of faculty evaluation, and one-half of the merit money will be distributed flexibly by the provost and deans and will be distributed on the department level according to the current system.
- F. The current system: the provost and deans can be flexible in their distributions, and there is no uniform system of faculty evaluation.

Dr. Miller said it does not say the percentage granted by the legislature. Under the current system, the monies come down as the same percentage per person, and by gentlemen's agreement to the schools. Dr. Miller said there should be something in writing as to the distribution as it is now. Dr. Faber said the climate is to move away from a uniform distribution (pro rata). Dr. Ratzlaff said there is no reward in the present system when there are graduate programs involved. Dr. Giese said whether it is pro rata or according to criteria choice how does the money come down? Is it pro rata from the top down

or are the top people going to make distinctions as are made at the lower level. Are the deans going to negotiate with the provost to get dollars? Dr. Rickman said that until we know what the management strategy of the University is how do we know what we want?

Mr. Ison said that President Hammond asked for information because of individuals' perceptions of inequities. We are moving toward a uniform system of evaluation which may take care of some of the inequities.

The following straw vote was recorded as to first choice by the Senators present:

A	1
B	0
C	6
D	5
E	0
F	11

The following straw vote was recorded as to the alternative by the Senators present:

A	1
B	0
C	2
D	13
E	2
F	3

The ad hoc committee is moving toward recommending to the President to move to a uniform calendar year basis. Spring 1989 merit dollars will be distributed on the current basis. 1990 merit money will be based on the 1989 calendar year.

Dr. Sandstrom said there is a new steering committee that met last Thursday. There are some givens that cannot change. There are University Goals prepared which are not set in concrete as yet. There will be some open forums to discuss the goals. Schools and departments will need to conduct their own forums in terms of their goals. Contact Dr. Sandstrom if you have comments. A draft copy of the 1989-91 goals was distributed.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joan Rumpel, Secretary