

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

9-13-1988

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 13, 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, September 13, 1988" (1988).
Faculty Senate. 800.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/800

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

September 13, 1988

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Ron Sandstrom, President of the Faculty Senate, at 3:35 p.m. in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union.

ROLL CALL

The following members were present: Dr. Bill Daley, Mr. Rick Mullen, Mr. Dale Ficken, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Manton Gibbs, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Jim Rucker, Dr. James Hohman, Dr. Lloyd Frerer, Dr. Bill Watt, Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. Bill Powers, Dr. Paul Phillips, Dr. Bill Rickman, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Mark Giese, Dr. John Klier, Mr. Marc Campbell, Dr. Ron Sandstrom, Dr. Jeff Barnett, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Ms. Marcia Masters, Dr. Paul Faber, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Larry Gould, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Richard Schellenberg, Dr. Nevell Razak, Dr. Mike Kallam.

Members absent: Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. David Ison, Ms. Leona Pfeifer, Dr. Merlene Lyman, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Mr. Kevin Schilling.

Also present: Ms. Rose Arnhold, Dr. James Murphy, Julie Grubbs.

The minutes of the July 13, 1988 meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Sandstrom reported that the steering committee has met twice regarding the goals and objectives and encouraged faculty to provide input to the committee. The committee is still discussing changes and it is still open for discussion. It will not be possible to adhere to the deadlines.

Track I for reassigned time has been approved by President Hammond, but Track II has been returned to University Affairs Committee. Dr. Sandstrom has asked President Hammond for some clarification, but has not received a response yet.

In terms of Appendix O and the Timeline, the first draft of Appendix O has been received by the University Affairs Committee to look over. In Appendix O, there has been some changes in the timeline after discussion with Mr. Ted Ayers, legal counsel for the Board of Regents. Another committee has been established for hearing appeals and looking at Appendix G.

The faculty senate by-laws revisions were approved.

ELECTIONS

The nominating committee presented two names to be nominated for President-elect. They were Dr. Jeff Barnett and Dr. John Klier. There were no nominations from the floor. Dr. John Klier was elected as President-elect.

The nominating committee presented two names to be nominated for Secretary. They were Dr. Fred Britten and Ms. Martha Holmes. There were no nominations from the floor. Dr. Fred Britten was elected as Secretary.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS: No report.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: Dr. Faber reported that he would be the chair and Dr. Frerer would be the secretary.

STUDENT AFFAIRS: Dr. Shapiro reported that he would be the chair and Dr. Rucker would be the secretary.

BY-LAWS AND STANDING RULES: Dr. Powers would be the chair.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS: Dr. Larry Gould would be the chair.

OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Larry Gould presented some questions regarding the establishment of the University Unclassified Personnel Committee (UPPC) and it dealing with tenure and promotion only. When he received a request for assignments to committees, he remembered that there was not a committee endorsed by the faculty senate. How can people be appointed to a committee that has not been endorsed by the faculty senate? What was the process by which this committee was suggested. He feels this is consistent with a larger process which has been present on campus which usurps some the commission of the faculty senate. What is the competency of the committee and how does it relate to Appendix G, which deals with the appeals process? In the past, there has been a problem with the appeals process. An administrative hearing officer would offer some continuity and may improve the appeals process. We cannot appoint people to a committee that does not exist. If this committee has been established, the faculty senate may want to protest. We should not just accept it and allow us to have things imposed upon us. The faculty senate should take advantage of the opportunity to look over Appendix O again.

Dr. Faber stated that the UUPC was not formed by the ad hoc committee. The UPPC committee came back in the document on the timeline after the timeline had been approved by the senate and sent up the chain of command.

Dr. Murphy said the UPPC was added upon advice from the legal staff. There needed to be some provision for due process.

Dr. Gould inquired about the implications for Appendix G.

Dr. Murphy said that the portion relating to tenure and promotion appeals would be deleted.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Miller moved that the Faculty Senate commend Joan Rumpel for the excellent job that she has done as Secretary for the past two years. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Dr. Miller also reported that FHSU is now associated with a different faculty exchange program, Faculty Exchange Center. If any faculty are interested during the summer or fall of 1989, they should contact Dr. Miller.

Dr. Sandstrom made notice of the article in the University Leader which announced the recognition received by Dr. Miller from the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers.

Dr. Sandstrom reported that the Council for Advancement and Support of Education had recognized a faculty member at FHSU, Rose Marie Arnhold, as Kansas Professor of the Year. He stated that Ms. Arnhold was present in the Senate today and would like to be recognized.

Ms. Arnhold stated that she was very honored to receive this award and to be asked to speak to the faculty senate. This award caused her to reflect back to last spring when she was denied promotion at FHSU. In light of this, she felt that this should be dealt with above board. She wanted to convey some things to the faculty senate and would like for them to reflect upon her thoughts. Her motives will gain her nothing. She wanted to encourage the Senate to listen to what she has to say. When the university did not recognize her accomplishments by promoting her, then she had to put her thoughts together and respond. She then read from a letter she wrote to the university where she stated that her materials showed that her performance adhered to acceptable characteristics. She read that the marginal position held by women was realized and that they must challenge this position. We need to recognize the success of women. We need to reward their accomplishments. Her letter went on to say that the current system of rewards goes to men or to women who emulate men. Pressures are present to adapt to the masculine styles. The pressure is inescapable. To use this model of success would be too costly. As with any actions such as this, there are positive and negative consequences. She has gained renewed respect for many of her colleagues. She has discovered many of them are consciously aware of the real issues at stake. She has been given an opportunity to deny or reaffirm what she is doing. She has chosen to reaffirm.

Ms. Arnhold said that we are talking about a system. As members of the faculty, we need to look at this system and see if there is consistency within the system. She thanked the faculty senate for allowing her the opportunity to reaffirm her thoughts.

Dr. Gatschet expressed his admiration for Ms. Arnhold coming before this body, but that it goes deeper than that. The system is made up of rules and guidelines. If she feels that the rules and guidelines did not apply to her, then that is not a small matter. He asked her that when she was denied promotion was she given reasons why. You must have a cause for denying promotion. He asked her what she was told. Ms. Arnhold said that she was unclear whether equality was a part of it. She was told to reconsider and perhaps reapply. Are there certain qualities that are being looked for? Dr. Gatschet said that certain guidelines must be used. He felt that she was owed a specific explanation for this denial. Was it time in grade? Was it terminal degree? Ms. Arnhold said that she agreed with that, but that there was no consistency in the application of the guidelines.

Dr. Shapiro stated that he served on the committee and that the committee had to look at certain guidelines. It is not necessarily a quantity and quality decision. This area needs to be addressed.

Dr. Gould stated that one of the directions of the university is to develop a "high touch" environment. He could not think of a faculty member that epitomizes the concept of "high touch" more than Rose Arnhold.

Dr. Klier said that rules and guideline are set to be followed. As soon as the exceptions are made, the rules no longer exist.

Dr. Gould said that people are affected when a new set of rules are put into place.

Mr. Logan said that outside of academe, there are such things as 'grandfather' clauses. Ms. Koerner asked how the change of rules affects those people who are in the tenure and promotion process. Which set of rules should be followed?

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Fred Britten, Secretary.