

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

5-7-1991

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, May 7, 1991

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, May 7, 1991" (1991). *Faculty Senate*. 830.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/830

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
May 7, 1991

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union on May 7, 1991 at 3:30 pm by President Robert Markley.

The following members were present: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. William King, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. James Hohman, Dr. Serjit Kasior, Dr. Willis Watt, Dr. John Ratzlaff (for Dr. Paul Phillips), Dr. Ralph Gamble, Mr. David Ison (for Dr. Paul Gatschet), Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Robert Luehrs (for Dr. Raymond Wilson), Mr. Glen McNeil, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Ronald Sandstrom, Dr. Lewis Miller, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Richard Hughen, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Kenneth Olson, and Dr. Nevell Razak.

The following members were absent: Dr. Thomas Wenke, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. William King, Dr. Robert Jennings, Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. John Zody, Mr. Glenn Ginther, Dr. Mahammad Riaz, Mr. Kevin Shilling, Dr. Martin Shapiro, and Dr. Michael Kallam.

Others present included Provost James Murphy; Dr. Thomas Guss of the Department of Administration, Counseling, and Educational Studies; and Ms. Adele Shaver of the Hays Daily News.

The minutes of the April 1, 1991 meeting were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

The announcement regarding tuition increases at Regents' schools was included with the meeting notice. There were no additional announcements.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. Presented by Dr. Britten.

M-1. To amend the foreign language requirements associated with the B.A. degree to allow international students whose native language is not English to count English as their foreign language.

Because the committee voted by mail on this issue and one committee member voted that the committee meet to discuss it, Dr. Britten asked for a second on this motion before discussion. Dr. Hassett seconded the motion. Dr. Sandstrom commented that he was very much in favor of the motion but that the committee should sometime in the future consider options for students who are bilingual. Dr. Britten stated that students in that situation can test out of the language courses, but Dr. Sandstrom pointed out that this was an option only if we offer courses in that language. Dr. Heil asked about the definition of "international

student", and this question was related back to the student's visa status. Dr. Watt said that the intent of the Board of Regents was surely to make students bilingual, and that if they already were bilingual they should not have to learn an additional language. Dr. Britten pointed out that this motion was not meant to exclude the bilingual and that this is a separate issue. President Markley commented that he had gotten letters of support from a variety of people. Dr. Watt asked if this was something we can do here at Fort Hays since this is a Regents' requirement, and President Markley answered that he thought so since the Academic Affairs officer of the Board had told him that they had not thought of this before. This officer suggested that President Markley contact the other Regents' schools to see what they do about this issue. By way of Interim Dean Nelson, President Markley had heard that Pittsburg State Univ. has a policy that is much "softer" than this one.

Motion carried.

2. University Affairs. Presented by Dr. Hughen.

M-2. Motion to approve the proposed Guidelines for the Administration of Student Evaluations of Faculty. This motion was carried over from the April meeting.

Dr. Sandstrom stated that he had discussed this issue with his constituents and that he would have to vote "No" on this motion, primarily because of item 3 on the proposed guidelines. He said that his constituents felt that it was totally unrealistic that students be asked to evaluate all part-time and all full-time teaching every semester since this would be burdensome and costly to the university. Dr. Hughen asked how often they felt that faculty should be evaluated, and Dr. Sandstrom said that full-time tenured faculty are evaluated once a year in all their classes except for those classes having small numbers of students. Ms. Koerner commented that this issue was discussed in committee, and that according to the last sentence in item 3 exceptions to this requirement shall be negotiated with the department chair. Dr. Watt said that based on another issue he would have to vote against this motion because item 2 would destroy anonymity since it would allow faculty members to receive the "actual or typed copy of the student comments". Dr. Britten pointed out that the words "actual or" were a deletion in the text, and Dr. Watt withdrew his objection.

Mr. Ison asked if someone could convince him that there would be any equity in the way student assessment of courses is actually implemented if these guidelines were put in place. He said that currently people are evaluated according to different internal departmental policies and according to different standards with different kinds of information coming forward. He said that this leads to tremendous inequities in the present situation, and asked if these proposed changes would help solve the inequity problem. Dr. Olson said that the original intent was to standardize procedures as much as possible, but Mr. Ison

said that according to everything he was hearing we are not moving forward on this issue of standardization of procedures. He said that he didn't think these guidelines would be followed, but Ms. Koerner said that it would be up to chairs and deans but that at least with these guidelines we would have something written to refer to. Dr. Shaffer stated that one objection that her chair had was to his having to oversee or choose a designee to distribute the evaluations because the department simply didn't have enough personnel to do this. Dr. Hassett asked who it was who currently picks up the evaluations after they are completed, pointing out that that person could be considered the designee. President Markley commented that in the Psychology Dept. the secretary is the one who administers and collects all of the evaluation forms. Ms. Koerner stated that the key issue is the protection of student anonymity, and that this issue will continue to come up until a policy is in place to address it.

Dr. Hassett said that she was still concerned about requiring all classes to be evaluated every semester, suggesting that once a year might be sufficient. President Markley pointed out that a potential problem with once-a-year evaluations is that faculty members might select the classes that they want evaluated, but Mr. Ison said that he didn't see anything necessarily wrong with such selection. Ms. Koerner commented that requiring new faculty to evaluate every class while allowing tenured faculty to select the classes they evaluate can bias merit pay considerations in favor of the tenured faculty. Dr. Watt stated that not giving the students everything they want is understandable, but stated that there are at least two regents who are in favor of the students' position on this. Dr. Ratzlaff asked Dr. Watt about the basis of his (Dr. Watt's) opinion that the students want every class to be evaluated every semester, and Dr. Watt replied that he had met with student representatives on at least three occasions. Dr. Ratzlaff stated that this was in contrast to student comments that he had read at the last meeting from an article in the *University Leader*, and suggested that the students that Dr. Watt met with may not actually be representative of all the students.

Dr. Huguen asked if everyone agreed that all faculty should be evaluated, and Dr. Shaffer responded that she felt that was not the issue. Instead she asked what role these evaluations should play in merit and other decisions. Dr. Luehrs commented that he did not hear from his students a groundswell demanding evaluation, and stated that every student evaluation is not equivalent to every other student evaluation. He indicated that evaluations from students who miss large numbers of the class meetings, are taking the course under duress, and doing poorly in the course should be treated in a fashion different from evaluations from good students who are in the class by choice. Dr. Luehrs then asked why the committee decided that the statistical summary was more important than the student comments, stating that in his opinion the comments were actually more important than the statistics. Dr. Huguen replied that in the opinion of some committee members a bad student comment taints

the perspective of some administrators regarding that particular faculty member, while a good comment is not taken as seriously; in other words, a negative comment has more of an effect than a positive comment. Dr. Sandstrom asked why this view led to the elimination of all student comments from consideration, and Dr. Huguen responded that student comments could still be used at the departmental level.

Ms. Koerner read part of the proposed revisions to Appendix O which permit faculty members to insert into promotion or tenure files additional material deemed appropriate by the applicant. She stated that a faculty member could at this point insert student comments if he or she desired to do so. Dr. Sandstrom said that this option made Appendix O inconsistent with these proposed guidelines for administering evaluations. Dr. Huguen reported that the reason some committee members sought to exclude student comments from promotion and tenure files was because they felt that a negative student comment could take on a disproportionate weight, while a negative response on the multiple choice portion of the evaluation form would be absorbed by the other responses in the statistical summary. Mr. McNeil pointed out that this depends on the size of the class: in a small class a negative response has more of an effect on the statistical summary than it would in a large class.

Ms. Koerner commented that the Executive Committee had made a change in item 3 of the proposed guidelines limiting the requirement for evaluating courses to those with Hegis designations of 0 or 1. She said that this included all regularly scheduled classes, including all lab classes. Hegis designations of 2, 3, 4, and 5 are experiential classes such as practicums, internships, student teaching, field experiences, appointment courses, research, readings, and independent study classes. She said that these would be smaller classes and would not be required to be evaluated. President Markley stated that the only problem he saw with excluding these classes from the requirement was that included with them are physical education service courses and music band courses, and that these courses probably should be evaluated.

Dr. Gamble asked if we had to accept or reject these guidelines exactly as they are, and Dr. Huguen stated that we should certainly consider alterations. President Markley asked about the distinction between a policy and a guideline, and Dr. Britten suggested that a guideline permits more exceptions. President Markley pointed out that these are guidelines, not a policy. Mr. Ison asked if we could return this to the committee, but Ms. Koerner said that sending it back to the committee without suggestions for alterations would be a waste of time. Dr. Hassett moved the previous question, and Dr. Watt seconded this motion. Mr. McNeil stated that these are just guidelines, not a requirement. The motion to stop debate carried by a vote of 15 to 6.

The motion on the proposed Guidelines for Administration of

Student Evaluations of Faculty failed on a vote of 9 for and 14 against. Mr. McNeil commented that he felt that many people were confused about whether these were to be guidelines or a policy, and President Markley stated that in his view these were to be guidelines and therefore not binding. Dr. Razak stated that if that was the case then the vote was inconsequential and we had wasted an hour. Mr. Ison said that he didn't think we had wasted an hour but instead had tested the waters on this issue. Dr. Hassett agreed and said that in time guidelines can become policy. Mr. Ison stated that the committee should be thanked for their work on this proposal and there was a general show of approval.

M-3 Proposed Revisions to Appendix O (mailed to all faculty)

Dr. Hassett handed out some suggested amendments to this revised Appendix O that came from the Nursing Department, and Dr. Razak had some suggestions from the Sociology Department. President Markley asked that debate be limited to just item 4 amendments, that is, substantive disagreements to the revised Appendix O.

Ms. Koerner stated that one point that the Nursing Department felt needed clarification was the definition of the term "community service". Dr. Ratzlaff said that his department opposed the inclusion of community service at all, saying that doing our job here was more important. Dr. Huguen said that at least some consideration of community service should be included, since we are part of the community. Dr. Stephenson asked if we did not all get asked from time to time to help out in the community, and could that not be considered part of each faculty member's job? Dr. Hassett pointed out that this document would allow for inclusion of such service. Dr. Sandstrom objected to the sentence on page 3, lines 33-36, saying that this sentence essentially tells a faculty member to avoid "making waves". Dr. Huguen suggested that the reason for this sentence was that some faculty members simply can't get along with their colleagues even though they may be excellent scholars, but Dr. Sandstrom said that those were the kinds of people we would want to keep. Dr. Gamble moved that the sentence on page 3, lines 33-36 be eliminated, and President Markley proposed that we "stack" all such suggested changes and vote on them at the next meeting.

Ms. Koerner asked about the relative weighting of the three types of duties on the same page, asking where administrative duties would be included under this heading. Mr. Ison stated that many administrative duties that require reassigned time would fall under the heading of service, but Dr. Hassett said that there is also reassigned time for instructional and scholarly activities. Ms. Holmes indicated that she could see a problem when files go outside the department and a faculty member with administrative duties might appear to be teaching less than he or she should. Ms. Koerner suggested that such administrative duties be assigned to one of the three recognized areas so that new faculty would know how to include them. Dr. Heil pointed out that line 19 on page 3 specifies service to the Hays community,

and said that this is very restrictive and should be broadened to include other communities.

Ms. Koerner asked about merit salary recommendations discussed on page 4, do these include cost-of-living adjustments? President Markley said that for unclassified employees at least, all salary increases are considered merit increases. Dr. Markley then turned over the presiding duties to Vice President Watt and presented a proposal to make the dean and the provost voting members of the college and the university committees, respectively, that make promotion and tenure decisions. The dean and the provost would not make individual decisions regarding tenure and promotion. Dr. Markley said that this would be more economical, would enhance shared governance, and would emphasize the importance of the faculty in granting promotion and tenure. Dr. Heil seconded this motion. Dr. Sandstrom opposed this proposal, saying that the other members of these committees would not be so candid about their views if the dean or provost were on the committee. Dr. Gamble suggested that it would be terribly intimidating to have the dean or provost on these committees, but Dr. Markley asked what tenure was for if one could not disagree with a dean or the provost? He also said that the dean and the provost in most cases would know only what the department had to say about the faculty member, though they might have a broader perspective which could be communicated to the committee. Ms. Koerner stated that this addresses a point that has been brought up before regarding faculty concerns that a dean or the provost might overrule a committee's decision regarding promotion or tenure. Dr. Gamble called attention to page 8, line 27, in which the chair is explicitly excluded from the departmental promotion committee, suggesting that the reason for this was the same as his reason for objecting to the inclusion of the dean or the provost on promotion or tenure committees. Dr. Miller said that he had served on the University Tenure Committee under Dr. Eickhoff and Dr. Murphy, and that none of the committee members felt the slightest bit of intimidation in that circumstance.

Ms. Koerner asked if there are any existing college promotion committees, and President Markley said that there are college promotion committees but no university-level promotion committee, just as there is a University Tenure Committee but no formal college-level tenure committees. Dr. Sandstrom called attention to page 8, lines 41-43, in which departmental committee members are required to be "familiar with the guidelines of this appendix", saying that this statement does not need to be in this document. Ms. Koerner asked if the proposed changes could all be brought together in a group, and President Markley said that he would make a "master list" of suggested amendments. He also suggested that the discussion of Appendix O be stopped until next meeting, and Dr. Watt asked that further comments be passed on to a member of the Executive Committee. Mr. Ison asked that the "master list" be mailed out well enough ahead of the June meeting to allow time for consideration, and President Markley said that he would mail the list out by May 17 at the latest.

3. Student Affairs. Presented by President Markley.

President Hammond is holding the Academic Clemency Policy passed by the Faculty Senate at the March meeting in abeyance because the Student Senate has passed its own Academic Clemency Proposal and President Hammond would like the two Senates to resolve any differences between the two. Dr. Watt will deal with this and report back to the Faculty Senate.

4. Bylaws and Standing Rules. Presented by President Markley.

Departments needing to do so should by now have elected new Senate representatives, and they need to communicate the results of these elections to Mr. Ginther. Also, the secretaries of all standing committees should send records of their committee minutes to Dr. Watt to go into the university archives.

5. External Affairs. Presented by Dr. Sandstrom.

The results of the faculty survey regarding Strategic Planning items were presented in the form of a handout listing the sum of the rankings of each item, and Dr. Sandstrom noted that items 9, 10, and 11 dealing with the library easily got the highest rankings. Mr. Ison asked why items such as number 22 ("Add additional faculty in English") were included in the survey, since many faculty wouldn't even care about this. Dr. Sandstrom replied that he simply included all Strategic Plan items that would require new State monies, and President Markley added that it can be important for the administration to know that faculty consider one item to be more important than another.

6. Executive Committee. Presented by President Markley.

The Nominating Committee has selected Dr. Huguen and Dr. Gamble as nominees for Vice President, and Ms. Holmes and Ms. Koerner as nominees for Secretary. President Markley said that at the September meeting further nominations can be made from the floor, and then elections will be held.

OLD BUSINESS

None.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Dr. Guss of the Department of Administration, Counseling, and Educational Studies presented a resolution to give President Hammond a vote of confidence, the results of which would be presented to President Hammond by the president of the Faculty Senate. The vote of confidence would include but not be limited to the following categories: fund raising, public relations, administration and management, budget and finances, and mission and action plan. President Markley asked that this proposed resolution be written out and that a senator be asked to bring it to the floor. Dr. Miller suggested that the proposal be sent to

the Executive Committee for further action. Dr. Slattery moved that this resolution be passed, and he brought a typed copy to the secretary. Dr. Huguen seconded. Dr. Miller asked if part of the motion was that the vote should be taken at the last scheduled meeting of the Faculty Senate in June, and President Markley said that that was the way the motion reads.

Dr. Heil said that he assumed that the president has our confidence, so that it was not clear that the vote was necessary. Dr. Sandstrom asked if Dr. Guss understood the implications, and Dr. Guss replied that he wanted the Faculty Senate to discuss the issues. Dr. Hassett asked if there was a particular urgency to this motion in terms of the political ramifications, and Dr. Guss responded that he saw it as political in a generic and a proactive sense. He said that there was a lot of muttering about the decisions that the president makes or doesn't make, and that this motion provides something to do with that muttering or else put it away. Dr. Gamble stated that he was concerned about the precedent that this motion would set, and Mr. Ison said there had never been a need for such a resolution before. He also pointed out that the summer meetings of the Faculty Senate are often not well attended, making it possible that at a future meeting a quorum might not be available to pass such a resolution. Dr. Olson said that we should have a strong motive for such a vote of confidence and that he was not sure that muttering constituted a strong motive. Ms. Koerner asked about the status of categories that were not listed. Dr. Heil moved that the resolution be tabled, and Dr. Gamble seconded this motion.

Motion to table this resolution carried.

2. Dr. Sandstrom presented a report regarding the activities of the Curriculum Review Committee and handed out copies to all senators. He solicited comments orally or in writing, and said that the minutes of the committee meetings were on reserve in the library under the heading Curriculum Review.

LIAISON REPORTS

None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

James R. Hohman, Secretary
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate