

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

6-3-1991

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, June 3, 1991

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, June 3, 1991" (1991). *Faculty Senate*. 831.

[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/831](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/831)

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

June 3, 1991

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

The following members were present: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattey, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. James Hohman, Dr. Serjit Kasior, Dr. Willis Watt, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. Paul Phillips, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Mr. David Ison (for Dr. Paul Gatschet), Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. Allan Busch (for Dr. Raymond Wilson), Mr. Glenn Ginther, Ms. Anita Gordon-Gilmore (for Mr. Jerry Wilson), Dr. Ronald Sandstrom, Dr. Charles Votaw (for Dr. Mohammad Riaz), Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Kenneth Olson, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Michael Rettig (for Dr. Michael Kallam).

The following members were absent: Dr. Thomas Wenke, Ms. Martha Holmes, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. William King, Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Mr. Glen McNeil, Mr. Kevin Shilling, Dr. Richard Hughen, Dr. Maurice Witten, and Dr. Richard Heil.

Others present included Provost James Murphy, Dr. Don Hoy, Dr. Larry Gould, and Erik Sandstrom and Grant Bannister of the Student Government Association.

The minutes of the May 7, 1991 meeting were approved.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. President Hammond has approved the modification of the foreign language requirement associated with the B.A. degree to allow international students whose native language is not English to count English as their foreign language.

2. A new Regents' Task Force on Faculty Evaluation is being established, and will be composed of faculty and student representatives as well as administrative and Regents' staff representatives. Specifically the members will be FHSU Provost James Murphy and the chief academic officer from KU, the student government presidents from ESU and PSU, Dr. Martine Hammond Paludan and Dr. John Welsh from the Regents' staff, and two faculty representatives as nominated by the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents. These two faculty representatives are Dr. Gerald Hanna of KSU and Dr. Charles Burdsal of WSU.

3. The Council of Faculty Senate Presidents is pursuing changes in the Board of Regents' council structure to enhance faculty participation in the governance process in a proactive way.

4. Mr. Ted Ayres, the Regents' attorney, has replied to the

proposal regarding software rights that was sent to him some months ago, and copies of this reply have been sent to Ms. Holmes of the University Affairs Committee, and to Dr. Gamble, Dr. Kallam, and Dr. Hassett who were involved in writing the proposal. Dr. Miller asked about the gist of Mr. Ayres reply, and President Markley said that essentially the letter said that yes, this issue is important but there were minor quibbles about who reports to whom and the authority of the provost to enter into contracts.

### STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. No report.
2. Student Affairs. No report.
3. Bylaws and Standing Rules. No report.
4. External Affairs. No report.
5. Executive Committee. No report.
6. University Affairs. Presented by President Markley.

A list of suggested amendments and other issues related to Appendix O was sent to all senators, and additional comments and suggestions were handed out by Dr. Kasior and Dr. Gamble. President Markley stated that the list that he had sent out was in no particular order but suggested that we consider the issues in the order in which they were listed.

The first of these issues was that of collegiality as a criterion for evaluating a faculty member's service duties, as stated on page 3, lines 33-36 of the draft copy of Appendix O dated 4/15/91. Several individuals suggested leaving out this sentence altogether. Dr. Sandstrom moved that this sentence be deleted, and Dr. Hassett seconded. This motion carried.

The second issue was that of definition of service, specifically the location of the community (page 3, line 19 specifies Hays), the inclusion of administrative service with other kinds of service activities (page 3, line 28), and the nature of community service (page 3, lines 30-33; page 15, line 41; page 23, line 44; and page 25, line 29). It was moved and seconded that the word "Hays" be struck from the phrase "and service to the Hays community" on page 3, line 19, and this motion carried. Dr. Miller moved that "part-time administrative service" be added to the end of the sentence ending on page 3, line 28, and this motion carried.

As regards the nature of community service, President Markley said that two questions were raised: whether or not just being a member of a civic organization constitutes community service, and whether or not community service has to be professional in

nature. President Markley stated that as things presently stand the nature of community service is defined by each department and varies considerably across campus. Dr. Gamble commented that the College of Business counts virtually anything that helps humanity as community service, and said that as he saw it the thrust of this issue was general service not necessarily professionally related. Dr. Votaw suggested that professional service should come under that heading rather than under the heading of community service, and that community service shouldn't necessarily have anything to do with one's profession. Dr. Jennings asked if this might not open up a Pandora's box in which someone would have to decide if a professionally related service relationship was close enough to count or not. Ms. Koerner suggested that we leave the definition of community service as broad as possible and let the departments decide on the specifics. Dr. Shapiro suggested that the sentence beginning on page 3, line 30 be changed to read "Community service may include activities such as..." rather than "Community service includes but is not limited to activities such as...", but Dr. Stephenson said that those are substantively the same. Ms. Koerner suggested that we leave the issue of the nature of community service as it is, and President Markley suggested that everyone consider this issue further and possibly return to it next month.

The third major substantive issue dealt with evaluation and could be sub-divided into two items: whether or not faculty members could realistically be compared to other faculty at FHSU in comparable positions (page 4, lines 47-48), and the general question of whether evaluation comparisons such as norm or reference group assessments should be done or instead should evaluation be limited to achievement of standards. Dr. Busch moved that item 4. c (page 4, lines 47-48) be deleted, and this motion carried. Ms. Koerner asked with regard to item 4. b, do we want to be compared at all? Dr. Busch asked what the reference group would be under reference group assessment, and Dr. Gamble asked if faculty members would be compared to the average or median of their departments. President Markley suggested a non-reference mode of assessment whereby faculty members would be put into categories according to their performance without necessarily designating any one category as being superior to the others. Dr. Busch remarked however that at some point faculty must be distinguished from each other, and that there must be a "spread" in merit evaluations. Dr. Votaw suggested that perhaps the faculty disagree with the order that there must be a spread, and President Markley said that this order is analogous to saying that a certain percentage of a class must get U's. Dr. Busch stated that if the regents say there must be a spread then we can't write a policy opposed to this.

The fourth issue on the list dealt with "the demonstrated ability to team teach" as specified on page 2, line 50, with several people suggesting redefinition or deletion of this criterion. Dr. Shapiro commented that the sentence was not appropriately worded since an ability is not a duty or an

activity. Dr. Sandstrom moved, and Dr. Busch seconded, that the entire sentence on page 2, lines 48-52 be deleted, and this motion carried.

The fifth issue on the list dealt with certain details regarding the materials to be included in promotion and tenure files, specifically the implication on page 15, lines 23-24 and on page 25, lines 10-11 that an individual faculty member could claim credit for successful students. President Markley said that some of those who objected said that the success of a student is a departmental result not an individual faculty member's result, but Dr. Busch asked if anyone had given thought to the possibility that the success of the student was due to the student. Dr. Razak agreed and moved that item d on page 15 (lines 23-26) be deleted. Dr. Shapiro remarked that in the Music Department an individual student often works closely with one particular faculty member, and that in those cases the success of the student should be largely credited to the faculty member. Ms. Koerner moved that the first part of item d, up through the word "or" (page 15, lines 23-24), be deleted, and this motion carried. President Markley commented that there would be a parallel change on page 25 (lines 10-12).

Dr. Razak stated that a list of items to show an applicant's teaching skills could be extended forever, and suggested deleting items b through e (page 15, lines 7-36) saying that lists of suggestions could be converted into requirements. Dr. Hassett said that new faculty would find such a list helpful, but Dr. Razak commented that this document was already too long to be helpful. Ms. Koerner stated that as a member of that committee what she was hearing from new faculty was that everyone seemed to prepare their files differently and that no one had a clear idea of what was wanted. Dr. Razak agreed that a list of criteria would be helpful but that that was not what this list was supposed to be. Dr. Shapiro said that he agreed with Ms. Koerner that guidelines would be helpful, but Dr. Sandstrom suggested that there would be a temptation on promotion and tenure committees to compare such a list item by item with an applicant's file. Ms. Koerner said that the comments she had received from various committees was that there was so much diversity in the files they were reviewing that decisions were difficult to reach, but Dr. Razak suggested that this list would actually increase diversity. Dr. Shapiro remarked that in his opinion diversity was unavoidable, and said that on the committees on which he had served no one had ever done a strict item by item comparison of a file to a list of guidelines. Dr. Razak moved, and Dr. Sandstrom seconded, that items b through e (page 15, lines 7-36) be eliminated, and President Markley commented that these items also appear on page 24, lines 44-52 to page 25, lines 1-24.

Dr. Britten stated that on the tenure committee a question that often comes up is what criteria are there other than student evaluations by which to evaluate candidates for tenure. He said

that he agreed with Ms. Koerner that a list such as this would be helpful to faculty preparing a tenure file, and he also agreed with Dr. Shapiro that no one on the tenure committee did an item by item comparison of a file with the list of guidelines. He said he would like to see these items retained since they would be helpful to the tenure committee as well. Dr. Busch commented that deletion of items b through e would not mean that this information could not be included in a file, but Dr. Britten said that deletion of these items would give no information to those preparing files regarding what things to include. Dr. Stephenson stated that candidates coming down the line would have no idea what should be included if these items are deleted. Dr. Busch asked if such candidates never have discussions with their chairs, saying that if a candidate can't present a file to the tenure committee then that person's chair should be carefully scrutinized.

Motion to eliminate items b through e, lines 7-36 on page 15, failed on a vote of 6 for and 15 against.

The sixth item on the list was the itemized anti discrimination clause repeated on several pages, with several people objecting to the repetition of this statement many times throughout the appendix. Two specific suggestions were to make the statement once near the beginning of the appendix and let that stand for all that follows, or to make the list longer to include other groups. Dr. Hoy commented that he saw no reason to repeat the statement so many times, and that the list as it stands does not include all of the categories covered by the affirmative action policy. He suggested an expanded list to include, for example, the special disabled and also Vietnam-era categories. Dr. Shapiro asked what was meant by special disabled, and Dr. Hoy replied that special disabled refers to both physical and mental handicaps. President Markley asked if federal specifications regarding affirmative action did not keep changing every few months, and Dr. Hoy responded that this expanded list is fairly standard except for the special disabled category which is more recent.

Dr. Hassett asked why the Vietnam-era category had to be specified and not the Korean or other conflicts, and Dr. Hoy replied that the Vietnam conflict was not officially a war and that some people who were in the military were not sent overseas but were nonetheless Vietnam-era veterans. Dr. Gamble suggested an alternative to the wording currently under consideration in which all the special categories would be eliminated leaving only a statement that faculty members would be evaluated fairly and equitably. Dr. Hoy said that he saw no problem with such a statement though he said that repeating the special categories here could make people more aware of them. Dr. Gamble moved, and Ms. Koerner seconded, that the anti-discrimination clause be changed to read "Faculty members shall be evaluated fairly and equitably and without discrimination, pursuant to the affirmative action policy of Fort Hays State University." He also moved that

this statement appear only once in place of the statement on page 2, lines 17-19, and that the current statement be deleted elsewhere in the appendix. This motion carried.

At President Markley's suggestion, further action on Appendix 0 was postponed until the next meeting.

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. Dr. Watt reported on a meeting he had held with Erik Sandstrom regarding the Academic Clemency policy passed by the Faculty Senate at its March meeting. He said that the Student Senate had passed a policy of its own on Academic Clemency and that President Hammond had asked the two Senates to reconcile the differences between the two proposals. Dr. Watt then read a resolution from the Student Senate outlining three significant changes that the students would like to see in the policy as passed by the Faculty Senate: first, that upon the granting of academic clemency the grades be omitted from the transcript leaving only the course names on the transcript along with the notation "Academic clemency has been granted"; second, that academic clemency be granted only for an entire semester as a unit rather than allowing the student to pick and choose the courses for which clemency would be sought; and third, that a maximum of 2 one-semester units per student could receive clemency. Dr. Watt then asked Mr. Sandstrom or Mr. Bannister to comment on each of these three proposed changes.

Mr. Sandstrom stated that the Student Senate had passed two resolutions with regard to academic clemency: the first was in support of the concept of academic clemency almost without regard to the specifics of the academic clemency policy, and the second addressed the exact type of policy that the Student Senate would like to see in place. Mr. Sandstrom said that, aside from the three suggested changes, the Student Senate's proposal was consistent with the policy passed by the Faculty Senate.

In reference to the first of these three suggested changes, Mr. Sandstrom stated that the personal preference of most students was that grades not be left on the transcript for courses which have received academic clemency because students view academic clemency as somewhat "stronger" than retaking a class. He said that leaving the grades on the transcript would just open the student up to more questions, and that academic clemency should give the student a fresh start. The second of the suggested changes was to ensure that the credibility of the degrees received was maintained to the highest degree possible. Mr. Sandstrom said that by eliminating the "pick and choose" option we would be telling the students that they can't just eliminate the bad grades but would have to give up the good with the bad. He said that academic clemency is something that students should take seriously, and that by eliminating all grades from a semester we would be wiping the slate as clean as possible. Finally on this point, Mr. Sandstrom said that current

students may feel a little betrayed by there being a policy that allows returning students to "pick and choose" the courses for which academic clemency would be sought.

The third suggested change brought up the question of how financial aid is awarded. Mr. Sandstrom pointed out that PELL grants and other federal financial aid packages are awarded in blocks of one year, and that this might lead some students who do poorly one semester to come back for the following semester even though they may not be ready for it. He said that allowing academic clemency for a maximum of 2 one-semester units would remedy this situation. He then asked for questions on any specific issues.

Ms. Koerner asked if the 2 one-semester units would have to be consecutive, and Mr. Sandstrom said that they hadn't discussed this point but that allowing them to be non-consecutive would provide for more situations where academic clemency might be needed. Dr. Phillips asked if there should not be consistency between the way class retakes are handled and the way academic clemency would be handled in terms of the question of omitting or including grades on student transcripts. Mr. Sandstrom said that students who wish to improve their grades should simply retake those classes, while academic clemency should be used when a student has a bad problem one semester and needs to have the record wiped clean. He said that this would be a different policy covering a different situation, but that the issue of whether or not the grades stay on the transcript is less important to students than the other two suggested changes.

Dr. Miller said that he felt the Senate could not act on these suggestions without documentation in front of the Senators, and he moved that these suggestions be sent to the Student Affairs Committee for consideration. President Markley asked if there were any objections and, hearing none, he said that he would send the Student Senate's proposal to the committee.

2. Dr. Watt reminded the chairs and secretaries of the standing committees to get their meeting minutes to him by the end of June.

#### NEW BUSINESS

1. Dr. Watt encouraged anyone who was interested in chairing or being a member of a standing committee for the coming year to let him know.

2. Dr. Sandstrom moved that the Senate show its appreciation to President Markley for his efforts over the past year, and there was a general show of approval.

#### LIAISON REPORTS

None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 pm.

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