

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

7-2-1991

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, July 2, 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, July 2, 1991" (1991). *Faculty Senate*. 832.

[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/832](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/832)

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 2, 1991

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Pioneer Lounge of the Memorial Union on July 2, 1991 at 3:30 pm by President Willis Watt.

The following members were present: Dr. Fred Britten, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Dale McKemey, Ms. Joan Rumpel, Ms. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Mr. Lance Lippert (for Dr. Serjit Kasior), Dr. Steve Shapiro, Dr. Rick Zakrzewski (for Dr. Gary Millhollen), Dr. Ralph Gamble, Dr. Richard Leeson (for Dr. Paul Gatschet), Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Dr. Merlene Lyman (for Mr. Glen McNeil), Mr. Herb Zook, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Paul Faber (for Dr. Richard Huguen), Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Mike Rettig.

The following members were absent: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Joseph Thomasson, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. Robert Jennings, Mr. Jack Logan, Mr. DeWayne Winterlin, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Helmut Schmeller, Dr. Mohammad Riaz, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Richard Heil, and Dr. Kenneth Olson.

Others present included Dr. Don Hoy, Dr. James Hohman, and Mr. Grant Bannister of the Student Government.

The minutes of the June 3, 1991 meeting were approved with the following correction: on page 2 in the last full paragraph regarding the definition of service to be used in Appendix O, on the fifth line from the end of the paragraph the word "stuck" should be "struck".

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Issues that were raised at the June 27, 1991 meeting of the Board of Regents included the following.

a. The Student Advisory Committee brought out a proposal to raise the minimum score on the TSE for non-native English speaking faculty and teaching assistants from 220 as it is now to 240. Grant Bannister of the Student Government commented that this change would be phased in over two years, and that the proposal also specified that a place be designated on each campus to receive student complaints and suggestions regarding faculty competency in English. In response to a question from President Watt Mr. Bannister said that this change would not apply to current faculty or teaching assistants but only to future hires. President Watt commented that this change may make it more difficult to get teaching assistants and perhaps faculty in some areas such as math and the sciences, and that the TSE seems to have a bias against Pacific Rim nationalities such as Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino persons.

b. House Bill 2454, section 26. f has recently made it a law that no state employee may accept honoraria, and although this law was meant to apply specifically to legislators it is written in such a way as to apply to all state employees including faculty at Regents' schools. In addition, this prohibition against accepting honoraria includes consulting fees unless certain criteria are met, according to the Regents' attorney (Mr. Ted Ayres), although these criteria are fairly straight-forward such as the need for a written contract. Dr. Hoy commented that he had received a note from the Regents' attorney on this issue and that Mr. Ayres felt that an honorarium was money given to honor some person, not a payment for activities carried out by a state employee in his or her area of expertise. Mr. Ayres suggested that in written contracts regarding such activities the word "honorarium" should not appear anywhere, and that the payment should not be above the standard for such activities. Dr. Hoy stated that this issue would be on the agenda for the President's Cabinet in July and the results of this discussion would be disseminated. Dr. Markley asked if one impact of this law would be that we'd have to go back to filing consultancy reports, and Dr. Hoy replied that that could happen since Mr. Ayres believes that the Regents will be asked to develop a policy regarding this issue.

c. There is an effort ongoing to form a commission to promote research among six member states (Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Kansas), and Dr. Koplik is involved in this effort. This commission plans to encourage the sharing of knowledge and resources to the benefit of the educational systems of the member states.

d. The Task Force dealing with the examination of mission statements among the Regents' institutions made a report, and this generated some heated discussion. Many of the regents did not like the label of "advocate" for the Regents' system that was used in the report, and ultimately the Board restructured that part of the report to minimize the use of this designation. The perceived "micro-management" of the Regents' schools by the Regents also came up for discussion.

e. A Task Force on qualified admissions was established at the meeting.

2. Ms. Karen Cole made a presentation to the Council of Presidents regarding the expansion of library services within the Regents' system by cooperative electronic sharing of information and databases. She is planning to make a similar presentation to the Regents at their September meeting.

3. Executive Order 91-133 dealing with elimination of waste and duplication of effort was also brought up at the Council of Presidents meeting, although discussion was put off until their September meeting.

A recent meeting of the chairs of the Arts & Sciences departments brought up a reminder of the Regents' requirement for granting graduate credit for workshops and seminars.

#### STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. No report.
2. University Affairs. No report.
3. Student Affairs. No report.
4. Bylaws and Standing Rules. No report.
5. External Affairs. No report.
6. Executive Affairs. No report.

#### OLD BUSINESS

1. The discussion of revisions to Appendix O was carried on from where it left off at the last meeting, and President Watt turned over the podium to Dr. Markley. Dr. Miller suggested that discussion of these revisions be discontinued at 4:45 pm, and Dr. Markley asked everyone to keep this suggestion in mind. Dr. Markley noted that we had gotten through item 6 of the list of proposed revisions from the last meeting agenda, but pointed out that a final decision had not been made on all of these 6 items.

The seventh issue from the list of proposed revisions dealt with the reporting of the results of hearings, appeals, and consultations. The question that was raised was, after hearings or appeals should only the final or amended report go on to the next level or should both the original recommendation and the final one be sent on? Ms. Koerner commented that for the sake of due process both reports should be sent on, although she could see circumstances under which an individual or committee might not want the original report to go forward. Dr. Rumpel stated that if only the amended report was sent on that would be tantamount to the committee making out the application for the candidate, which he felt was not the committee's job. Dr. Zakrzewski commented that an amended report would not necessarily be more favorable than the original report, and moved that both reports be sent forward.

Dr. Miller agreed with that motion but asked if the candidate was to be allowed both to insert new materials and to delete old materials from the file. Dr. Hassett commented that sometimes a committee might recommend that some materials be deleted from a file, for example, to preserve anonymity on student grade records. Dr. Britten said that he felt this was part of the departmental committee's responsibility, but Dr. Miller said that he was really asking if the candidate had the same right to delete materials as to insert them for his or her own benefit. He pointed out that right now no new materials may be inserted

beyond the departmental level, and moved that the candidate not be allowed to delete materials. Dr. Zakrzewski stated that as he read it the word "insert" implies that no deletion is presently allowed, and that if there were any materials deleterious to the candidate they should be discussed in the departmental committee's report to the chair.

Dr. Gamble suggested that perhaps a candidate should be allowed to delete as well as to insert materials at this level, since the file could be considered to be at a formative stage at this point. Dr. Miller asked if the candidate should be permitted to pore through the file looking for things that shouldn't be there, and Dr. Zakrzewski stated that that should have been done before the candidate turned in the file in the first place. Dr. Markley commented that the intent of insertion by the candidate was so that an unfavorable committee recommendation could be discussed or possibly refuted by a letter written by the candidate and inserted into the file. Dr. Miller moved that the sentence on page 9, lines 11-12 be changed to read as follows: "At this point the applicant may insert additional materials in the file but not remove them.", and this motion was seconded by Dr. Leeson.

Dr. Hassett asked what should be done if there are materials such as student grade records in the file that should be removed, and President Watt responded that this should be the committee's responsibility. Dr. Rumpel offered a friendly amendment to the motion to the effect that the modified sentence be moved to page 8 to follow the sentence ending on line 15, but Dr. Miller said that the sentence would have to be rephrased. Dr. Markley asked if it was sufficient to state simply that it was the intent of the Senate that no deletions be allowed, and Dr. Miller withdrew his motion and moved that the University Affairs Committee consider that the intent of the Senate was that no deletions be allowed. Dr. Leeson seconded this motion, and the motion carried. Dr. Markley asked if there was any further discussion of the original issue regarding the sending forward of all reports, and there was a general consensus that no change be made.

The eighth issue from the list of proposed revisions had to do with the question of whom the provost should consult with in cases of disagreements over salary recommendations (page 5, line 44). No suggestions from the floor were offered and the general consensus was that no change was needed in the current wording.

The ninth issue from the list regarded promotion and tenure and dealt specifically with two questions. First, can an instructor ever be promoted without a terminal degree and if so, under what conditions (page 6, lines 36-39)? Dr. Rumpel pointed out that this question is answered in lines 31-32 on page 6 in which it is stated that the rank of assistant professor may be achieved after service in the rank of instructor as an alternative to being hired with a terminal degree as an assistant professor. The second question raised under this issue was, can