

Fort Hays State University

FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

11-4-1991

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, November 4, 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, November 4, 1991" (1991).
Faculty Senate. 835.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/835

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
November 4, 1991

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Trails Room of the Memorial Union on November 4, 1991, at 3:35 p.m. by President Willis Watt.

The following members were present: Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Ms. Martha Holmes, Mr. Michael Jilg, Mrs. Joan Rumpel, Dr. Ann McClure (for Dr. Dale McKemey), Mrs. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Steve Shapiro, Dr. Mary Romjue (for Dr. Robert Jennings), Mr. Jack Logan, Dr. Gary Millhollen, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Pam Shaffer, Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Dr. Helmut Schmeller, Mr. Herbert Zook, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Mohammad Riazzi, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Ms. Cindie Streck (for Dr. Mary Hassett), Dr. Richard Huguen, Dr. Maurice Witten, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Kenneth Olson, and Dr. Michael Rettig.

The following members were absent: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Madden, Dr. Dale McKemey, Dr. Serjit Kaur-Kasior, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Mr. Glen McNeil, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Richard Heil, and Dr. Nevell Razak.

Also present was Lane Victorson of the Student Government Association.

The minutes of the October 1, 1991 meeting were approved with a spelling correction for the name of Dr. Gary Millhollen and with inclusion of Mr. Dewayne Winterlin in the list of senators present.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Statement of the COFSP to the BOR, Oct. 17, 1991: President Watt remarked that the statement was harsher than he would have recommended, but a strong statement had to be made to get our point across. He will send it out to senators, and he requests that the senators send responses to him if they wish.
2. Pittsburg Morning Sun, Oct. 18, 1991: An article, printed in the Pittsburg Morning Sun concerning the Aspiration document will be sent to senators by President Watt.
3. Sampson "Stewardship" document, dated Oct. 1, 1991: Regents Chair Sampson has written a document in response to the Aspirations document written by the Regents' staff; the Sampson document is quite similar to the Aspirations document. President Watt will send the Sampson document to the senators; accompanying this will be another statement by Mr. Sampson in which the Regents affirm that they are not seeking centralization of authority in the Regents system.

4. Joe B. Wyatt Challenge Award: Fort Hays State University received this award for voice mail technology in foreign language. At the present, students studying French use this technology.
5. Task Force on Faculty Evaluation: Dr. Markley stated that COFSP Chair Kerle was incorrect in his statement that the two faculty members on this Task Force were chosen for their expertise in developing "evaluation forms." Dr. Markley said that he was a member of the committee which chose these faculty members and that they were chosen for their knowledge of evaluations generally and not for any particular expertise with forms.
6. Politically Correct Speech: President Watt will send information on this issue to the senators; he foresees potential legal liabilities for faculty in the future. Dr. Miller asked if this really is an issue since the Chronicles of Higher Education are debating whether it is an issue. President Watt pointed out that several faculty at other universities would say there is definitely a problem.
7. Additional announcements included President Watt's congratulations to Dr. Lewis Miller for his selection as President's Distinguished Scholar 1991 and a reminder of the opening of the Faculty Art Exhibition in the Moss-Thorns Gallery at 7:00 p.m. on November 4.

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. No report.
2. By-laws/Standing Rules. No report.
3. External Affairs. No report.
4. Student Affairs. Presented by Dr. Stephenson.

Dr. Stephenson reported on Executive Committee action concerning the Academic Clemency Policy proposal. Dr. Huguen had pointed out that the policy as approved at the Oct. 1, 1991, Faculty Senate meeting does not prevent a student, coming back after two years and doing poorly the first semester, from appealing that first semester after his return. The Executive Committee voted to accept an insertion in the policy of the following sentence: "Only FHSU credit hours and course work taken prior to the two-year separation may be petitioned." This sentence will be added after the first sentence of the approved policy.

5. University Affairs. No report.

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Shaffer asked what President Watt's response had been to Provost Murphy's proposal on summer school salaries.

President Watt stated that he had replied primarily on three issues: 1) the faculty are opposed to the faculty of one college receiving 100% of 2/9 salary; 2) the faculty are willing to discuss 80% of 2/9 salary, but all faculty are dissatisfied with receiving less than 100%; and 3) the faculty request that the administration and twelve-month faculty share the burden of reduced salary with the faculty.

Dr. Shaffer stressed that an across-the-board salary reduction to 80% of 2/9 undercuts programs of value. She expressed the hope that Faculty Senate would give more support to consideration of summer school salaries. She wondered if the faculty could change administration priorities.

Dr. Shaffer proposed the motion that the Faculty Senate disapprove the values implied by the way the administration is handling summer programs.

President Watt pointed out that most faculty received between 37-83% of 2/9 salary last summer and that summer is a separate contract a faculty member makes and no one is guaranteed this work.

Ms. Koerner recommended that the money which Dr. Hammond has earmarked for special requests be used for summer salaries. Dr. Gatschet stated that the previous system, in which each chair and dean determined what courses should be offered and what the faculty should be paid, was better than the one now proposed; he added that the department program should be the important factor in determining faculty salaries.

Dr. Shaffer proposed the following motion against an across-the-board percentage: The Faculty Senate goes on record as disagreeing with the action of the administration in proposing to cut the salaries of summer teaching faculty.

After additional discussion in which several senators supported cutting unneeded programs and service courses in order to pay remaining faculty 100% of 2/9 salary, the motion was approved unanimously.

President Watt suggested that the University Affairs Committee should consider the priorities, salaries, and programs of summer school.

There was no other new business.

OLD BUSINESS

Dr. Markley continued the discussion of Appendix 0 by handing out a copy of the last pages of his document, "Substantive Issues Raised Concerning Appendix 0." He summarized earlier discussions during last

year's Faculty Senate meetings and directed senators to a consideration of sections XII-XV on the handout.

Section XII. Student Ratings of Teaching

- a. Dr. Rumpel suggested that the document read "regularly scheduled courses" which eliminates courses by arrangement or by appointment unless included under an agreement between the chair and the faculty member. Dr. Britten pointed out that the University Tenure Committee was concerned that a faculty member might have the opportunity to select which course evaluations are submitted; Dr. Britten suggested that the wording read "all regularly scheduled courses, in addition other courses as agreed to by chair and faculty." Dr. Millhollen observed that students in low-enrollment regularly scheduled courses are concerned about anonymity. Dr. Markley reminded the Senate that procedures to solve that problem had been proposed to the Senate last year and were defeated; he suggested that the question of anonymity should be considered in relation to a separate statement concerning procedures for student evaluations rather than in regard to Appendix 0. Dr. Rumpel recommended that the appropriate sections of Appendix 0 (P14 L52-53, P24 L 35-36) read as follows: Student evaluation summaries of, "at the minimum, all regularly scheduled courses" taught by; quotation marks are used only for ease of identifying the recommended changes and will not appear in the final version of the document. This recommendation was approved by the Faculty Senate with one dissenting vote.
- b. The second concern with the revision pertains to what parts of the student evaluations should be used for tenure, promotion, and merit. The revision excludes the written comments of students; some departments use only the statistical data while others use only the written comments or both statistical and written. Dr. Britten pointed out that for 90% of the faculty student evaluations are the only evidence of teaching quality and thus the written comments are valuable to the University Tenure Committee. Ms. Koerner mentioned that if faculty are concerned with negative comments on the evaluations, they have the option of adding their own comments to the bottom of the summary form; such comments might include explanations of their teaching strategies or of changes in the course which they will undertake to respond to the students' criticism. Dr. Huguen recommended the elimination of the sentence, "Student's written comments shall not be included.." (P15 L2-3, P24 L39-40) and made the motion to substitute a statement: "Both statistical data and students' written comments should be submitted." Dr. Britten amended the motion with the inclusion of the words "if available" so that the sentence now should read: "Both statistical data and students' written comments, if available, should be submitted." The motion was passed unanimously.

Section XIII. Committee Membership.

- a. Dr. Markley indicated that there is a lack of uniformity in departmental committees; in some departments all tenured faculty serve on the Tenure and Promotion Committee while in other departments only a few of the tenured faculty serve. In the latter departments the selection of the committee members may be made by election or by the chair. The senators had very little to say about this issue; Dr. Rumpel recommended that the Senate leave it up to each department to decide. Dr. Huguen moved that the section (P17 L48) remain as it is presently written in the revision; this motion passed unanimously.
- b. Dr. Markley indicated that the revision of Appendix 0 does not make a distinction between the departmental promotion committee and the departmental tenure committee. He asked if the senators intended that there be two distinct committees. The Senate decided to leave this issue to the discretion of the departments.
- c. Concerning the issue of nontenured faculty on a promotion committee, Dr. Watt said that Dr. Murphy believes that only tenured faculty should serve on promotion committees. Dr. Watt pointed out that in small departments the promotion committee could include tenured faculty from other departments. The recommendation was made to strike the word "generally" from P8 L23; the motion passed with one dissenting vote.

Section XIV. Patronizing Tone in Document.

The Senate did not discuss each of the sections for which questions had been raised. For sections on P10 L1-2, P10 L50-51, P16 L43, P18 L7, and P20 L43, Dr. Britten stated that the sections spell out the responsibilities of department chairs and committee members and should be retained. Dr. Britten was concerned by the sentence, P18 L13: "The committee should strive for unanimity in its vote...."; he recommended that the entire sentence be deleted. None of these recommendations were voted upon although there seemed to be general consensus concerning retention of the first sections discussed and deletion of the P18 L13 sentence. The section on P2 L50-52 was not specifically discussed nor were sections on P3 L1-2, P12 L52, P13 L1-2, P16 L40-46, and P22 L47; perhaps these should be brought up at the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Section XV. Length of Process and Power of Provost & Dean: Pt. 2.

Dr. Markley proposed a sequence of steps for the promotion and tenure processes, which are different from the steps in the revision of Appendix 0; he stated that these steps would create a parallel structure for the tenure and promotion processes by establishing a University Promotion Committee and College Tenure Committees and would eliminate some confusion and illegality at the present time. Dr. Markley recommended retention of the three-layer committee structure presented in the revision and a

change of the powers of the Deans and the Provost; the Deans and Provost as members of the College and University committees respectively would have one vote, but would not have a separate level of decision making as they do now. Dr. Miller asked if anyone had considered eliminating a step or two instead of adding steps; he suggested the elimination of the College committees in both tenure and promotion processes and retention of only the University committees in both cases. Dr. Huguen asked if the Senate did not want several faculty involved in decisions affecting faculty; he pointed out that eliminating a college committee would reduce the number of faculty involved in decisions. Ms. Koerner recommended eliminating other committees not dealing with faculty if senators believed there were too many committees now. Dr. Shapiro asked why there was a need for parallelism since tenure and promotion are two different issues. Dr. Huguen asked why, if a committee was good for tenure, a similar committee would not be good for promotion. At this point Dr. Watt asked for discussion of the revision to cease for the day; Dr. Markley suggested that the topic of parallelism could be discussed later when he has brought back to Senate the final revision reflecting the Senate's discussions.

LIAISON REPORTS

There were no liaison reports. President Watt asked the senators to please note on this month's Faculty Senate agenda the appointments of student liaisons to Faculty Senate Standing Committees and the faculty liaisons.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Holmes, Secretary
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate

MH/ct

Minutes of the
Faculty Senate
of Fort Hays State University

February 4, 1992

President Willis Watt called the Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate to order on February 4, 1992, at 3:40 p.m. in the Trails Room of the Memorial Union.

The following members were present: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Robert Stephenson, Dr. Fred Britten, Dr. Michael Madden, Ms. Martha Holmes, Mr. Michael Jilg, Dr. Dale McKemey, Mrs. Joan Rumpel, Mrs. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Serjit Kaur-Kasior, Dr. Stephen Shapiro, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. John Durham, Dr. Carl Parker, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Carl Singleton, Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Dr. Gary L. Millhollen, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Helmut Schmeller, Dr. Merlene Lyman (for Mr. Glen McNeil), Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Mohammad Riazzi, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Richard Hughen, Dr. Roger Pruitt (for Dr. Maurice Witten), Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Phyllis Tiffany, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Mike Rettig.

The following members were absent: Mr. Glen McNeil, Mr. Herb Zook, and Dr. Maurice Witten.

Also present were Dr. James Murphy, Dr. Larry Gould, Dr. Mary Hoy, Dr. Donald Hoy, Dr. Virgil Howe, Grant Bannister of the Student Government Association, a representative of the Leader, Ms. Adele Shaver of the Hays Daily News, and several faculty members of Fort Hays State University.

The minutes of the January 13, 1992, and January 28, 1992, Faculty Senate meetings were approved by unanimous vote. One typographic error under New Business on the January 13 minutes, "organized for collection bargaining purposes," was corrected to read "organized for collective bargaining purposes." Typographical errors on the January 28 minutes were noted by the secretary and have been corrected.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. President Watt reminded senators that he had distributed a draft document concerning the new general education committee, written by Dr. Larry Gould. President Watt encouraged senators to provide their opinions of the document.
2. He also requested that senators read Attachment A of the agenda, "How to Identify the Copyright Holder" and distribute to their department colleagues.
3. He referred senators to the announcements on the agenda and asked for any questions or comments; there were none. He noted the announcement about Grant Bannister, D.2.a., and added that Grant had reached the final stage in the Truman Scholarship