

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

12-3-1991

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 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, December 3, 1991" (1991).  
*Faculty Senate*. 836.  
[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/836](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/836)

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

December 3, 1991

The Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate was called to order in the Trails Room of the Memorial Union on December 3, 1991, at 3:30 p.m. by President Willis Watt.

The following members were present: Dr. Robert Stephenson, Ms. Martha Holmes, Dr. Dale McKemey, Mrs. Joan Rumpel, Mrs. Sharon Barton, Dr. Max Rumpel, Dr. Serjit Kaur-Kasior, Dr. Stephen Shapiro, Dr. Robert Jennings, Dr. Ralph Gamble, Dr. Paul Gatschet, Dr. Pamela Shaffer, Mr. Dewayne Winterlin, Dr. Gary L. Millhollen, Dr. John Zody, Dr. Tom Kerns, Dr. Helmut Schmeller, Mr. Glen McNeil, Mr. Jerry Wilson, Dr. Charles Votaw, Dr. Mohammad Riazi, Dr. Lewis Miller, Dr. Martin Shapiro, Ms. Dianna Koerner, Dr. Mary Hassett, Dr. Roger Pruitt (for Dr. Maurice Witten), Dr. Richard Heil, Dr. Robert Markley, Dr. Kenneth Olson, Dr. Nevell Razak, and Dr. Mike Rettig.

The following members were absent: Dr. Bill Daley, Dr. Michael Slattery, Dr. Fred Britten, Mr. Michael Madden, Mr. Michael Jilg, Mr. Jack Logan, Mr. Herb Zook, Dr. Richard Huguen, and Dr. Maurice Witten.

Also present were Dr. James Murphy, Dr. Ron Sandstrom, Grant Bannister and a representative of the Leader.

The minutes of the November 4, 1991 meeting were approved.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Regents have referred the COCAO Mission Review document, Partnership in Quality, and Aspirations to Achievement for consideration to a committee chaired by Regent Creighton. Dr. Murphy added that this committee will meet on December 9, early enough, it is hoped, to allow each university to respond to any compromise proposal.
2. President Watt has received the University of Kansas response to the "Stewardship" document written by Regent Sampson. This document was sent to all senators; President Watt would appreciate comments.
3. All initiatives listed on the agenda, D. 1. 1, will be discussed between the Regents and the State Legislature.
4. A change to D.2.b. of the FHSU-level announcements is the resignation of Mr. Drew Irwin as Student Liaison to the External Affairs Committee.

## STANDING COMMITTEE REPORTS

1. Academic Affairs. No report.

2. Bylaws/Standing Rules. No report.

President Watt has asked this committee to compare the revised Faculty Handbook which has been placed on the computer with the former hard copy.

3. External Affairs. No report.

4. Student Affairs. Presented by Dr. Stephenson.

The committee chose 62 students to submit for inclusion in Who's Who Among American University and College Students.

5. University Affairs. No report.

Dianna Koerner, Chair, indicated that the names of Dr. Ralph Gamble, Mr. Michael Jilg, and Dr. Mike Rettig should be included on the membership of the University Affairs Committee.

## OLD BUSINESS

President Watt distributed the most recent draft of the FHSU Mission Statement (attached at end of minutes). He has found some areas where change could be made; if any senators wish to comment, please contact President Watt or Dr. Murphy by noon on December 10. The Steering Committee will discuss the Mission Statement on December 10. The Deans drafted the original draft.

President Watt stated that Appendix 0 is now Chapter 3 of the new Faculty Handbook.

Dr. Markley continued the discussion of Appendix 0 (Draft document 12/02/91). Two issues -- to create parallel procedures for tenure and promotion reviews and to eliminate the University Unclassified Personnel Appeals Committee -- are the only items left to consider.

Dr. Markley referred the senators to the last page of Draft document 12/02/91 on which three different tenure and promotion processes were outlined. Column One represents the procedures already in place; Column Two, the system proposed in the revised Appendix 0, and Column Three, an alternative proposed by Dr. Markley.

Dr. Shaffer asked that Dr. Markley summarize the advantages of his proposal. The advantages are 1) that there are fewer steps, 2) that the Provost and Deans become members of their respective committees, each having only one vote on the committee and not also having an independent vote, and 3) that this proposal would create official power for the committees since they would have stronger voices in

decisions. Of course, all committees are advisory to the President.

Dr. Gamble asked whether a tenure or promotion application goes on to the Regents if the President rejects it; in some organizations a disapproved application moves on to the next level. According to the proposed Appendix 0, disapproved applications go to the President, but Dr. Gamble pointed out that Appendix 0 does not mention any review beyond the presidential level. Dr. Markley answered that disapproved applications and even approved applications are not sent forward to the Regents. Dr. Murphy asked if the faculty would want the Regents to scrutinize their applications.

Dr. Gatschet wondered if anyone had asked the Provost and Deans what they think about Dr. Markley's proposal. Dr. Murphy expressed concern that there would be no independent input from administrators in this proposal and that the appeal process at the University level would be eliminated. He pointed out that the university-level appeal was initiated because the Regents legal staff had recommended it.

Dr. Heil asked for justification of the additional committees which would be added in the Column Two proposal. Dr. Markley stated that in regard to the University Promotion Committee, the rationale seems to be that if the University Tenure Committee is a worthwhile committee, then a University Promotion Committee should be a worthwhile committee also. In regard to the College Tenure Committees, Dr. Markley pointed out that there are already de facto College Tenure Committees which have no official status; the revised system would give them official recognition.

Dr. Pruitt asked whether there were limits or numbers on tenure and promotion for each of the colleges. Dr. Markley answered that there are no limits mentioned in the Regents' Policy Manual. Dr. Murphy concurred and pointed out that the only limit is at the entry level when the university decides who will be placed on tenure track.

The question was asked: "Is it rationale to have a University Tenure Committee but College Promotion Committees?" Dr. Markley commented that he had heard that tenure was a university decision and promotion, a college decision; therefore, in the past there has been a University Tenure Committee and College Promotion Committees.

Dr. Rumpel called the question and asked for a vote on current status -- Column Two. It was pointed out that there must be a vote on closure to stop debate, to move the previous question, which requires a two-thirds vote. The vote was 15 affirmative and 6 negative votes which did not meet the two-thirds requirement.

Dr. Votaw moved the deletion of the university committees in both the tenure and promotion structures; the college decisions would go directly to the Provost from the Deans. Dr. Miller and Dr. Gatschet asked about due process. Ms. Koerner asked if the faculty would lose any protection by not having a University Tenure Committee. Dr. Gatschet remarked that under a former Vice President for Academic Affairs some colleges received more tenured positions; the University

Tenure Committee was created to control the distribution of tenured positions. Dr. Murphy pointed out that the University Tenure Committee was longstanding to provide consistency and equity of evaluation and that the Regents legal staff wanted an all-university review.

Dr. Votaw made the motion to cut out the university step of the process because most consideration of tenure and promotion should be at the college level. Dr. Jennings was reluctant to see the faculty surrender any involvement in the process. The motion was defeated.

Dr. Markley proposed a motion to delete the college committees but to maintain the university committees. Ms. Koerner stated that the college committee had been helpful to her in solidifying her application before it moved on to the University level. Dr. Rumpel mentioned that the Dean could still have an advisory committee. Dr. Heil pointed out that one dean might have an advisory committee and another dean would not; would this be fair to faculty? Dr. Martin Shapiro added that faculty would possibly have no opportunity to appeal decisions of such an advisory committee. The motion was defeated.

Dr. Heil made the motion to approve Column Two except to eliminate the University Promotion Committee in Column Two and to retain the University Tenure Committee, in other words to eliminate steps #10 and #11 on back page of Column Two. The motion passed unanimously.

Other items in revised Appendix 0 which were discussed included the intent of the weighting scale, grammar, and style. Dr. Jennings suggested that attention should be drawn for the Provost and the President to the fact that the percentages outlined in Appendix 0 are weighting of duties for merit, tenure, and promotion evaluation and not for pay decisions and that the percentages are open to negotiation with the chair and dean. According to the original discussions of the percentages, each faculty member could negotiate the percentages to be applied to teaching, scholarly activities, and service; these percentages would vary for each faculty. Teaching activities were assigned no less than 60% for merit evaluation but could be given more than 60%. Dr. Jennings recommended that if this revision is approved, the Faculty Senate attach a statement to the effect that the percentages are for merit and not for pay.

Dr. Hassett believes that the Faculty Senate had recommended insertion of the word "international" in the parenthetical section of line 57 on page 9, item 11e since the university is emphasizing an international focus. This recommendation will be added.

Dr. Shaffer commented that the second sentence on page 1, Part I, lines 36-38, was poorly written. Dr. Markley stated that the intent had been to parallel the existing mission statement of the university. Dr. Gatschet moved that the word "should" be deleted and the word "to" be added in place of "should." The motion passed unanimously.

Dr. Shaffer stated that on page 1, Part IIA, line 59, the word "its" should be substituted for the word "their." All senators agreed.

Dr. Hassett moved that the Faculty Senate accept the revised Appendix 0; Mr. McNeil seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Another topic of old business was a report by Dr. Ron Sandstrom on the work of the Ad-hoc Committee on Curriculum Review.

In September 1990 Dr. Robert Markley, then president of Faculty Senate, appointed a committee of faculty to review the graduation requirements of Fort Hays State University; the committee was directed to report in May 1991. In May, Dr. Sandstrom indicated that there would be a document in Fall, 1991. The committee has not yet reported for two reasons: the unexpected resignation of the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the ongoing negotiation with the deans on the rough draft. Dr. Sandstrom hopes to present a report in early Spring.

Dr. Murphy stated that the committee's delay had placed him in a difficult position because he needs to move ahead to a review of major programs outlined in Phase Two of the President's charge. Dr. Murphy said that if he did not receive a document, he would take the question of revised graduation requirements to the faculty as a whole.

President Watt said that the Executive Committee and Dr. Sandstrom hoped to provide a document by January 13; Dr. Watt hopes to give Dr. Murphy a copy by mid-January. Dr. Watt stated that the document was important and should not be rushed; he asked for patience. Dr. Markley questioned why the department reviews of major programs could not begin before any substantive changes are finalized.

Dr. Murphy commented that the review of graduation requirements was the most important document the faculty has worked on in the last ten years and perhaps the Faculty Senate should meet more than once in January to discuss the Ad-hoc Committee's report. Dr. Murphy acknowledged that perhaps Phase Two could begin before Phase One was approved by the President.

#### NEW BUSINESS

New business was discussion of the deadline for Fall, 1991, grades. Dr. Murphy is attempting to provide students with their fall grade reports before Christmas. He suggested that the deadline for turning in grades remain Monday, December 23, at 10:30 a.m. but that the Registrar's Office be open on Saturday, December 21, to take grades from faculty. Dr. Murphy asked what hours would be best; afternoon hours were recommended. The hours, 2-4 p.m., were approved.

President Watt will send a short memo to the faculty requesting that grades be turned in early if possible, by or on Saturday, December 21, between 2-4 p.m.

#### LIAISON REPORTS

Dr. Votaw stated that the Classified senators were just concerned about getting the grades in.

The only report was presented by Dr. Kaur-Kasior, substituting for Dr. Stephen Shapiro at the Student Government Association. She said that the students had discussed the number of absences they could have for a course. The students seem to believe that there is an official policy. Dr. Miller commented that there was no official policy; there are no official excuses for absences. President Watt pointed out that each faculty member may establish their own policy.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Martha Holmes, Secretary  
Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate

DRAFT  
11/22/91

#### FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT

Fort Hays State University, a regional university principally serving western Kansas, is dedicated to providing instruction within a computerized environment in the arts and sciences, business, education, the health and life sciences and agriculture. The university's primary emphasis is an undergraduate liberal education which includes the humanities, the fine arts, the social/behavioral sciences, and the natural/physical sciences. These disciplines serve as the foundation of all programs, preparing graduates for entry into graduate school; for employment requiring well-developed analytical and communications skills; and for the complexities of the 21st century.

Natural outgrowths of this commitment are the pre-professional, professional, master's, and education-specialist programs. A statewide strategic orientation of the university is the integration of computer and telecommunications technology to the educational environment and the work place.

Scholarly research and creativity at FHSU constitute immeasurable assets for stimulating faculty and students, discovering new knowledge, connecting the disciplines, and building bridges between

teaching and learning. Scholarship in the university's professional colleges links theory with practice and addresses the needs of society.

The university is responsible for providing public service to the community, the region, the state of Kansas. This includes programs consistent with the university's academic and research activities as well as emphasizing the importance of FHSU as the cultural center of western Kansas.