

## MINUTES

### KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

June 13, 1995 3:30 p.m. K-State Union Little Theatre

Members Present: Abbott, Balk, Benson, Biere, Buchholz, Charney, Chastain, Conrow, Erpelding, Foster, Fritz, Gallagher, Hagmann, Hassan, Havlin, Higgins, Jardine, Johnson, Kassebaum, Klopfenstein, Lamond, Legg, Martin, May, McCulloh, McMurphy, Moeller, Mohr, Moxley, Nafziger, Niehoff, Peak, Poresky, Ransom, Ross, Schoning, Smit, Stewart, Swanson, Taylor-Archer, Twiss, Verschelden, Wright.

Proxies: Twiss for Ottenheimer, Buchholz for Kuhlman, Chastain for Maes, Moeller for Pallett, Steward for White.

- I. The meeting was called to order at 3:38 p.m. in the Little Theatre.
- II. Senator Benson moved for approval of the minutes of May 9, 1995. Senator Verschelden seconded the motion. It was noted that Senator Poresky's name was misspelled.
- III. Announcements
  - A. In addition to the announcements seen in the Executive Committee minutes for May 22, 1995, President Havlin indicated that there is a search underway for a parliamentarian, the secretary is out today, the next Faculty Senate meeting is August 22, and there is no meeting in July.
  - B. Havlin reported that Sandra Wood, professional secretary, is leaving the university and he indicated the search process for a replacement was initiated this morning. He anticipates it will take two to three weeks.
  - C. Havlin asked if there were any questions regarding the text of the attached announcement and there were none.
- IV. Reports from Standing Committees
  - A. Academic Affairs - Johnson
    1. Senator Johnson indicated that he would like to amend the agenda to include course and curriculum changes (599 and below, with the exception of General Education Courses) approved by the College of Human Ecology, December 9, 1994. No one dissented. Johnson then moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below, with the exception of General Education courses approved by the College of Human Ecology, December 9, 1994. Senator Balk seconded the motion. The motion passed.
    2. Senator Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below, with the exception of General Education courses) approved by the college of Human Ecology, March 10, 1995. May seconded the motion. The motion passed.

3. Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below, with the exception of General Education courses) approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, April 20, 1995. Senator May seconded the motion. The motion passed.
4. Senator Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below, with the exception of General Education courses) approved by the College of Technology, Salina, March 9, 1995. Senator Hassan seconded the motion. The motion passed.
5. Senator Johnson moved approval course and curriculum changes (599 and below, with the exception of General Education courses) approved by the College of Human Ecology, May 12, 1995. Senator Ransom seconded the motion. The motion passed.
6. Johnson reminded Senate members that at the last meeting, a request for a listing of General Education courses similar to the procedure followed for Graduate Courses should be included with the agenda. To meet that request, the courses were tabled from consideration until today. Johnson moved approval of General Education courses approved by the General Education Task Force, April 20, 1995, with the exception of ART 196 Art History II. May seconded the motion. The motion passed.

Add:

AGRON 335	Environmental Quality
ART 100	Design I
ART 190	Drawing I
ART 560	Art for the Exceptional Individual
ECON 110	Principles of Macroeconomics
ECON 120	Principles of Microeconomics
ECON 507	The Japanese Economy
ECON 527	Environmental Economics
ECON 636	Comparative Economics
GEOG 220	Environmental Geography I
GEOG 221	Environmental Geography II
GEOG 300	Geography of Tourism
GEOG 350	Introduction to Climatology
MUSIC 250	Introduction to Music
MUSIC 420	History of Jazz
MUSIC 424	Jazz in Kansas City and the Southwest
PSYCH 202	Drugs and Behavior
PSYCH 280	Childhood and Adolescence
STAT 320	Elements of Statistics
STAT 330	Elementary Statistics for the Social Sciences
STAT 340	Biometrics
STAT 350	Business and Economic Statistics
SOCIO 533	Rural Society
SOCIO 665	Women and Crime
SOCIO 580	Women's Perspective on Peace and War
SPCH 311	Business and Professional Speaking
SPCH 526	Persuasion
THTRE 270	Introduction to Theater

AS&I 201 History and Attitudes of Animal Use

Senator Poresky asked for clarification of the terminology "add," as the courses already exist. Johnson replied that it means added to the list of courses approved for meeting general education requirements, not as "add a new course," as so far the general education proposals have been revisions of already existing courses. Senators Balk and McCulloh confirmed this.

7. In addition to the courses in question at the last meeting, Johnson moved for approval of General Education courses approved by the General Education Task Force, March 30, 1995 and April 8, 1995. Senator May seconded the motion. The motion passed.

ADD:

MATH 160 Introduction to Contemporary Math

ADD:

MUSIC 160 Music Listening Lab

MUSIC 245 Introduction to American Music

MUSIC 100 Music Fundamentals

8. Senator Johnson reminded the Senators that Academic Affairs brought the Academic Fresh Start policy to Senate earlier this session and that the policy could be beneficial and should undergo further consideration to meet the approval of associate deans and the registrar's office to ensure that it can be implemented. Johnson indicated the subcommittee assigned to the revision determined the attached policy was worth considering. Johnson moved approval of the Academic Fresh Start policy as documented in the agenda. Senator Mohr seconded the motion. Comments about the policy include:

Reference II. 2. Will a student with more than three semesters behind him/her benefit? Senator Foster responded, yes, they will benefit, as the application is made at the end of semester after successful completion of the first 12 hours since readmission. Then, up to three semesters of grades can be stricken. The semesters in their entirety must be stricken and they must be consecutive.

Reference application to graduate schools. Will the final grade of 4.0 be useable or will a GPA of 1.78 from 1972 still count? Foster responded that it is in the best interest of the student to utilize the 4.0 for applications, however, our professional school indicates that regardless of what an applicant reports, they still recalculate the GPA to meet their own criteria. He noted that the grade would still be on the transcript, but not reflected in the cumulative GPA.

Senator Moxley moved to amend I. section 2 to clarify when the 2.5 GPA requirement goes into effect. She moved to amend by inserting "since readmission" directly following 2.5 GPA. Senator Legg said that striking the word "cumulative" would make the entire statement clearer. Verschelden countered that the 12 hours could, for example, be taken over a three-semester time frame. Therefore, the GPA would be cumulative. Verschelden acknowledged this creates problems, when, for instance a student reaches the first 12 credit hours while enrolled in 20 hours. Poresky moved to delete the word "cumulative." Legg seconded the motion. The motion passed. Senator Conrow indicated that the

amendment did not clear up the confusion. Verschelden concurred. Biere then suggested amending the amended sentence by striking "upon completion....in which" and substitute the preposition "on," and add the phrase "or more" after 12 credit hours.

The motion was seconded. Havlin asked if this amendment solved Senator Moxley's concerns. Moxley retired to Senator Foster who indicated that the 2.5 GPA has to occur at the end of an academic session. Biere indicated that his concerns parallel Verschelden's in that the policy statement did not make sense until this discussion was underway and he's concerned those who want to utilize the policy will be just as confused.

Biere moved to refer the document back to committee for further review to tighten up the interpretation.

Havlin suggested that further discussion end until all Senators have an opportunity to read the proposed policy more carefully.

Martin referenced section II. item 2 and asked what was the thinking behind 1, 2 or 3 academic sessions in calculating GPA? Poresky indicated his interpretation meant only up to last three sessions. McCulloh responded that actually, it means a student can wipe out a minimum of one semester up to a maximum of three semesters. Biere indicated it would be more appropriate for that to be stated in the preamble.

Nafziger reminded the Senate members that the motion is to move the item back to committee. Ransom seconded the motion to return the proposed policy to committee for further revision.

Johnson pointed out that the order of the pages is confusing and that the rationale should have preceded the policy. Poresky added that the committee should examine the effect the policy will have on departments which require a 2.75 GPA. Verschelden indicated that a department can make decisions separate of this policy and perhaps the policy should include such a statement.

McCulloh asked if there were any more suggestions.

Verschelden said the policy does not preclude a department's decision on GPA. Poresky said the intent is clear, but for education majors this policy could be misleading as the student does not qualify for readmittance to the program with only a 2.5. Verschelden said that is at the discretion of the college. Martin expressed concern about the GPA and courses required for graduation. McCulloh said the courses meeting program requirements will appear on the transcript and the grade will appear. However, given the date that the Academic Fresh Start Policy goes into effect, that is the date at which the GPA is recalculated.

Biere responded that he did not see any benefit from the fresh start. McCulloh said that this policy is intended to assist students who did poorly, left for at least five years and are back; after some maturing and will likely do better. The current policy encourages these students to go elsewhere where their credits will transfer without grades. For example,

transfer students who come here are awarded credit for their courses elsewhere, yet the grades do not transfer. Otherwise, we are telling these student to go someplace else.

Martin asked how will this policy affect KSU GPA perception by other universities. Johnson responded that a large number of universities already have similar programs in place. May pointed out that Academic Fresh Start doesn't involve large numbers of students and only a small group would benefit. Poresky then asked why not wipe out all semesters? Johnson said the reason for selecting up to three semester and for a five-year wait is that other universities have as much as a seven-year wait and as little as three years. According to Johnson, this was recommended by the subcommittee. Foster indicated that most problems encountered by undergraduates occur during the freshman year and that Academic Fresh Start is intended to overcome that. Verschelden pointed out that under current KSU policy, a student doing poorly would not have more than six semesters of grades anyway.

Havlin said that if there are other concerns, to bring them to the attention of Academic Affairs. He then called for a voice vote.

The motion to refer back to committee carried with some dissent.

Biere voiced his concern that student could qualify for academic honors. Verschelden said we offer that opportunity to students who transfer from KU. Beire said that just the courses transfer in and we don't see the student at that point, whereas, a KSU student received warnings and a dismissal that caused problems. Johnson indicated that this then penalizes the students with whom we're familiar, while they could transfer to another school, get the credits transferred and earn academic honors there. Benson concurred with Johnson and provided a recent example of a student who in the beginning of his course was doing poorly, earning a D on the first exam. However, by mid-semester he had worked hard enough to earn A's on the remaining exams. He indicated the student's final grade was an A. In addition, he said that he has worked with grad students who did not do well as undergraduates. However, as non-traditional graduate students they are exceptional. Benson reasoned, shouldn't the student be judged at the end of the academic experience and not penalized for a bad start. Martin said that based on that philosophy, anyone can start rough and end up strong. Conrow indicated that what's important about Legg's observation is that students get credit for required courses even with a D. Conrow said that perhaps we could neutralize the problem by requiring retakes of required courses with a grade of D. Benson said that this solution is agreeable even for distributional requirements. Havlin said that these concerns are all substantive and that perhaps Academic Affairs could bring the policy back this October.

Klopfenstein indicated that before the committee reconsiders the policy, she is concerned that the overwhelming sentiment at today's meeting is that perhaps the policy, even with the additional changes, will not be acceptable to Senate members. That being the case, she asked for a straw vote to determine if Academic Fresh Start is what KSU needs or not. Klopfenstein further indicated that some members expressed a fundamental opposition to the concept of Academic Fresh Start and if that's the case, then the policy should not go back to committee for reconsideration. Havlin called for a show of hands.

The majority of the Senate members voted in favor of implementing some form of the policy.

9. Johnson indicated that the Approval, Routing and Notification Policy will go back to a subcommittee and that he anticipates that revisions will be brought forward in early fall.
10. Johnson announced that Senator Harbstreit is chair-elect of Academic Affairs.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee

1. Havlin asked if anyone on the committee would like to present a report. Senator Niehoff indicated that there was not a quorum at the last meeting. Havlin announced that a chair had not yet been selected, however, that Pierzynski and Rahman will serve as either chair or chair-elect.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning

1. Senator Ransom indicated that there is no report as the committee does not meet in the summer.

V. Old Business

- A. Havlin indicated that the Chronic Underachievers Task Force has submitted a report, which recommends changes to the faculty handbook. The changes will come to Senate in early fall. To bring the newly elected senators up to speed, he gave a brief history of the Board of Regents policy for underachievers passed this past spring and he read from their March 16, 1995 recommendations. The recommendations are attached for senators as Senator Nafziger requested. (See Attachment A)

Havlin also reported that in the past three years no KSU faculty have received less than a 1% pay raise for three consecutive years. The numbers are not yet available for the other five regents schools, however, when they are, Havlin promised to share them.

- B. Senator Benson raised the issue of professional notetakers and how recent concern has been over only intellectual property rights. He indicate that notetaking is a valuable skill, and professional notetakers take away from the development of this skill, additionally he's concerned about the quality of the notes. He indicated that he's seen three of the jobs and the notes are riddled with errors. He's concerned that the notes are faulty and therefore a defective product.

Verschelden said she was updated via her interactions with a student group of which she is faculty sponsor. The group wanted to contribute a sum of money to the note taking business to enable the business to distribute flyers on campus announcing the service. Verschelden met with the business manager who indicated that professors' permission will be sought, however, if the professor says no, the notetaker will come anyway, which is evidence of no scruples.

Martin said she had learned that an attempt to ask for permission was all she was assured. Martin also requested a copy of the notes prepared for her class. She indicated the quality was poor,

particularly riddled with errors in mathematical symbols and equations. Martin said she believed that the paid notetaker could be asked to leave the classroom at the professor's discretion as the notetaker presumably is not a student and has not enrolled in the class.

Havlin indicated that a letter from University Attorney Seaton was released and that Academic Affairs could study the issue further. Senator Legg said the letter from Seaton should be available through department heads.

VI. New Business

- A. Havlin indicated that information about the tentative FY97 budget is available. He also indicated that he had several of the proposed plans under Board of Regents consideration at hand. He said that Tom Rawson assured him that KSU will not experience a deficit as KU has, however, to anticipate some cuts in faculty positions in order to maintain current levels of support.
- B. Havlin also indicated that he is keeping a close watch on HB25.53 (Kansas Commission on Post Secondary Education) which will effect the future of higher education in Kansas.

VII. Senator Balk moved for adjournment. Benson seconded the motion. The meeting ended at 4:40 p.m.



# KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS

700 SW HARRISON • SUITE 1410 • TOPEKA, KS 66603-3760

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION - 913 296-3421 • STUDENT ASSISTANCE - 913 296-3517 • FAX 913 296-0983

March 23, 1995

RECEIVED

MAR 27 1995

MEMORANDUM

PRESIDENTS OFFICE

TO: Members, Council of Presidents

FROM: Stephen M. Jordan *SMJ*  
Executive Director

RE: Faculty Evaluation Recommendations

At the March 16, 1995 Board meeting, the Board of Regents acted on the one remaining recommendation pertaining to faculty evaluation. The recommendations adopted in December 1994 and March 1995 supplement recommendations adopted in April 1992. I have attached copies of the recommendations the Board expects to be implemented in this important area of our accountability to the public. Please note that the Board expects a report on the implementation of these recommendations in May 1996. I have also enclosed a draft of the student perceptions of instruction survey instrument the Board endorsed in March. The Councils should react to this draft prior to the Board's consideration of it in May. Once it is adopted, each institution will need to develop a plan to implement it in the 1995-1996 academic year.

SMJ:sef

enc

cc: Members, Kansas Board of Regents  
Members, Council of Chief Academic Officers  
Members, Council of Faculty Senate Presidents



## FACULTY EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1a. Teaching faculty should be rated by students at least once a year, on a form that is controlled for student motivation and other possible bias. The form should contain directions which indicate how the information is used, and the forms should be administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure students' anonymity. Each academic unit should determine the student rating form to be used by its faculty that conform to the above guidelines.
- 1b. Multiple sources of information should be gathered to evaluate teaching. Sources of information might include the content of the course, its design and presentation. For example, (a) syllabi, examinations and samples of graded exams, textbooks, etc. might be evaluated by peers for their suitability and coherence, (b) videos of class presentations might be viewed by peers or the department chair to evaluate presentation of material, etc.

Units should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive, flexible approach to teaching evaluation that includes several types of evidence that can be collected, presented and evaluated as a Portfolio. Student ratings of teaching should be an important part of this Portfolio; they are nevertheless only one part. Peer evaluation, defined as a comprehensive, critical review by knowledgeable colleagues of each faculty member's entire range of teaching activities, should be the foundation of the university's teaching evaluation program. No single source of information, including ratings by students, should be taken at face value, but rather should be interpreted by those peers who are in the best position to understand this evidence and to place it in the appropriate academic context. Departments should be encouraged to use additional tools such as exit interviews and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness.

- 2a. All department chairs should participate in the evaluation of faculty and meet with faculty individually as needed to discuss the evaluation. Institutions should enhance opportunities for the preparation of department chairs for work in departmental administration, particularly as that relates to the evaluation of faculty and the allocation of faculty effort as in (4).
- 2b. At the beginning of each academic year, representatives from Student Governance on each campus should have the opportunity to meet with campus representatives from Academic Affairs or their designees to discuss the operation of student ratings of teaching. Ratings of individual faculty are not an appropriate subject in such discussions.

3. Instruments to measure student ratings of instruction should solicit, at a minimum, student perspectives on (a) the delivery of instruction, (b) the assessment of learning, (c) the availability of the faculty members to students, and (d) whether the goals and objectives of the course were met. Printed directions on the rating scale should indicate that the information will be used by the individual faculty member to improve his/her instruction. The department, college and university will also use the information to enhance teaching effectiveness. The forms should be determined, administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure student anonymity, as indicated in Recommendations 1a and 1b.
4. Based upon institutional and departmental goals, tenured and tenure track faculty should meet with their department chair individually to allocate the amount of effort the faculty member will devote to teaching, research and service. A reduction of effort in one area should be made up by augmentation in another. Merit evaluation of faculty should follow this agreement. These agreements should reflect varying emphases at different times within a faculty member's career. Teaching should be evaluated as rigorously as research.
5. All campuses should insure that each school/college develops a plan to financially recognize faculty who are promoted.
6. In FY 1995, data should be provided on the number and percentage of faculty who received 0% to 1% for the past three consecutive years, and the percentage of all faculty who received a 0% and 1% raise in each of the three past years. This information must be viewed in the context of the total dollars available for merit raises; therefore, the amount of General Fund increase for merit raises should also be given for each of the past three years.
- 7a. Each campus should i) provide assistance for faculty renewal and development, ii) define chronic low performance, and iii) examine dismissal policies to include chronic low performance, *despite all assistance*, as an indicator of incompetence.
- 7b. Each institution should provide information to the Board on efforts to improve teaching.

The Board will distribute with student ratings scales a one-page survey of student perceptions of instruction. The survey will be collected separately from the student ratings scales used in the evaluation of faculty. The survey will be used to demonstrate student attitudes toward instruction at the Regents universities.

The Regents universities should provide the Board with a report by June 1996 on the implementation of the recommendations adopted in December 1994 and March 1995.

ADOPTED BY THE KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS, MARCH 16, 1995.

## FACULTY EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

1a. Teaching faculty should be rated by students at least once a year, on a form that is controlled for student motivation and other possible bias. The form should contain directions which indicate how the information is used, and the forms should be administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure students' anonymity. Each academic unit should determine the student rating form to be used by its faculty that conform to the above guidelines.

1b. Multiple sources of information should be gathered to evaluate teaching. Sources of information might include the content of the course, its design and presentation. For example, (a) syllabi, examinations and samples of graded exams, textbooks, etc. might be evaluated by peers for their suitability and coherence, (b) videos of class presentations might be viewed by peers or the department chair to evaluate presentation of material, etc.

Units should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive, flexible approach to teaching evaluation that includes several types of evidence that can be collected, presented and evaluated as a Portfolio. Student ratings of teaching should be an important part of this Portfolio; they are nevertheless only one part. Peer evaluation, defined as a comprehensive, critical review by knowledgeable colleagues of each faculty member's entire range of teaching activities, should be the foundation of the university's teaching evaluation program. No single source of information, including ratings by students, should be taken at face value, but rather should be interpreted by those peers who are in the best position to understand this evidence and to place it in the appropriate academic context. Departments should be encouraged to use additional tools such as exit interviews and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness.

2a. All department chairs should participate in the evaluation of faculty and meet with faculty individually as needed to discuss the evaluation. Institutions should enhance opportunities for the preparation of department chairs for work in departmental administration, particularly as that relates to the evaluation of faculty and the allocation of faculty effort as in (4).

2b. At the beginning of each academic year, representatives from Student Governance on each campus should have the opportunity to meet with campus representatives from Academic Affairs or their designees to discuss the operation of student ratings of teaching. Ratings of individual faculty are not an appropriate subject in such discussions.

3. Instruments to measure student ratings of instruction should solicit, at a minimum, student perspectives on (a) the delivery of instruction, (b) the assessment of learning, (c) the availability of the faculty members to students, and (d) whether the goals and objectives of the course were met. Printed directions on the rating scale should indicate that the information will be used by the individual faculty member to improve his/her instruction. The department, college and university will also use the information to enhance teaching effectiveness. The forms should be determined, administered and collected under controlled conditions that assure student anonymity, as indicated in Recommendations 1a and 1b.
4. Based upon institutional and departmental goals, tenured and tenure track faculty should meet with their department chair individually to allocate the amount of effort the faculty member will devote to teaching, research and service. A reduction of effort in one area should be made up by augmentation in another. Merit evaluation of faculty should follow this agreement. These agreements should reflect varying emphases at different times within a faculty member's career. Teaching should be evaluated as rigorously as research.
5. All campuses should insure that each school/college develops a plan to financially recognize faculty who are promoted.
6. In FY 1995, data should be provided on the number and percentage of faculty who received 0% to 1% for the past three consecutive years, and the percentage of all faculty who received a 0% and 1% raise in each of the three past years. This information must be viewed in the context of the total dollars available for merit raises; therefore, the amount of General Fund increase for merit raises should also be given for each of the past three years.
- 7a. Each campus should i) provide assistance for faculty renewal and development, ii) define chronic low performance, and iii) examine dismissal policies to include chronic low performance, *despite all assistance*, as an indicator of incompetence.
- 7b. Each institution should provide information to the Board on efforts to improve teaching.

The Board will distribute with student ratings scales a one-page survey of student perceptions of instruction. The survey will be collected separately from the student ratings scales used in the evaluation of faculty. The survey will be used to demonstrate student attitudes toward instruction at the Regents universities.

The Regents universities should provide the Board with a report by June 1996 on the implementation of the recommendations adopted in December 1994 and March 1995.

**ADOPTED BY THE KANSAS BOARD OF REGENTS, MARCH 16, 1995.**