

## MINUTES

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting**  
December 12, 1995, 3:30p K-State Union Big 8 Room

Members present: Anderson, Aramouni, Baker, Balk, Behnke, Biere, Bissey, Buchholz, Charney, Conrow, Dukas, Dyer, Elkins, Erpelding, Fenton, Foster, Fritz, Gallagher, Glasgow, Gray, Hagmann, Harbstriet, Hamilton, Havlin, Higgins, Hoag, Jardine, Johnson, Kassebaum, Klabunde, Klopfenstein, Kuhlman, Lamond, Legg, Madsen, Maes, May, McCulloh, McMurphy, McNamara, Michie, Miller, Molt, Moxley, Nafziger, Niehoff, Ottenheimer, Pallett, Peterson, Pierzynski, Poresky, Ransom, Reeke, Ross-Murray, Schoning, Shultis, Smit, Stewart, Swanson, Taylor-Archer, Twiss, White Wilson, Woodward, Zschoche

Proxies: Jeff Peterson for Aubrey Abbott, Jeff Peterson for John Potter, Dennis Kuhlman for Pat Murphy, John McCullogh for Sue Zschoche, Mick Charney for Jim Dubois

Visitors: Sheila Hochhauser, Kent Glasscock, Sue Peterson, Charles Reagan, Curtis Kastner

- I. President Havlin called the meeting to order at 3:35p.
- II. Senator Reeck moved approval of the minutes of the November 14, 1995, meeting with two clarifications: Debbie Nuss resigned as Acting President of KSURF, but is still part of the staff, and Ron Trewyn was named as Acting President of the foundation. The motion was seconded and the minutes were approved as amended.
- III. President Havlin introduced Representatives Sheila Hochhauser and Kent Glasscock. Representative Hochhauser outlined her view of what we might expect from the Legislature this year. Her bleak outlook included the expectation that there would be no money available for increases to the universities this year. What they will try to do is provide the Board of Regents institutions more ways to be flexible, by freeing the schools from state purchasing restrictions, by giving the schools more control over the tuition raised (although the details are not yet clear), and perhaps by giving the institutions operating grants based on performance as opposed to relying so heavily on the old funding formulas. In response to a comment, she indicated that the only way taxes would go this year is down.

Representative Glasscock answered an inquiry about the "performance guidelines" for the operating grants by saying the Regents system would be asked to provide them. Senator Hagmann pursued the mentioned \$150 million suit by single taxpayers against the state and was told that losing the case could cost the state some \$60 million a year. Neither representative could predict closely the effect federal tax policy would have on the state's budget, but they agreed it is likely to hurt the state. Medicaid was cited by Representative Hochhauser as an example where proposed federal cuts would be less onerous the first couple of years, but the brunt of the cut would be felt some five years out.

Representative Glasscock answered a question about qualified admissions but suggesting that it is unlikely to pass at present, but may be looked at in the future as a means to control enrollment and hence necessary financing. Senator Michie inquired whether universities could say, for instance, that they would only accept students who had completed the Regents college preparatory curriculum. Representative Glasscock didn't know whether the Regents would accept that idea. Representative Hochhauser commented on a legislative committee which is meeting with the Board of Regents and the state Board of Education to consider such questions.

#### IV. Announcements:

President Havlin introduced Pam Bernardo, the new secretary for Faculty Senate. She can be reached in the Leasure Hall office.

President Havlin described the proposed organization and schedule for the faculty retreat on January 19. It is being arranged in conjunction with the Strategic Planning Committee to discuss the Regents document "Vision 2020".

The session will begin at 9:00a in the Student Union Ball Room with brief reports from sub-committees of the Strategic Planning Committee. An open discussion would ensue for about an hour to an hour and a half after which the group would break out into meetings of CCOPs with the faculty from that college.

Lunch would be provided by President Wefald. Following lunch, participants could go back into small groups or have another large meeting. The CCOP's would go back to work that day or later.

Curtis Kastner, Chair of SPC, explained the necessity for obtaining faculty input as plans are made for the future of the university. He also stressed the importance of having focus and direction in the discussions.

Senators McCulloh and Benson suggested that cross-college discussions would be very useful. Senator Kuhlman said that some college-specific problems would also need to be discussed.

President Havlin agreed that small group discussions and cross-college meetings would be part of the plan.

#### V. Standing Committee Reports

##### A. Academic Affairs - John Johnson

1. Senator Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below) approved by the College of Agriculture, October 19, 1995. The motion was seconded by Senator Harbstreit and approved.

2. Senator Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below) approved by the College of Arts and Sciences, October 12 and November 2, 1995. The motion was seconded by Senator May and approved.
3. Senator Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes (599 and below) approved by the Salina College of Technology, October 12, 1995. The motion was seconded by Senator Shultis and approved.
4. Senator Johnson moved approval of course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Engineering, October 13, 1995. The motion was seconded by Senator Shultis and approved.
5. Senator Johnson moved approval of the General Education courses approved by the committee October 26, November 2, and November 9, 1995. The motion was seconded by Senator Poresky and approved.

Senator Michie called attention to an academic matter. Brian Hesse has been awarded a coveted Marshall Scholarship. She wanted to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Hesse and to publicly congratulate and thank Senator Nancy Twiss for her outstanding work with students applying for these awards. A round of enthusiastic applause supported her remarks.

**B. Faculty Affairs - Gary Pierzynski**

1. Senator Pierzynski moved to remove the amendments to the Faculty Handbook from the table. Senator Kuhlman seconded. The motion was approved.
2. Senator Pierzynski moved to divide the motion to discuss each item separately. Senator Kuhlman seconded. The motion was approved.
3. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of the changes proposed for section C33. Senator Kuhlman seconded.

Senator Pierzynski explained that the revisions resulted from a Faculty Affairs study of how to change the Faculty Handbook to meet the new Board of Regents recommendations on evaluation.

Senator Pallett pointed out that C33 called for multiple data sources for evaluation and believed that it should be paired with C34.2. He moved to amend the motion by identifying C33 as C33.1, moving the proposed last sentence to the beginning of C34.2, and renaming the latter C33.2. Senator Michie seconded. The discussion centered on the relationship of C33 to the various sections of C34 which deal with the evaluation of classroom teaching. The motion to amend failed.

C33 was approved as presented.

4. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C34.2. Senator Kuhlman seconded. The motion passed.
5. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C45.1. Senator Kuhlman seconded.

Senator Gallagher, with the inclusion of several “friendly amendments”, moved to amend “scholarship, teaching, and service” in the first and last sentence to read “research and creative endeavors, teaching, extension, directed service and non-directed service”. The amendment was approved.

The amended version of C45.1 was approved.

6. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C31.5. Senator Stewart seconded.

Senator Pierzynski explained that the sub-committee had discussed academic freedom and alternatives to post-tenure review and agreed that it should be handled at the department level. For that reason they proposed the wording here.

Senator Legg moved to amend by adding the word “overall” in the fourth sentence “a faculty member’s overall performance”. Senator Stewart seconded. The motion to amend was approved.

Senator Michie believes the Faculty Handbook and the AAUP Guidelines provide sufficient protection for the university in cases of low achievement by tenured faculty. She suggested we should simply tell the Regents, “We’re already covered.”

Senator Moxley pointed out the overlap with sections C161.1 and 161.2. Senator Pierzynski noted that “chronic low achievers” are not defined in C161.1. Senator Kassebaum wondered whether we wanted to give “chronic low achievers” five years at the university. Senator Reeck emphasized that tenure does not and should not protect “low achievers”.

Senator Wilson suggested several changes: he would eliminate the sentence where faculty would be drawn into the discussion (sentence 3), would change “can” to “will” in the last sentence, remove the words “at the discretion of” in the last sentence, and cut the number of unsatisfactory evaluations to 3 in any five years. Discussion dealt with this and other matters, but the motion was not amended.

Senator Kuhlman explained that Board of Regents staff and some members had reviewed our Faculty Handbook. They do not think our “incompetence” covers “chronic low achievers”. We need something to satisfy the Regents and the public.

Senator Balk moved to amend C31.5: in line 2, "may" should become "shall". The seventh sentence should be amended to read: "The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards the year following the department head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean." The next sentence should read: "If the faculty member has two successive evaluations or a total of three in any five year period in which minimum standards...." and "will be considered" instead of "can be considered". Senator Nafziger seconded.

Senator Higgins expressed concern that personality conflicts could lead to poor evaluations. Senator Wilson is familiar with a similar policy which has been in effect at the University of Kentucky for ten years. So far, no one has been dismissed, although some faculty have left the university. Senator Legg read from C161.1 that persistent non-compliance with rules and policies of the university is "cause" for dismissal of tenured faculty.

The motion to amend was passed.

The amended motion was passed. (45-yes; 23-no)

7. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C30.3. Senator Kuhlman seconded. The motion passed.

Senator Reeck requested adjournment to later this week because of the late hour and the small number of senators present. President Havlin stated he would not be available.

8. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C46.1. Senator Kuhlman seconded. The motion passed.
9. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C46.4. Senator Kuhlman seconded. The motion passed.
10. Senator Pierzynski moved approval of C34.1. Senator Kuhlman seconded.

Senator Anderson moved to change "should" to "shall" in the sentences "Probationary faculty...shall be rated by students" and "Tenured faculty...shall have". Senator Balk seconded. The motion to amend was approved.

The amended motion was approved.

11. Senator Pierzynski moved acceptance of the Faculty Salary Report. Senator Harbstreet seconded the motion.

Senator Legg wanted to go on record as opposing having the letters of department heads quoted by phrases only. He finds that misleading.

The report was accepted.

Senator Kuhlman moved to defer the remaining business to the January meeting.  
Senator Nafziger seconded the motion. It was passed.

**VI.** The meeting adjourned at 5:45p.

Changes in Faculty Handbook Section C that would address recommendation 1a of the Board of Regents Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation

C34.1 Student ratings of classroom instruction. In most cases documentation submitted by faculty members with teaching responsibilities would be considered incomplete and presumed inadequate, unless evidence of teaching effectiveness is included. Student ratings of classroom instruction are an important source of information in the evaluation of teaching effectiveness, provided that the format includes controls 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 conforms to the guidelines specified above. Probationary faculty with classroom responsibilities shall be rated by students at least once a year in each course that they teach. Tenured faculty with classroom responsibilities shall have at least one course per year evaluated by the students in the course (unless their department or unit has a policy of evaluating more than one course); however, the faculty member may choose which course will be evaluated. Faculty members with classroom teaching responsibilities ought to include the results of student ratings in the documentation they submit for personnel decisions concerning annual merit salary, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Because the number of students engaged in individualized instruction with any one faculty member is typically small, units may decide to evaluate individualized instruction on a two-year cycle, or only when evaluations are available from a minimum number of students. Faculty members engaged in individualized instruction should be guided by the unit's criteria for evaluating such instruction. (See C32.2)

Changes necessary to meet recommendation 7a - provide assistance for faculty renewal and development, define chronic low achievement, and examine dismissal policies to include chronic low achievement, despite all assistance, as an indicator of incompetence. Sections 31.5, 30.3, 46.1 and 46.4

C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement. Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his/her professional duties as defined in the respective unit shall constitute evidence of "professional incompetence" and warrant consideration for "dismissal for cause" under existing university policies. Each department or unit shall develop a set of guidelines describing the minimum acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility for the faculty as well as procedures to handle such cases. It is expected that departmental faculty will have input into any decisions on individual cases, if requested by the faculty member. When a tenured faculty member's overall performance falls below the minimum acceptable level, as indicated by the annual evaluation, the department or unit head shall indicate so in writing to the faculty member. The department head will also indicate in writing a suggested course of action to improve the performance of the faculty member. In subsequent annual evaluations the faculty member will report on activities aimed at improving performance and any evidence of improvement. The names of faculty members who fail to meet minimum standards the year following the Department Head's suggested course of action will be forwarded to the appropriate dean. If the faculty member has two successive evaluations, or a total of three evaluations in any five year period in which minimum standards are not met, then "dismissal for cause" will be considered at the discretion of the appropriate dean.

C30.3 It also is clearly understood that faculty renewal, development and improvement are of critical importance to the University in pursuit of excellence. Each department or unit should develop a means of providing feedback to the individual so that he or she can maintain high levels of performance. Faculty members also have a personal responsibility to maintain or improve performance and are encouraged to participate in professional development activities. The department or unit head, in consultation with the Dean of the College and the Provost shall assist the individual with such improvement activities. Often an agency external to the department or unit can contribute to this process. For example, the Office of Educational Advancement provides independent and confidential help to strengthen teaching, the office of Research and Sponsored Programs assists with efforts to design projects and secure external funding, and the Office of Professional and Organization Development in Extension Systems and Agricultural Research Programs (ESARP) assists in program evaluation and development.



**C46.1 Responsibilities of evaluators.** The unit head will prepare, by January 31, a written evaluation for each regularly appointed (See Note 2) unclassified person. Quantitative ratings may be used to summarize evaluative judgments, but the basis for these judgments must be explained by a narrative account. The evaluation shall provide succinct assessments of effectiveness in performing each responsibility and these statements must include summaries of achievements and evidence which support these assessments. It is the responsibility of the department or unit head to provide written communications regarding specific areas of high or low achievement. (Note 2. Those appointed to regular part-time positions must be evaluated, however. Evaluations are not required for an individual on a term appointment (as defined in C11, even if that appointment will be renewed for another year).)

**C46.4** The department or unit head who prepared the evaluations must submit the following items to the appropriate dean (or, for support units, the appropriate administrator): (See schedule as published by the provost each October.)

- a. A copy of the evaluation system used to prepare the evaluations.
- b. A written evaluation for each regularly appointed unclassified person employed for a least three months during the calendar year. The department or unit head will document areas of high or low achievement relative to the faculty member's responsibilities.
- c. A recommended salary adjustment for each unclassified person that should be based directly on the person's evaluation.
- d. Documentation (e.g., a statement signed by the individual evaluated) establishing that there was an opportunity to examine the written evaluation and to discuss with the evaluator the individual's resulting relative standing for the purpose of merit salary increase in the department or unit.
- e. Any written statements submitted by unclassified individuals of unresolved differences regarding their evaluations.
- f. Any recommendations for salary adjustments on bases outside of the annual evaluation, together with documentation which supports these recommendations.

Changes in Faculty Handbook Section C that would address Board of Regents Recommendations on Faculty Evaluation

**I. Changes necessary to meet recommendation 1b. - Broader & more flexible approaches to evaluation of teaching**

**C33 Multiple data sources for evaluations.**

Professional performance is exceptionally complex and cannot be evaluated adequately based on a single source of information. It is essential that faculty evaluation be based on multiple sources of data for each area evaluated in order to provide various perspectives and to avoid a concentration on narrow performance objectives. Lists of suggested activities and forms of documentation appropriate to the evaluation of the various categories of faculty responsibilities can be found in *"Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure, and Promotion."* Departments or units should be encouraged to develop a comprehensive, flexible approach to teaching evaluation, where several types of evidence can be collected, presented and evaluated as a portfolio.

**C34.2** However, student ratings should never be the only source of information about classroom teaching. Peers, administrators, and other appropriate judges also can offer useful insights about a faculty member's teaching performance. Peer evaluation, defined as a critical review by colleagues knowledgeable of the entire range of teaching activities, can be an important component of the university's teaching evaluation program since peers are often in the best position to interpret and understand the evidence and place it in its proper academic context. Data other than student ratings that provide relevant evidence of teaching effectiveness are described in *"Effective Faculty Evaluation: Annual Salary Adjustment, Tenure and Promotion."* Examples include: course materials such as reading lists, syllabi, and examinations; special contributions to effective teaching for diverse student populations; preparation of innovative teaching materials or instructional techniques; special teaching activities outside the University; exit interviews, and graduate interviews and surveys to obtain information about teaching effectiveness.

**II. Changes necessary to meet recommendation 4 - Objectives for the allocation of faculty time & efforts for purposes of merit evaluation**

**C45.1 Responsibilities of those who are evaluated.**

Each unclassified person will meet annually with the unit or department head to jointly establish personal goals and objectives in research and other creative endeavors, teaching, extension, and directed and nondirected service for the upcoming evaluation period and to discuss their relative importance within the context of the unit's goals. These goals and objectives should reflect the relative percentages of time and effort the person plans to allocate to the appropriate areas in the upcoming period. It is expected that the previous year's statement will be considered during the annual evaluation and goal setting process. It is recognized that the relative emphasis placed on research and other creative endeavors, teaching, extension, and directed and nondirected service may vary over the course of the person's career.