

Minutes
Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting
December 10, 1996 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union

Present: Anderson, Aramouni, Atkinson, Baker, Balk, Behnke, Benson, Bissey, Brigham, Bussing, Charney, Conrow, Deger, Dyer, Elkins, Exdell, Fenton, Feyerharm, Foster, Glasgow, Gould, Gray, Hagmann, Hamilton, Hansen, Harbstreit, Hassan, J. Johnson, N. Johnson, Jones, Kassebaum, Klopfenstein, Krstic, Laughlin, LeBoeuf, Legg, Martin, May, McCulloh, McNamara, Michie, Miller, Moeller, Molt, Mosier, Niehoff, Ottenheimer, Pallett, Pierzynski, Rahman, Reeck, Shultis, Smit, Smith, Stewart, Taylor-Archer, White, Woodward, Wright

Absent: Abbott, Aslin, Barkley, Briggs, Chastain, Clegg, DeBowes, Fingland, Fjell, Fritz, Higgins, Hoag, Kuhlman, Mathews, Oukrop, Raub, Ross, Royse, Schroder, Swanson, Wilson

Proxies: Buchholz, Lamond, Maes, Peak, Poresky, Ross-Murray, Zschoche

Guest: Nancy Goulden

- I. President Balk called the meeting to order at 3:34 PM.
- II. The minutes of the November 12, 1996, meeting were approved with the correction in V. A. 1 that the College of Business Administration approved their Course and Curriculum changes on September 26, 1996.
- III. Announcements
 - A. The Chief Academic Officers of the Big 12 Universities, plus the Faculty Senate Presidents from each school, met in Dallas, Texas, on December 1-2, 1996. The Chief Academic Officers proposed to begin a faculty exchange program to be called the Big 12 Faculty Fellows Program. A faculty member from any Big 12 university may make arrangements to spend up to two weeks at any other Big 12 university. At least six fellowships will be permitted annually per institution. Unless the total number of fellows from KSU exceeds six, no more than two fellows any calendar year may come from a single college. The sending institution will provide up to \$2,500 per faculty member selected to be a Big 12 Faculty Fellow. Host institutions will provide the visiting fellows office space, library privileges, and introductions to students and faculty. The fellowship program begins February 1, 1997.

At KSU a selection committee comprised of faculty members and a dean will be established. The Faculty Senate President will nominate a pool of faculty from which the Provost will choose six to serve. The Provost will nominate the Dean. Membership on the committee will last one year. No one may serve two consecutive terms.

The protocol for the selection of KSU Big 12 Faculty Fellows will include the following:

- (1) the faculty member will develop a brief proposal of what he/she wants to do;
- (2) the faculty member will provide a letter of invitation from the host university;
- (3) the faculty member will have letters of support from the unit head and from the dean. The selection committee will develop criteria to determine which fellowship proposals to select.

Senator Reeck expressed his concern that limits on the number of faculty from a college who could participate each year could affect faculty from large colleges adversely. He also expressed concern over the choice of the term "fellow" to designate a participant in this program, noting the term is insensitive to female faculty.

- B. Regent Phyllis Nolan and Regent William Docking, KSU Administrative leaders, and faculty nominated by the Faculty Senate President will participate in a discussion of institution-specific indicators of performance. The meeting will occur on the K-State campus in February. Along with other Regents institutions, KSU must provide the Board of Regents in April a written document on its institution-specific indicators of performance. The impetus for this meeting came from Jon Wefald's impassioned and articulate testimony before the Board at its November meeting that the use of descriptive statistics (e.g., percentages) to report such outcomes as four year graduation rates of all the Regents schools was misleading and failed to capture the differences between the universities in the Regents system.
- C. On Wednesday, December 4, the Legislative Educational Planning Committee held hearings on faculty evaluation and tenure and invited a five member panel to present information. Panel members were Phyllis Nolan, Chair of the BOR; James Coffman, Provost of KSU; David Balk, Faculty Senate President of KSU; Chris Hansen, Student Body President of KSU; and David Roos, a faculty member from the Business College of Allen Community College. Senator Lana Oleen is vice-chair of the committee. Questions from the audience focused on whether teaching is rewarded and if high quality teachers can be promoted and granted tenure if their scholarship focuses on teaching rather than the traditional notion of research.

- D. A "letter-to-the-editor" on faculty evaluation, signed by five former Faculty Senate Presidents, the President-Elect, and the current Faculty Senate President was sent to seven Kansas newspapers: the Wichita Eagle, the Manhattan Mercury, the Goodland Daily News, the Garden City Telegram, the Colby Free Press, the Salina Journal, and the Topeka Capital Journal. (See Attachment A) Jon Wefald and Jim Coffman as well as Steve Jordan, Executive Director of the Board of Regents, on the same topic have also sent letters on faculty evaluation to Kansas newspapers.
- E. At the request of the Faculty Senate at the November 12, 1996, meeting, I sent a letter to unit heads, with attachments of C31.5, C31.6, C31.7, and C31.8. Unit heads were asked to insure that these sections be distributed to all faculty in the unit. Faculty Affairs Committee members were identified in the letter, and faculty were asked to get their comments to members of Faculty Affairs or to members of their caucus.

IV. Standing Committee Reports

A. Academic Affairs -- Steve Harbstreit

1. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Arts and Sciences October 10, 1996. Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion was approved.
2. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the Salina College of Technology October 17, 1996. Senator Behnke seconded. The motion was approved.
3. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Education October 22, 1996. Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion was approved.
4. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of Undergraduate Course and Curriculum Changes approved by the College of Engineering October 25, 1996 (with the exception of DEN 582). Senator Shultis seconded. The motion was approved.
5. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of the General Education Proposal from the College of Agriculture approved by the General Education Task Force on October 7, 1996. Senator Klopfenstein seconded. The motion was approved.

6. Senator Harbstreit moved approval of the University General Education Policy for Transfer Students approved by the Intercollegiate Coordination Panel on March 30, 1995. Senator Benson seconded. The motion was approved. (See Attachment B).

7. Professor Nancy Goulden reported for the General Education Task Force. As of this meeting, 150 courses had been approved and 5 more were nearing approval. Another 48 courses have been returned for revision, but the Task Force hopes to approve as many as possible in the second semester. In addition four college programs had been approved and three were still under revision, but nearing completion. The task force, counting only 76 of the 150 courses, estimated that 13,723 seats would be available--- sufficient to meet the demand in at least the first two years.

One of the concerns voiced by Senators was whether all colleges were offering enough General Education courses. Professor Goulden agreed that some colleges had proposed very few courses. Senator Smith inquired whether all students must take their General Education courses from several colleges. They are not required to do so; President Balk noted that his department (the School of Family Studies and Human Services) would strongly urge that students take general education courses in at least three colleges. Senator Wright asked whether students could lose General Education credit by changing majors. They might, depending on the requirements, although they would still have graduation credit for those courses.

B Faculty Affairs – Fadi Aramouni

1. The Faculty Salary and Fringe Benefits Report has been submitted to Faculty Affairs. Bill Eberle, chair of the committee, will be at the January Senate meeting to discuss the findings.

2. Senator Aramouni moved approval of the proposed revision to Faculty Handbook C31.5. The motion was seconded.

Senator Pierzynski, Chair of Faculty Affairs last year, explained that the committee had discussed the importance of privacy and therefore preferred to let the faculty member decide whether the departmental faculty should review his/her case. Senator Exdell argued that the revision, which permits the faculty member to choose *not* to have a departmental review, protects privacy while making C31.5 more consistent with C31.6.

Several senators commented on the need to stipulate which faculty members should be included in a review, namely those with tenure and of equal or higher rank. The decision was to add the word "eligible" before departmental faculty as a friendly amendment.

The amended motion passed unanimously. ✓

3. Senator Aramouni moved approval of the proposed Faculty Handbook sections C31.6, 31.7, 31.8. Senator Michie seconded and suggested splitting the motion to deal with each section separately. Senator Aramouni agreed.

As discussion of C31.6 began, Senator Pierzynski suggested replacing "professional incompetence" in the third sentence with the words "chronic low achievement", which Senator Aramouni accepted as a friendly amendment.

Senator Kassebaum argued that the proposed new sections would make it very difficult for an administrator to comply with all the Faculty Handbook and departmental procedures with reference to the revocation of tenure and questioned whether these sections were needed.

Several senators indicated that the proposed sections arose in response to communications problems in the interpretation of C31.5. Faculty Senate requested the additions to establish clearly the unit's right to have a significant impact on standards and procedures used for these decisions and to protect the rights of individual faculty members. As Senator Michie pointed out, *procedures* should be uniform across the campus, but *standards* should be established by each department.

Other senators had opposed C31.5 from the beginning, believing AAUP guidelines covered the situation, but found it necessary, due to the existence of this section, to quantify as carefully as possible the standards which will apply. Some had supported C31.5 because they believed that renegotiating faculty work loads was only possible under this section. Senator Conrow reported that Faculty Affairs looked at these sections as supporting the Provost's plans for reallocation of resources. Senator Legg mentioned the importance of keeping separate the "minimum standards" mentioned here from the goals used for annual evaluations.

Senator Kassebaum suggested changing "professional incompetence" to "chronic low achievement" in the fourth and fifth sentences as well. Senator Aramouni agreed.

Senator Niehoff, an author of C31.5, thought C31.5 was clear and moved the deletion of the first four sentences of C31.6. His motion died for lack of a second.

A call for the question failed.

Senator Rahman suggested leaving the wording "professional incompetence" as it was in the proposal because the first sentence of C31.5 explains the intent. The consensus was to revert to the original proposal with "professional incompetence".

A call for the question passed. Proposed section C31.6 was passed in the form circulated with scattered "No" votes.

4. Senator Aramouni moved approval of section C31.7 in an amended form distributed at the meeting. Senator Stewart seconded.

Senator Smit explained that her amendment was a direct result of President Balk's letter encouraging wide-spread faculty discussion of the matter. Colleagues had approached her with the concern that a faculty member might be overburdened and therefore unfairly treated; hence the requirement that the head of the unit must determine that there has been an equitable distribution of duties within the unit.

Senator Pierzynski proposed amending the fourth sentence to read: "Referral for still other forms of assistance (e.g., medical or psychological) may be warranted." Senator Behnke seconded the motion. Senator Johnson asked whether a unit head could require medical or psychiatric help. Senator Smit indicated that "referral" is only a recommendation. Senator Kassebaum suggested that mandatory referral might be appropriate in misconduct cases.

The question was called. The motion to amend passed.

Senator Smith moved to delete the sentence because it would not help and might hurt the faculty member. Senator Benson seconded. The amendment failed.

The question was called. The motion, with Senator Smit's and Senator Pierzynski's amendments, passed with some "No" votes.

5. Senator Aramouni moved approval of section C31.8. Senator Shultis seconded.

Senator Conrow explained, in response to questions, that items in section b) 1-4 are important because they permit the department to define "overall" by establishing guidelines applicable to its faculty and to assure the university that non-productive faculty will be identified. Senator Kassebaum asked how a department can "explicitly state" the point at which C31.5 comes into play (section b). Senator Dyer, referring to her experience as Chair of the General Faculty Grievance Board, agreed that C31.8 could make it extremely difficult for the administration to justify its actions and recommended defeating C31.8. Others supported her view. Senator Legg stated that making such personnel decisions is his *most* serious responsibility as a department head and that he should have to follow very strict procedures. Senator Baker pointed out that the key word in C31.8 is "recommendations".

The call for the question passed.

The motion to approve C31.8 passed with some opposition. (*Attachment C contains the amended C31.5 and C31.6, C31.7, and C31.8 as passed in this meeting*).

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning

There was no report.

V. Old Business

President Balk asked senators to send suggestions for the Senate home page to Kristi Harper.

Vi. There was no new business.

VII. For the Good of the University

Senator Rahman addressed a concern that pressure may exist to include "collegiality" in evaluation and tenure decisions. She advocates avoiding that term in describing standards for personnel matters.

VIII. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A

November 26, 1996

W. Davis Merritt, Jr.
Editor
The Wichita Eagle
Knight-Ridder Inc.
825 East Douglas Avenue
Wichita, KS 67202

Dear Mr. Merritt,

Recent newspaper accounts regarding faculty evaluation at Regents institutions have created considerable fuss. We want to clarify issues of faculty evaluation as practiced on the K-State campus.

Faculty and administrators at Kansas State University have had in place for several years policies about faculty evaluation. These policies require faculty annually to submit evidence of their performance in several key areas: teaching, research, and service.

Some key points to make about faculty evaluation are

- it has a long history at Kansas State University,
- all faculty are evaluated every year,
- many sources of information including information from students are used in an evaluation,
- set standards of performance and criteria for assessing merit are used in every faculty evaluation,
- pay increases are tied to evaluation of performance,
- faculty welcome and expect evaluation of their work, and
- evaluation provides means for improvement and development.

Kansas State University has demonstrated to the Regents its elaborate and thorough approach to faculty evaluation. We use multiple sources of data, involve faculty in the formation of standards and procedures, conduct evaluations regularly, and use evaluation information to promote faculty improvement. Rigorous evaluation procedures eliminate around one-third of faculty who are seeking tenure. We have policies and procedures for determining professional incompetence, and for removing faculty whose continued performance is judged to be incompetent.

Faculty evaluation is alive and well at Kansas State University. It has been for many years. We take faculty evaluation seriously. We see its importance in helping

faculty develop. We include student assessments in evaluation of faculty performance. We use faculty evaluation in determining merit pay increases. If low performance is detected it will be rectified and, if not corrected, the faculty member will be dismissed. In short, faculty evaluation is a regular, ongoing process at Kansas State University and surpasses the evaluation procedures at many other universities.

Cordially,

Kansas State University Faculty Senate Presidents

David E. Balk, 1996-1997

Dennis Kuhlman, 1994-1995

Aruna Michie, 1993-1994

Charles Reagan, 1985-1986

Jerome Frieman, 1984-1985

Richard Gallagher, 1983-1984

James Legg, Faculty Senate President-Elect, 1996-1997

**Kansas State University
University General Education**

POLICY FOR TRANSFER STUDENTS

Students entering Kansas State University transferring credit from accredited two-year or four-year institutions are required to complete a minimum number of University General Education* credit hours at Kansas State University. The minimum number of University General Education credit hours required is based upon total number of completed transfer credit hours accepted at K.S.U. on initial date of entry.

Number of Completed Transfer Credit Hours Accepted at KSU on Initial Date of Entry	Minimum University General Education Credit Hours to be taken at KSU
0-14	18
15-29	15
30-44	12
45-59	9
60 & above	6

Each transfer student is required to complete a minimum of six credit hours of KSU upper division University General Education courses (300 and above) as specified in the program in which they will graduate.

*The Kansas Board of Regents defines basic skills courses separate from general education. Kansas State University defines basic skills as expository writing (6 hrs.), public speaking (2 hrs.), physical education (1 hr.), and mathematics (college algebra or higher, 3 hrs.). KSU will award transfer credit for these courses.

POLICY FOR CURRICULUM CHANGES

Students changing curricula within Kansas State University shall satisfy the University General Education requirements for the program in which they will graduate.

ATTACHMENT C

C31.5 Chronic Low Achievement. Chronic failure of a tenured faculty member to perform his or 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. In keeping with regular procedures in matters of tenure (C112.1 and C112.2), eligible departmental faculty will have input into any decision on individual cases unless the faculty member requests otherwise. 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 for 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.

C31.6 Section C31.5 is about revocation of tenure in individual cases. Tenure is essential for the protection of the independence of the teaching and research faculty in institutions of higher learning in the United States. Decisions about revocation of tenure, especially if the grounds are professional incompetence, should not be exclusively controlled or determined by and should not be unduly influenced by single individuals without input from faculty. Moreover, "dismissal for cause" in cases of professional incompetence can only be based on departmental guidelines about minimal-acceptable levels of performance that apply generally to all members of the department or unit and are distinct from individually-determined annual goals. Consequently, C31.5 establishes a departmental and faculty procedure for the decision about the revocation of tenure for professional incompetence. It is not the purpose of C31.5 to promote, endorse, encourage, or to have any stand whatsoever on the definition of "productivity," its relation to publication, or the proper relationship between measurable definitions of productivity and an intellectual University environment that is favorable to substantive scholarship, long-range projects, or critical and creative thinking. These are matters that C31.5 leaves to the department or unit to consider in "developing a set of guidelines describing the minimum-acceptable level of productivity for all applicable areas of responsibility." These minimum standards are not the same as those referred to in C31.1 or C41.1. It is expected that guidelines concerning minimal-acceptable levels of productivity will vary considerably from unit to unit. Not only disciplinary differences but differences in philosophies of departmental

administration are appropriate. What is not appropriate is the undue protection of non-contributing members of the faculty.

C31.7 Prior to the point at which "dismissal for cause" is considered under C31.5, other less drastic actions should have been taken. In most cases, the faculty member's deficient performance ("below expectations" or worse) in one or more areas of responsibility will have been noted in prior annual evaluations. At that point, the first responsibility of the head of the department or unit is to determine explicitly whether the duties assigned to the faculty member have been equitable in the context of the distribution of duties within the unit and to correct any inequities affecting the faculty member under review. Second, the head of the department or unit should have offered the types of assistance indicated in C30.3. Referral for still other forms of assistance (e.g., medical or psychological) may be warranted. Third, if the deficient performance continues in spite of these efforts and recommendations, the department head and the faculty member may agree to a reallocation of the faculty member's time so that he/she no longer has duties in the area(s) of deficient performance. Of course, such reallocation can occur only if there are one or more areas of better performance in the faculty member's profile and if the reallocation is possible in the larger context of the department's or unit's mission, needs, and resources.

C31.8 To help clarify the relationship between annual evaluations for merit, salary, and promotion and evaluations that could lead to C31.5, the following recommendations are made:

a) When annual evaluations are stated in terms of "expectations," then the categories should include at least the following: "exceeded expectations," "met expectations," "fallen below expectations but has met minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," and "fallen below minimum-acceptable levels of productivity," with the "minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" referring to the minimum standards called for in C31.5

b) The department's or unit's guidelines for "minimum-acceptable levels of productivity" should explicitly state the point at which a faculty member's overall performance can bring C31.5 into play. The guidelines should reflect the common and dictionary meaning of "overall" as "comprehensive," which may be based on any of the following:

1. A certain percentage of total responsibilities
2. Number of areas of responsibility
3. Weaknesses not balanced by strengths
4. Predetermined agreements with the faculty member about the relative importance of different areas of responsibility.