

11-6-2007

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE Minutes for Regular Meeting on Tuesday, November 6, 2007

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

Faculty Senate, FHSU, "FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE Minutes for Regular Meeting on Tuesday, November 6, 2007" (2007). *Faculty Senate Materials*. Paper 105.
http://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/105

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Materials by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Minutes for Regular Meeting on Tuesday, November 6, 2007

The meeting was called to order in the Stouffer Lounge at 3:35 p.m. by President Dan Kulmala.

1. Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting

- a. The October 1, 2007 minutes were unanimously approved, after having been moved and seconded. There were no changes to the meeting's sign-in roster.

2. Announcements and Information Items (no action required): Dan Kulmala

a. Board of Regents meeting

- Fiscal Proposal – Dan will provide information as needed or requested. The proposal allows more flexibility with spending. Provost Gould explained there are fifteen legislative initiatives. FHSU has four of them. One regards the old Endowment Building. The plans currently are to turn it into parking. The third is not revenue neutral. Scientists on campus are proposing the Professional Science Masters program, seeking \$800,000. The other doesn't change resources much.

b. COFSP meeting

- Grievance procedures: Chronic Low Performance at KSU – Dan noted that a representative from KSU explained their first case of chronic low performance.
- Faculty evaluations—See KBOR Faculty Evaluation Statement Attachment – Dan requested that faculty senate members peruse the document. It is being examined to determine if it is outdated. The document helps faculty as it puts a lot of emphasis on faculty being evaluated on concrete performance while conducted on a very large scale. Dan suggested we might want to explore best practices regarding the evaluation of faculty next semester.
- Does the statement still apply? Any changes?

c. President's Cabinet

- Discussed Emergency Procedures for FHSU – An email message was sent about the current official procedures.

3. Reports from Committees

a. Executive Committee: Dan Kulmala

- CoursEval: Piloted program – a database of questions is being piloted by History, Physics, Communication Disorders, Sociology and possibly another department. It collects a whole series of information for teaching evaluation. Students will go online to complete it. Each department can decide which questions it wants to ask and what specialized questions would apply to that department. Data would be available the day after grades are submitted. Departments, Chairs, Deans, the Provost, and others can specialize reports. It will be piloted this Fall and it will be discussed in February.

- Future plans for teaching evaluation— See Teaching Evaluation Attachment. Dan noted we will probably look at it to determine a system-wide series of questions. The Ad Hoc Committee does not have a standardized form. The Executive Committee will probably propose a standard series of questions in February. Each department would then customize it. There was a question about the set of approved wording from about four years ago. This process will pull it together. The items will be reviewed for the order of the questions and to be sure it is Virtual College friendly and for online. There are at least five departments planning to pilot the database. The pilot will determine whether or not we want to use the database through the University. Not every department is following what we sanctioned four years ago. This database allows for departmental individualized questions. The proposed teaching evaluation system comes from the document. It was included to provide context. The pilot will be managed through CTELT to help orchestrate the individual department questions. History is using its own questions. Sociology is using its own questions. The new database program will create graphs and ratings over years. Departments can create benchmark questions. It can collect information beyond teaching evaluations such as book sales. It can create an individualized tenure/promotion database for faculty.
 - Recommendations from committees
- b. Academic Affairs: Martha Holmes.
- There were two handouts regarding applications for new courses. Martha noted that Dr. Campbell was present if there were any questions about the new courses. Sociology and Social Work 333 “Global Forces in a Changing World” was approved by the Faculty Senate with one abstention. Sociology and Social Work 360 “Medical Sociology” passed unanimously.
 - Martha Holmes provided a handout, “Report on Design Element 3 and Design Element 6,” from the review by Academic Affairs. Pros and cons and recommendations were listed. There was some discussion and ideas such as a suggestion that more information be provided to students and faculty from the Small Business Development administrator. Dan plans to pull the information together from the Faculty Senate committees to provide our thoughts about what is being proposed. There was some concern about the ideas being misinterpreted without having a voting procedure. Dan plans to have the report ready for the December meeting. A summary by a committee member was that the idea in Element 3 has potential and merit but requires more discussion. Provost Gould suggested that “recommendations” such as item 1 be made clearer. One concern was that Faculty Senate members would like to be asked their opinion rather than just being information processors. The Provost noted that President Hammond wants opinions.
 - Dr. Squires noted that the Marketing Committee had asked Dr. Hammond what he intended. Some of the Marketing Committee ideas and concerns were presented: Should some of the land be used for partnering with companies? Pros were that we “might” be able to develop partnerships and research opportunities. There were several Cons such as the potential for bankruptcy, and, “Where will the seed money originate?” Not

all faculty would be able to participate. Would faculty be given lead time to pursue these entrepreneurial tasks? Would there be an adjustment of teaching loads? Will any potential patents be owned by students or faculty? Are we going to change the mission of the University? We need to think about it on a deeper level?

- Dan will generate the ideas in the next couple of weeks and look at it in the Executive Committee. It was suggested and there was general agreement that we not move forward on anything until further clarification of some of the issues and questions.
 - Design Element 6: Martha continued with the Committee's paraphrase, pros, cons, and recommendation regarding Design Element 6 with the recommendation being that the Modern Language Department should develop a one-hour course designed both to introduce students to one of the foreign languages taught at the University and to invite students to take additional courses." Martha noted that she intended to include the Committee's recommendation that sign-language should be one of the courses to be developed.
 - It was suggested by a Faculty Senate member that the President encourage high schools to have their students take the beginning language courses in high school. It was clarified by Martha that the "one-hour course" should not be limited to languages that are being taught here.
 - The SGA President, Chelsey Gillogly, said most student senators were in favor of the foreign language addition but were concerned about their somewhat tight degree programs – "What hours are being taken away?" and "Are you giving us more?"
 - Additional concern was the lack of instructors and funding for K-12 in western Kansas and other rural areas. The Provost also suggested that a group or department may want to have a "Study Abroad" experience as part of the internationalization of the campus, and that Nursing and other professional groups may want to consider offering "Workforce language" courses. Another idea was to bring together the graduate students in order for meeting those from places such as China. Hybridized degrees were discussed briefly.
- c. Student Affairs: Jeff Burnett
- Jeff reported they are meeting with the SGA sub-committee.
- d. University Affairs: Jerry Wilson
- Jerry commended his committee members for meeting frequently and compiling a long list of questions with a few pros and cons. Gene Rice met with the Committee regarding the definition of scholarship and the mission statement. Jerry reported that after embracing the concepts from University Affairs and having met with AAUP and the Regents, they now have three changes and will meet with the Faculty Senate.
- e. By-Laws and Standing Rules: Win Jordan
- Win reported that they submitted their report to Dan and he will include it.

- f. University Marketing and Strategic Academic Partnerships: Josephine Squires
 - Josephine reported in item 3b due to the similarities in concerns
- 4. Reports from Special Committees and Other Representatives**
 - a. Library Report: Diana Koerner
 - See Library Report Attachment
- 5. Old Business**
- 6. New Business**
 - a. Western Kansas Institute
 - Open Forum—November 9 from 3:30 to 4:30 at the Robbins Center, the Eagle Communications Hall. The Institute would explore and create a scholarship entity (rather than four institutes) for the region. The Faculty Senate is encouraged to attend. Conceivably, it would have an office to write grant applications for faculty rather than facilitate the writing. It would work in conjunction with the Docking Institute. Dan gave several samples of ideas of scholarship in the region.
- 7. Adjournment of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting** A motion was approved to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.