

3-6-2018

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 6, 2018

FHSU Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 6, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate*. 975.

https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/975

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository. For more information, please contact ScholarsRepository@fhsu.edu.

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate
Monday, March 6, 2018



Black & Gold Room, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Meeting called by: Denise Orth, Faculty Senate President

Please read/review prior to the meeting: *Located in Blackboard course FS000_01: Faculty Senate.* February 5, 2018 Faculty Senate Minutes
Academic Affairs Committee report and course/program approval documents
Committee reports

Agenda – Meeting started at 3:33

1. Approval of Minutes- Approved unanimously

2. Announcements and Information Items:

Welcome – Denise Orth

Tisa Mason – President update

- Shared governance is important
- Faculty is at the heart of what we do.
- Visiting all departments to get to know everyone better and will be sure to answer all questions and address all departmental issues during those meetings.
- Asked each Senator to introduce themselves
- Very briefly updated Senate on the shared governance structure and the Provost search, both of which were underway in terms of meetings, shared info, etc.
- There has also been alumni donor interaction

Report of the Faculty Senate President – Denise Orth

- Kansas Board of Regents (KBOR) and Council of Faculty Senate Presidents (COFSP)
 - New Foresight plan will be getting underway throughout the summer
 - Reality of decreased enrollment in 4-yr and community colleges was discussed and what the fiscal liability and responsibility is for declining programs. There was discussion about how some programs that are small may still have components that are integral to other programs and that they can't and won't look at single pieces of information or single numbers in a vacuum.
 - Tony Gabel and Denise Orth will travel together to Pittsburgh to attend the next meeting together.
- Meeting with Jeff Briggs
 - Dr. Briggs is taking a look at all aspects of discontinuing the use of the syllabus server and is having ongoing conversations.
 - Will send report to KBoR about all programs for UG degrees at 120 hours being underway.
- Nominations committee
 - Voting will take place in April

- Some nominations have already been put forward, and nominations are still open.
- The nominations committee is comprised of Dr. Jeff Burnett, Dr. Stephen Donnelly, Dr. Eric Deyo, Dr. Emily Breit and Denise Orth.

3. Consent Agenda Motion to approve

- Consent agenda was moved by Justin Greenleaf and seconded; passed unanimously
 - Item 1: Approve New Course – GSCI 602 Urban Geography. Motion passed 10-0-0
 - Item 2: Approve New Course – MDI 433 Emerging Issues in Healthcare. Motion passed 10-0-0
 - Item 3: Approve New Course – LDRS 401 Advanced Leadership Seminar I. Motion passed 9-0-1
 - Item 4: Approve New Course – LDRS 402 Advanced Leadership Seminar II. Motion passed 9-0-1
 - Item 5: Approve New Course – ART 202 Survey of Art History II. Motion passed 8-0-0
 - Item 6: Approve Course Change – ART 201 Survey of Art History I. Motion passed 8-0-0
 - Item 7: Approve Course Change – ENG 327 Literature Matters. Motion passed 10-0-0
 - Item 8: Approve Program Name Change – Bachelor of Arts in Performing Arts. Motion passed 10-0-0

3. Reports from Committees

Academic Affairs—Kenny Rigler and Helen Miles

- Course titles and descriptions and syllabus content containing under 25% of change to course outcomes will not have to go through this committee for changes; substantial changes to courses will require moving through this committee.
- Kevin Splichal updated the Senators on the General Education process. They are currently collecting survey data and urge people to share widely with anyone we feel should be a part of the sample. They are still clarifying learning outcomes and are not yet looking at individual courses.

Partnerships and Technology—Jason Harper

- Wanted to clarify that the unhappiness of some of the international faculty and their perceived lack of support was not coming from FHSU but from the partner institutions.

Strategic Planning and Improvements—Tony Gabel

- The committee is still collecting data and processing information and will report more detailed information at the next meeting.

Student Affairs—Amanda Fields and Jana Zeller

- Currently reviewing a document regarding “dead week” and other institution practices.
 - Justin Greenleaf requested the committee take into consideration how this would be applied across all modalities. The comments were well received.
- Also in contact with Dr. Crowley to discuss retention as it relates to freshman seminar.

University Affairs—Amy Schmierbach

Resolution on Workload. Motion passed committee.

- Discussion ensued about this resolution in terms of why it didn't refer specifically to the Workforce Taskload report.
- A Senator expressed the concern about departments already requiring annual statement of responsibilities and other requirements; is it really needed?
- While some departments have express duties outlined for tenure requirements, they do not have guidelines for NTT faculty.
- If each dept. does this, where does it go? To the Dean? Will this be policy? What is the mechanism by which this has an effect? Denise clarified that resolutions are simply passed on to the Provost and becomes part of a conversation about why the resolution was passed so that the desire and recommendation of Senators impacts on policies and procedures.
- Amy stressed that the goal of this resolution was to ensure that conversations and action continue to be in front of department chairs about workload.
- Some departments are hurting their faculty in the tenure process by having outdated policies and having documents that don't match.
- Vote ensued; Committee chair asked for numbered vote.
- Motion defeated 10-24-2

Resolution on Snow days. Motion passed committee.

- Several questions ensued regarding this resolution. Denise called for motion to suspend the rules so Dr. Briggs could address the Senate. Motion to allow him to speak passed unanimously.
 - Dr. Briggs addressed saying that the Finance group looks at the forecast and takes into account the facilities and whether they can be cleared, etc., and begins the process of advising the President to their recommendations. Dr. Briggs said he is not aware of specific collaboration with USD489.
 - One Senator said it was not USD489's responsibility to help determine our policy.
- Motion passed 23-13-1.

4. Unfinished Business

- Provost Committees requesting FS nominations:
 - Endowed Professor Review committee – 1
 - Faculty Development Funding committee – 1
 - University Promotion committee – 1 tenured appointee in RCoBE and 1 tenured appointee in WCoSTeM
 - University Tenure committee - 1 tenured appointee in Education
- Denise appreciates the nominations she has already received and encourages continued submission of names. Senators can nominate themselves.

5. New Business

- The new process for hiring faculty and specifically for negotiating salary for new hires was raised. The concern is that in the process at no point is the candidate communicating with the people they actually met on the campus visit which could in turn affect the perception of the university.

- Jennifer Sauer experienced the same concern and experienced it as an additional layer of bureaucracy and agreed that this needs to be addressed, probably through University Affairs committee.
 - Lexey Bartlett expressed concern about the same process for an additional reason: there is no negotiation. If the candidate does not accept the offer made by HR, the department is informed that the candidate would not be hired. Rather she would like to recommend that HR at least consult with the Dean or department as to whether the candidate is worth negotiating with.
 - Tony suggested alternately that we suspend the rules to have open discussion for a maximum of 10 minutes so we can better deliberate some of the issues. Motion passed. Open discussion began.
 - Dr. Briggs confirmed that this is a new process that has resulted in several concerns. There have been situations where department chairs have not been adequately consulted. However, he believes it can mature and get better. He has had conversations with Mike Barnett and HR about ensuring that Deans have the information as necessary (in other words the Deans decide whether to enlist the recommendation of the department chair). The old process had problems. Dr. Briggs would like to see this process mature and improve.
 - Tony asked why the locus of decision does not rest with department chairs when they are the ones responsible for overseeing faculty.
 - April Terry raised the concern in her department (Criminal Justice) that in the hiring process many times candidates have to foot the bill themselves for getting to campus to be interviewed which reduces the overall pool of desirable applicants when other institutions often provide stipends for candidates.
 - Angela Walters emphasized how important personal contact is at the department chair level.
 - Fred Britton is concerned about all of the things already shared and brought up the additional point of timeline. The process simply takes too long in some cases and we may be losing good candidates because of it.
 - Emily Breit also experienced wide variation as department chair and as search chair. Clearly, the search process for faculty should likely be reviewed and improved.
- Jeni McRay suggested that we include on the next agenda a robust discussion regarding the \$1.25 coming back to departments, as there were several concerns in her department. Other senators raised concern about whether or not there was a policy about how the money was used (e.g. if it was to be used for faculty development or not).
 - Denise suggested that she could ask Mike Barnett to come back and answer questions and/or call a special meeting specifically for this purpose. It would be more helpful if we could forward to him some of the specific information as to what we want him to address and also ask him to share documents in advance of the meeting electronically.
 - Faculty Morale poll is open. Please complete it! There has been good participation thus far, but reminding faculty to complete it would be helpful.
 - **6. Adjournment – Unanimously adjourned at 4:55.**