

1-31-2018

FHSU Strategic Planning and Improvements - Faculty Senate Subcommittee Minutes, January 21, 2018

FHSU Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "FHSU Strategic Planning and Improvements - Faculty Senate Subcommittee Minutes, January 21, 2018" (2018). *Faculty Senate*. 976.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/976

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

Strategic Planning and Improvement Committee Meeting - January 31, 2018 - minutes

Members present: Carl Miller, Tony Gabel, Kevin Splichal, Fred Britten, Paul Nienkamp, Kate McGonigal, Sarbari Mitra

Absent member: Jeni McRay

Tony Gabel: Comments/questions about the Draft questionnaire regarding Faculty Senators. Hold discussion for the moment.

Fred Britten gave background information about the history behind the number of Faculty Senate meetings eliminating summer meetings as well as the January meeting.

Carl Miller: Do we really have a enough Fac Sen business for two meetings per month?

Tony Gabel: Emergency meetings can be called and maybe the best option is to see how often this option is used to determine the necessity of two meetings per month.

Paul N.: In meetings with Tisa, have you (Tony) had input from her wanting more input from FS?

Tony Gabel: I think she does want more feedback from FS as well as all of campus. This could mean more work for FS, which is a good thing. Tisa very much wants open communication and shared governance.

Fred Britten: When the Gen Ed starts moving forward, FS will probably need more meetings whether emergency or scheduled.

Tony Gabel: Let's come back to the questionnaire. Are these questions sufficient? How are senators perceived? That is really what we are trying to find. And how they perceive other senators and how important this body is across campus.

Kate M.: I would like to see # 3 more open ended. I think there are other ways it is happening. A more open ended response may give us more information on this topic. "Describe" the process might be a better way of wording this.

Tony Gabel: Agreed.

Carl Miller: What is the "role" of a faculty senate member? Are we to be an active body or do we simply pass along information?

Fred Britten: How do Fac Sen members give feedback in the department?

Carl Miller: Many departments meet at different intervals. Some monthly. We meet weekly in my department. Current/relevant information can be missed with this irregularity.

Tony Gabel: Rewording of some questions pertaining to discussions. I do hope to have a good response rate even if the questionnaire is a little longer based on revisions. We will probably give a deadline in Mid-February followed by emails, etc so that our committee can meet to discuss responses before March FS meeting.

Fred Britten: Provide a statement about how this is used and the purpose of Strategic Planning.

Tony Gabel: If you have any other comments, please let me know. I will send out the second draft soon.

Paul N: Let's put this in digital form.

Kevin S: I can do that. A google form.

Sarbari M: If we did this by paper/pencil at the next FS meeting, we could get a very high response rate. Committee agreed that this was a good idea.

Kate M: Just because other universities are doing this, does it make them more effective in achieving the goal we want? Engagement/ Open Communication, etc. ?

Carl M: The two meetings per month really could give FS more "ownership" and possibly "power" in shared governance.

Fred B: If it is decided to change / or enforce the 3-year (assistant professor rank and 3 full years on faculty) timeframe for members, you might find individuals more engaged. Those on tenure-track have different concerns, etc. There are a lot of items to consider.

Kate M: The previous provost was not adhering to the tenure procedures to begin with. I can see that this would absolutely be a concern for people on tenure track.

Tony G: My recommendation would be to change the wording in the bylaws to actually enforce the assistant professor rank and 3 years on full-time faculty rather than having it be a "recommendation".

Tony G: Any other comments? Tony will revise the questionnaire and get it back to members.

Carl M: I like the idea of Tony presenting the questionnaire at FS before handing it out.

Tony G: Item 2. Standing Rule #4. Standing Rule #5 can easily be changed. SR #4 is in regard to "headcount" and what it means. Fred indicated we could get rid of SR #4 if we addressed the headcount issue.

Fred B: Standing Rules can be changed by senate. They do not need to go to all faculty.

Tony G: SR#5 can be changed. Strategic Planning and Improvement.

Carl M: SR#7 Archiving. Does anyone do this? Can we eliminate this? We probably should investigate this and determine a way to keep archives.

Fred B: Somewhere there is an archive (library) but with it being electronic now there may not be an issue. If it is electronic, then the standing rule should change.

Tony G: Should we adjust this? (SR#7). Do we need to reinstate and enforce this? I will contact the library and find out if any exist.

Carl M: Maybe FS should control our own website and make sure everything is accurate and organized because currently it is not.

Tony G: Will follow up with SR #7. SR#5 can be updated. That gets us back to #4. It is a challenging topic. We should all take a look at SR#4 and report back.

Carl M: What about SR#8? This has not been followed. Either get rid of it or enforce it.

Tony G and Fred B and Paul N: We should enforce this. (SR#8 Nominations) Engagement might increase as a result.

Tony G: Will send Denise Orth an email regarding SR#8.

Tony G: For the next meeting: Review SR#4. All of Article III: Representation. We should have our survey back by then. Plan on a 1PM meeting on a Wednesday again. Will send an invite.