

9-18-2018

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 18, 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, September 18, 2018" (2018).
Faculty Senate. 1006.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/1006

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
Special Meeting, Tuesday, 18 September 2018
McCartney Hall 201, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Minutes

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 3:34 p.m.

2. Discussion of the Proposed Strategic Plan, facilitated by President of Faculty Senate, Dr. Gabel.
Floor open to senators.

Note: Dr. Tisa Mason, President, and Dr. Tim Crowley and Dr. Deb Ludwig, Co-Chairs of the Strategic Planning Committee, will be available to respond to specific questions, if needed.

- **Mission Statement:** McGonigall asks about timeline for full endorsement of strategic plan. President Mason thanks the Faculty Senate for the special meeting and notes that the timeline for approval takes us through April, with approval of the plan’s framework by November, followed by work on each goal, ideally completed in February, with a fully developed plan to be brought to KBOR in April. Mason also notes that the process will continue to move between workgroups and larger constituencies for each stage.
- **Vision Statement:** McRay asks what the discussion was around what a vision statement is supposed to be, noting that it seems brief. Mason defines vision statement as what an organization aspires to be. After open comment period, we arrived at this vision statement. Even if it’s not perfect, it can be usable. It focuses on accessibility and the needs of our communities and region. Stark (sub. for Gillock) asks about not including “innovative” in the vision. It is noted by Mason and Miller that it is in the mission and a core value. Mehaffey-Kultgen approves of the vision. McRay asks if it is really an aspirational goal because we are already accessible. Scott disagrees that we still have a way to go to be accessible to all. Naylor-Tincknell notes that we are accessible from a price point-of-view, but other ways are still an issue. Shaffer (sub. for Wilson) agrees we still have more to do. Breit doesn’t think it is aspirational—perhaps needs a descriptor before accessible. Stark (sub. for Gillock) suggests we should aim to inspire people to seek higher ed. as well. Gabel notes that other bodies will review. Splichal reiterates that it is not perfect, so we can revisit it. Miller says things tend to stay the same once approved, so when and how will we come back to it? Mason responds that we will have a cyclical revision process with feedback. Schmierbach approves the latter part of the sentence supporting “democratic, economic, and social needs.”
- **Values:** Miller doesn’t like the writing style. Miles agrees. Bartlett notes that the style is direct, specific, and clear. McRay asks why the core values and aspirational values are separated. Mason responds that the core values are already here and who we are, and aspirational values are things we don’t exhibit every day in every practice but that we want to achieve. Nienkamp notes that teaching as a word is not mentioned in any value, although it might be inferred in the first value of “Knowledge & Scholarship.” Whitaker asks if this is meant to be an exhaustive list. Shaffer (sub. for Wilson) notes “dissemination of knowledge” might be read as “teaching.” Donnelly notes that the values represent where “the rubber meets the road,” or how we put the mission and vision into action. Lee asks if academic excellence can be a core value. Arthur asks whether the last value implies that all of our

ethical values are the same. Splichal notes that the judgment of what is right will be done from multiple perspectives. Whitaker asks whether values will stay the same. Mason notes she hopes our core values will remain the same. Bartlett notes that the first two aspirational values fit well with aspirational aspect of the vision to be accessible to all.

- **Goals:** Naylor-Tincknell asks what we mean by growth: is it merely numerical or in terms of other metrics (quality, etc.)? Naylor-Tincknell likes the word “sustainable.” Mason responds that the definition will come out of the strategies for achieving each goal. The strategy sessions will return to the goals and develop desirable outcomes, based on feedback from the community of the institution. Briggs notes that growth might include all of the above: enrollment, diversity of students and faculty, programs, enhanced learning outcomes, and so on. Stark (sub. for Gillock) notes that, historically, growth here has usually meant enrollment, so we should be sure to make it broader. Ludwig adds that the outcomes are critical to that end. Gabel asks for clarification that goals will be the next phase after endorsement. Mason notes that next week she will put out a call for teams to work on goals. Sun asks if there will be a SWOT process associated with outcomes. Mason notes that SWOT analysis was done earlier in the process but may certainly be part of the development of strategies for goals within teams. Lee asks about the final goal, which seems to overlap with the final core value. Smith notes that it echoes current practice, so it is appropriate.

3. Consideration for Endorsement of the Strategic Plan: Gabel requests a motion to approve the whole strategic plan as is without word-smithing and in its entirety.

- Stark (sub. for Gillock) moves to endorse document in its entirety; seconded by Smith.
- Discussion: Growe thinks as open as the document is, it is good. McRay states her appreciation of the transparency of the process and the genuine inclusion of stakeholders in the whole process up to this point and moving forward.
- **Motion carries unanimously.**

4. Adjournment

- Motion by Orth to adjourn; seconded by Andrews.
- Meeting adjourned at 4:22 p.m.