

12-3-2018

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 3, 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, December 3, 2018" (2018).
Faculty Senate. 1007.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/1007

This Minutes 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.

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate
Monday, December 3, 2018
Black and Gold Room, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Minutes

Senators were to have read before the meeting the following documents:

- 5 Nov. 2018 Faculty Senate Minutes/Attendance Log
- Reports from standing committees

1. Call to Order: Meeting called to order at 3:31 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

- Motion to approve agenda from Bill Stark, seconded by Helen Miles.
- Approved.

3. Approval of Minutes

- Bill Stark moves to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Emily Breit.
- Approved.

4. Announcements and Information Items:

Report of the FS President:

- Next Meeting: 22 Jan. 2019, 3:30 p.m., Black and Gold Room—A brief meeting to report on KBOR meeting.
- At the last KBOR meeting, the FS presidents were given a list of the powers delegated to the CEO of KBOR, including the ability to negotiate with bargaining units, which is a significant change. This represents a shift in moving some power from the university presidents back to KBOR, especially the CEO. All member universities rejected the Johnson County credit-hour proposal. No agenda has been posted yet for next meeting. FHSU will be presenting its list of faculty rewards, which compares well to the other universities' programs.
- President's Cabinet: Karen Allen shares packets from the meetings, so please review them. The email policy change was the most significant issue; no forwarding of faculty email to other systems such as Yahoo or Gmail will be allowed.
- Move-to-Market emails should have been received by now by all faculty; if there are questions, faculty should take those to department chairs.
- Provost Search Committee: Proposals for consulting companies are coming in; the new search committee is being formed.
- Both Spring Commencements will be in the morning to avoid heat.
- Workday transition is still progressing, and President Mason will keep us updated on it.
- The Strategic Planning Committee will also be reporting on progress.
- Janett Naylor-Tincknell reports that AAUP is having a holiday party at its final meeting during finals week; tenure and promotion committee training will also

begin next semester. Negotiations will begin in January. They would like to have a focus group with NTT faculty to make sure they are fully represented.

5. Consent Agenda (no action this month)

6. Reports of Standing Committees:

- Academic Affairs: Stephen Donnelly submitted a written report. He notes that the vote tally in the document was incorrect on p. 13; the tally was 9-0-1, rather than 10-0-1.
- University Affairs: Amy Schmierbach submitted a written report.
- Strategic Planning and Improvement: Kevin Splichal submitted a written report.
- Partnerships and Technology: Jason Harper submitted a written report.
- Student Affairs: Jeffery Solheim submitted a written report.
- Tony Gabel reminds committees to submit approved minutes to Kevin Splichal for archiving.

7. New Business:

- a. Motion to adopt Resolution from Executive Committee (Consenting Relations Policy; see attachment) (Motion substituted for the postponed motion from the ad hoc Committee on the policy)

RESOLVED: The Faculty Senate supports the FHSU Consenting Relations policy as revised by the ad hoc committee (see attachment).

Discussion: This motion is substituted by the Executive Committee for the postponed motion from the ad hoc committee. Tony Gabel explains that the policy is up for review by the administration, and the Faculty Senate's role is advisory only. Kevin Splichal asks whether the policy will come to us for approval if the policy we endorse is replaced by the administration in the spring. Tony Gabel says he is not sure, but since it affects employees, it will go through an approval process through the President's Cabinet. Carl Miller notes that, at the very least, we will be on the record as having advocated a certain position. Kate McGonigal asks if employees having extramarital affairs will follow the policy rule #4 to report the relationship. Linda Smith notes that the policy is likely there to protect the institution in the event of a problem. Helen Miles notes that the policy consequences cover the failure to report. Bill Stark notes that the word *should* should be omitted where the wording has changed from "recommended" to "required" in Guideline #3. Gabel notes that if we make that editorial change, it will open the whole document to revision. However, the Senate agrees to not change other wording in order to make this editorial correction.

- **Carl Miller moves to strike should after relationship in #3 and #4. Bill Stark seconds. Approved.**
- **Call to question to close debate: Approved.**
- **Vote: Approved by voice vote.**

- b. Adopt motion from Academic Affairs Committee (General Education CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes; see attachment)

It is moved that the Faculty Senate approve the CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes produced by the General Education Committee as written in the document titled “Final General Education Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes for Approval 11 13 2018.pdf.”

Discussion: Stephen Donnelly reminds the Senate that we are only voting on the CORE Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes, not the additional explanatory information and examples. The next step will be to write the specific procedures and create the rubrics for the outcomes. Jeni McRay says her department had several questions about the program, but they appreciate all the work the committee has done. They see issues related to implementation and want to know what the best venue is for the questions. Stephen Donnelly suggests that they ask the General Education Committee to meet with their department. Jeni McRay requests that someone from the committee come to speak to the Senate about that; Kevin Splichal notes that this has been the process—questions go to the committee and members come to Senate to report. Breit asks a question about whether the departments will assess the requirements that are satisfied in the major. Kevin Splichal notes that this is part of the later discussion about implementation. Laura Wilson notes that the amount of science seems to be reduced, as well as the lack of a lab requirement, and that the outcomes related to the different disciplines seem unbalanced. Discussion ensues about examples that most agree have to do with implementation. Robb Scott says it will be difficult to transition into a different way of looking at general education from the ways of counting credit hours and courses that we have been used to; the outcomes that open possibilities for interdisciplinary work may allow us to create new courses that would not have been possible under the old system. Bill Stark notes that we have had to consider a balance between credit hours and FTEs under the current system; Robb Scott notes that Education has had to find ways to make courses that might be used for General Education credit. Denise Orth supports the point that the program seems to limit science requirements. Glenn Grove also sees a problem with not having a lab course. Helen Miles and Emily Breit note that the reduction in required hours allows for more flexibility in the major, but Laura Wilson and Jeni McRay reiterate that the hours do not seem to be enough, and it will undercut the graduate assistantships in their program. Janett Naylor-Tincknell notes that some other objectives may be fulfilled by science, such as critical thinking. Denise Orth notes that some of these outcomes may be difficult to satisfy in some majors. Jeni McRay says she thinks the idea was to build more flexibility into the program. Tony Gabel reminds the FS that the approval is just on the Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes. Ginger Loggins agrees with Denise Orth’s point that some outcomes may be too specifically written. Helen Miles notes that the program reduces the number of hours, which allows majors to add courses, but Laura Wilson comments that that doesn’t allow all departments to come into contact with undeclared majors. Tony Gabel reminds us that the Board of Regents has reduced total credit hours to 120, so if we don’t reduce the requirements according to a plan of our own, it will be imposed from outside. Janett Naylor-Tincknell asks about the BA/BS requirements (languages or additional science); the response is that those are college requirements, not general education, so they will not be affected by the change.

- **Approved by a vote of 32-7-2.**

8. Adjournment

- Motion from Bill Stark, seconded by Emily Breit. Approved.
- Meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m.