

9-9-2019

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 9, 2019

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 9, 2019" (2019).
Faculty Senate. 1027.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/1027

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
September 9, 2019
Black and Gold Room, MU, 3:30pm - 5:00pm

Minutes

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

- Review minutes from 7 May 2019
 - Access to FS documents can be found through the shared Faculty Senate Folder: goo.gl/1Np8Fp

1. **Call to Order:** Meeting called to order at 3:32pm

2. **Approval of Minutes:**

- Bill Stark moves to approve the minutes as presented, seconded by Jeni McRay
- Approved.

3. **Announcements and Information Items:**

a. **Guest announcements**, provided by Provost Arensdorf:

- i. She is working on getting to know her direct reports and scheduling time to meet with all departments to learn more about our programs and to meet new faculty.
- ii. Two searches are underway for Dean of the Robbins College of Business & Entrepreneurship and Dean of the Werth College of Science, Technology, and Mathematics (the search for Dean of the Graduate School is expected to begin in the spring). The search committee is working to finalize the job posting for these positions.
- iii. Internationalization structure continues to be a priority. President Mason provide an update at fall convocation. We can expect more news (i.e., announced structure) in January followed by a comment period.
- iv. Provost Arensdorf is working with Brett Zollinger on implementation of the Strategic Plan (SP). She encourages faculty and all departments to get involved and to review SP documents found online.
- v. She will start *Coffee and Conversation with Jill* as an opportunity to share updates and get to know faculty, staff, departments, and programs. The first Coffee and Conversation is scheduled for October 2nd at 8:00am.
- vi. Training of new chairs will be a priority.
- vii. A Tenure Track Panel will take place on October 15th from 3:00pm-4:30pm in Stouffer Lounge. No RSVP is needed.
- viii. Provost Arensdorf concluded her remarks by briefly discussing her approach to this role. She acknowledged that there has been a steep learning curve, but she remains committed to being communicative, collaborative, and transparent.

b. **Report from Faculty Senate President:**

- i. Need one faculty senator to serve on the Alumni Board. Primary responsibility is membership on Awards and Recognition committees (Torch, Pilot, Lighthouse, Homecoming, etc.) Contact Charlene Nichols
 - **Loretta Dorn will serve in this role.**
- ii. Need one faculty senator to serve on Provost's OER Committee. Deb Ludwig is co-chair with Andrew Feldstein.
 - **Jason Harper will serve in this role.**
- iii. Need one faculty senator to serve on MU Policy Board. Contact Edith McCracken.
 - **Janet Stramel will serve in this role.**
- iv. Gen Ed Committee, approval of Procedures/Policy. First step: to Academic Affairs. Anticipated vote in FS during Oct meeting.
 - Kevin met with Tim Crowley, Stephen Donnelly, and Brad Will. They developed a plan that was emailed to all senators with the FHSU CORE Assessment and Course Proposal document attached. Senators were instructed to forward this document to their department and solicit feedback about text in blue. All questions/feedback about the blue text should be forwarded to Kevin. He will compile our questions and take to the Gen Ed Committee.
 - **Discussion:** Bill Stark asked if we will discuss the points in blue or just direct questions to Kevin. For now, Kevin indicated that we will direct questions to him so that we can get answers from the Gen Ed Committee to inform our vote at our October meeting. Ginger Loggins asked Kevin to clarify if the answers from the Gen Ed Committee will be forwarded to the Academic Affairs Committee and then shared with the larger body. Kevin indicated that this is his plan. Fred Britten asked if there is a deadline for submitting questions. Kevin indicated that he would like questions as soon as possible so that we can vote in October. Helen Miles suggested a deadline of two weeks (by 9/23).
- v. [Strategic Plan at implementation stage](#). Jill Arensdorf and Brett Zollinger are leading this charge. If you would like to join, please contact Jill or Brett. Please visit the website.
- vi. Possibility of a Provost's task force to look into the need and possible solutions to university wide policy/procedure for proctoring and/or exams. (Andrew Feldstein, VC rep, Dean and Chair reps, Faculty reps)
 - Anyone interested in being on this committee should contact Provost Arensdorf's office.

- vii. President Mason, Provost Arensdorf, and Mike Barnett will be making visits to the regent's members throughout the year.
- viii. Great Colleges to Work for Survey, 2019 - FHSU's survey average was 67% which equals the 67% Carnegie Class Mean. Overall – positive
 - Contact Sangki Min if you would like to see the report or see the shared FS Google folder (link above).
- ix. New Teacher Evaluation system beginning Fall 19, eXplorance Blue, assigned to University Affairs Standing Committee. Contact Tim Crowley and Sangki Min.
- x. Dean and Assistant Dean surveys Fall 2020
- xi. Chair surveys Spring 2020
- xii. Faculty Senate Membership
 - If you are new to Faculty Senate, we are in the process of creating name cards. Kevin asked new members to check the Faculty Senate list (found through the shared FS folder, link above) and to let him know if their name is not listed.

4. Reports from Committees (see committee minutes/reports)

- a. Academic Affairs: **No report provided.**
- b. University Affairs: **No report provided.**
- c. Strategic Planning and Improvements: **Vote to approve method for editing bylaws.**
 - On behalf of the committee, Paul Nienkamp presented the following proposal: Proposed Standing Rule #10:
Rule for Faculty Senate Voting: Actions or measures which require a full vote of the Faculty Senate shall be done via general consensus, written/paper, or electronic means, as deemed acceptable by the Executive Committee, so that a timely and efficient vote on Faculty Senate matters can be conducted. Paul made a motion to approve the proposal, seconded by Bill Stark.
 - **Discussion:** Helen Miles asked if a senator is not present at a meeting, does this person get to vote electronically. Paul indicated that his understanding is that only senators who are present at the meeting can vote. Fred Britten mentioned that if we do not have a meeting but we need to vote on something, we might be able to do that electronically. Tony Gabel asked for clarification regarding what electronic voting will be used for. Paul provided the following example: if a committee needs to vote on something outside of a meeting, then the committee might do this via electronic vote. He also noted that the committee may still discuss what is being voted on at a meeting if needed, namely if general

consensus is lacking. Lexi Bartlett suggested adding language that a quorum is required at a meeting to cast vote and clarifying if only one method for voting would be used. Lexi made a motion to amend the proposal to: “Amendment to Proposed Standing Rule #10: Rule for Faculty Senate Voting: Actions or measures which require a full vote of the Faculty Senate shall be done via one of the following methods: general consensus, written/paper ballot, or electronic means, as deemed acceptable by the Executive Committee, so that a timely and efficient vote on Faculty Senate matters can be conducted.” Janett Naylor-Tincknell seconded the motion. Helen asked if an electronic vote is cast and quorum does not occur, then does that mean the vote does not pass. Paul and Kevin indicated that this is correct. The amendment was approved. Hearing no further discussion, the motion to approve the amended proposal was approved (1 senator opposed; no abstentions).

- d. Partnerships and Technology: **No report provided.**
- e. Student Affairs: **No report provided.**

5. New Business

- a. [FS Resolution on Faculty Morale Survey Results](#)
 - i. Provost Arensdorf is asking for open communication between faculty and administration to understand the major workload and compensation issues. I recommend that the FS fully vet these concerns amongst all teaching FHSU faculty and communicate those concerns to the President and Provost with potential solutions; what the results mean and what are our recommendations.
 - ii. President Mason concurs and additionally requests a process document to be submitted to the Provost by December 2019 and final recommendations by March 2020.
 - iii. This has been assigned to the University Affairs Standing Committee
- b. [Sense of the Senate regarding Open Education Resources:](#)
 - i. Endorsed by Provost June 21, 2019
 - ii. Endorsed by President June 24, 2019
 - iii. Deb Ludwig is our FHSU rep to KBOR for OER
 - iv. This has been assigned to the Student Affairs Standing Committee
- c. FHSU CORE Policies and Procedures
 - i. Filter through Academic Affairs Standing Committee for Q/A with General Education Committee
 - ii. Looking for a full faculty senate vote at October 8 meeting (blue text ONLY)
- d. SGA Dead Week Policy presentation, SGA President, Brad DeMers
 - Brad DeMers provided FS with a handout that outlined the highlights of his presentation. He then followed up with an email after the meeting to FS that included his PowerPoint slides, proposed policy, the survey results from the Docking Institute, and Regents Institutions dead week policy.

- **Discussion:** Skip Ward asked Brad to define dead week. Brad indicated that this refers to the week before scheduled finals. Jeni McRay requested clarification on what SGA wanted FS to do with respect to the proposed policy. Brad responded that he wanted FS to ask him questions about the policy and provide feedback that he could bring back to SGA. Jeni followed up with a question about the mechanics of the policy as well as clarification on the committee (L&AAC) mentioned during his presentation. Brad indicated that SGA hopes to create an academic affairs-like committee with the help of our feedback. Helen Miles requested clarification on what constitutes a semester long assignment. Brad indicated that this is something that students work on all semester and not simply an assignment that faculty have on the syllabus at the beginning of the semester. Gary Brinker asked for more information on how SGA determined that making the deadline earlier for assignments would be helpful for students. Brad said that SGA researched this through their survey and found that students said this would be helpful to them. Christopher Olds asked if SGA had considered virtual college students when crafting the policy and how the policy might help/hinder virtual students. Brad said that SGA feels that the policy applies to both virtual college students and on-campus students; this is based on the survey responses from both on-campus and virtual students. Skip Ward indicated that it was difficult to follow the presentation because we were not given any documents/information to review ahead of the meeting. Jeni McRay provided some background information to Brad in that this is our 4th/5th year hearing about this issue. Jeni indicated that the data suggest on-campus students do feel that this is an issue; however, we are up against competing values – one competing value being academic freedom (to design courses based on what faculty think is best for our courses and students). Lexi Bartlett thanked Brad for this presentation and offered her appreciation for the research/survey information. Christopher Olds then asked how the policy will be applied to short courses and summer courses. Brad said that the policy would not apply to these types of classes. Loretta Dorn raised questions about the survey and results shared during the presentation. For example, the survey questions are subjective and not well-defined (e.g., how much is *too* much work) and the survey described a dead *week* policy, yet the policy that was presented was for two days only. Loretta asked if the policy is even really helping students who indicated they have too much work before finals. Brad said that SGA wanted to be realistic with the policy knowing that faculty would most likely not approve something that was a full week. Christopher Olds also voiced concerns with the survey questions and the findings. He asked Brad what other evidence can

be presented to support the policy. Brad said that SGA can try to do more research and fix the survey, but he thinks that FHSU needs a policy because all other institutions in KS have a dead week policy. Tony Gabel mentioned that he served on a committee to look at this issue (over 7 years ago) and a recommendation of the committee was for SGA to talk to faculty about what they are currently doing during this week, but it is his understanding that this communication did not occur. Tony's concern is that faculty have not been asked what is actually going on in the classroom that week and this should be done to compare how students "feel" (survey responses) to what is actually going on. He also mentioned that K-State's policy states that students "curtail social activity" during dead week, and he questioned why that language was not used in the policy that was presented by SGA. Brad clarified what was meant by "curtail social activity" and said SGA will consider this in a revised policy statement. Rob Byer cited inconsistencies with current policy and indicated that clarification is needed (e.g., the policy indicates that no new assignments should be completed during this week, but does this also mean that no new material be introduced). Rob agreed with other senators who would like SGA to consider how the policy might impact virtual students. Brad responded that the survey results suggest that students feel they would be more prepared for finals if no new material is introduced. The days off would help students to review information covered earlier in the semester. He also said that SGA can try to update the policy to align better with virtual students. Jeni suggested that departments review assignments and syllabi to ensure that current policies are being followed as opposed to institute a new policy. Brad indicated that SGA would like to stick with and try to implement the policy they created. Janett Naylor Tincknell made the following motion (seconded by Lexi Bartlett): In the spirit of shared governance, SGA will work with the standing committee of Student Affairs to consider the feedback of FS and revise the proposed policy so that FS can vote on the issue. Motion was approved.

- e. Standing Committee Meetings (designation of officers and meeting dates/times)
 - Committee members met to assign a chair(s) and secretary.

6. Adjournment

- Motion from Tony Gabel, seconded by Janett Naylor Tincknell. Approved
- Meeting adjourned at 4:54pm