

12-5-2022

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 5, 2022

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 5, 2022" (2022).
Faculty Senate. 1048.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/1048

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

Faculty Senate Minutes December 5th, 2022 3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m. Ballroom, Memorial Union

[Shared Faculty Senate Google Folder](#)
[Faculty Senate Bylaws](#)

- I. Call to Order
- II. [Attendance](#)
- III. Approval of [Agenda](#): Brittany Howell moved to approve the agenda. The motion was seconded. The agenda was approved unanimously.
- IV. Approval of [November 8th](#) Meeting Minutes: Linda Smith moved to approve. Anita Walters seconded the motion. It was approved unanimously.
- V. Announcements and Informational Items
 - A. Guest Announcements
 1. Provost Jill Arensdorf
 - a) AHSS reorganization will be voted on at KBOR in December.
 - b) Rpk: Steering Team and Faculty Ad Hoc group heard a draft presentation. FHSU-specific team met with KBOR and Rpk to provide additional feedback on FHSU areas. The final presentation will be next Wednesday. The written narrative will be presented in early January. Last week's meeting was recorded and a link was emailed before the meeting. The draft presentation is on the KBOR website, a link was provided at the previous FS meeting and in cabinet notes.
 2. Janet Stramel - RPK Group Update
 - a) No substantive update
 - b) The rpk feedback form is still available. You are encouraged to use that if you have comments.
 3. Staff Senate Rep
 - a) Satisfaction Survey Results are available from an [online menu](#).
 4. No Updates from other guests
 - B. Faculty Senate President Announcements
 1. KBOR/RPK Items

- a) The data team at KBOR working on Year 2 funding for our food pantry and other food pantries across the state. There are increasing prices for food and housing resources. Many others are also asking for additional funding.
 - b) Daniel Archer reported performance indicators for future cycles to KBOR. In particular, there will be some changes to math and math remediation in 2025.
2. Other Items
- a) He continues to address other concerns as they come in. Please remember to communicate with your departments to ensure clarity.

VI. Consent Agenda

A. Courses Approved by Academic Affairs for November

- 1. CHEM 100 - The Chemist's View of the World (CORE)
- 2. CHEM 105 - Introduction to Chemistry Laboratory (CORE)
- 3. CHEM 120 - University Chemistry I(CORE)
- 4. CHEM 120L - University Chemistry I Laboratory (CORE)
- 5. COMM 125 - Introduction to Motion Pictures (CORE)
- 6. LDRS 640 - Principles of Civic Leadership (CORE)
- 7. PHY 211 - Engineering Physics I (CORE)
- 8. SOCW 365 - Social Work Advanced Research Methods

B. Courses and Minors Approved by Academic Affairs for December

- 1. ART 280 - Approaches to Creativity (CORE)
- 2. ECON 202 - Principles of Macroeconomics (CORE)
- 3. GSCI 602 - Exploring Earth's History
- 4. SOCW 360 - Social Work Research Methods
- 5. New Minor - Special Education (Non-Teaching)

C. Brook Manne motioned to approve the agenda. Mary Martin seconded.

D. Discussion: Originally, one senator voted no, but he had assumed the classes would go through anyway. There was a discussion of how the agenda worked.

- 1. It can only be passed with a unanimous vote. If senators are concerned about individual courses on the agenda, they can move those courses off the agenda to discuss. Those courses would need a majority vote for approval.

E. The senate did a revote once procedures were clarified. That vote was unanimous to approve the consent agenda.

VII. Standing Committee Reports:

A. No Updates

- 1. Academic Affairs - Chair Justin Greenleaf
- 2. Partnerships and Technology - Chair Shane Schartz
- 3. Strategic Planning and Improvements - Chair Gary Brinker

B. Student Affairs - Chair Lori Kniffin

- 1. Meets tomorrow

C. University Affairs - Chair Chris Olds

1. [Faculty morale survey, 2023](#) President Mason requested an open-ended question to address any concerns respondents wanted to bring up.

VIII. New Business

A. General Education Framework Proposal:

1. Discussion Ground Rules:
 - a) The November special session was intended to present the proposal and allow for broad discussion. This discussion must focus on the issues.
 - b) The proposal was developed in a conference committee (CC) with Academic Affairs and General Education.
 - c) We cannot amend the proposal. We can only approve or reject it. If we decide to reject it, we can provide a recommendation to those that begin the work again.
 - d) The proposal is set to roll out Fall 2023 if approved.
 - e) This discussion should be a debate, not an opportunity to get clarification. It is intended for arguments for or against the proposal, not questions of fact.
2. Peter Lillpopp moved to approve the proposal and Linda Smith seconded.
3. President called on people to speak in the order in which they raised their hands. He worked to ensure that the discussion featured voices in favor of the proposal and voices against it, usually back to back. These minutes reflect that aim.
4. Discussion to approve the proposal (Pro):
 - a) Having gone through it multiple times, it appears to be a thoughtful approach to a difficult challenge. Fulfilling the KBOR requirements while still fulfilling the mission of FHSU. As with all living documents, it can be revisited in the future. By voting on this now. We are setting the tone for KBOR. It has more merits than disadvantages.
 - b) Dept of Philosophy will help departments that want to develop courses and the persuasive writing element should work well. The honors college appreciated the Philosophy department's help with that on a course already. The evidence doesn't show that single Critical Thinking (CT) courses don't work, but that some techniques work better in CT courses than other techniques. There are texts already within various disciplines that specifically address CT and should make it relatively easy for disciplines to create courses in their areas. The current PHIL 100 course also introduces the various modes of inquiry that are then expanded upon when students complete classes intended to fulfill the outcomes for those modes of inquiry.
 - c) Argument Against (Con):
 - (1) Sociology was disappointed that the proposal was not complete because of the urgency to get it done. Rushing it means we can't work on it to be better. Among other

things, the department supports an advisory panel (Faculty Advisory Panel or FAP) from multiple disciplines for the CT outcome and thinks that outcome needs to be revised quickly.

- (a) CC member noted that a change is recommended for that outcome, but ultimately when and how that outcome is revised begins with the General Education Committee (GE). GE does select FAPs and has informally discussed bringing multiple departments on it.
- d) Clarification: What would the senate approve?
 - (1) A: The senate would approve the proposal, including the recommendations in the proposal. GE did already approve it, with the recommendations.
 - (2) Q: What if it doesn't work? Will we then go back and reconsider? What if it doesn't work with Workday?
 - (3) A from Provost — Dr Angela Poole, who handles the Workday process, has been looking at this to ensure it can work with Workday.
- e) Robyn Hartman's long work with GE since the committee was first formed was recognized.
- f) CON: Intercultural competence (IC) is no longer central to the GE curriculum?
- g) PRO: The recommendation in the proposal is to merge IC with Engaged Global Citizens (Global).
- h) CON: But GE developed IC. That outcome is flawed and has difficulties. Why should GE be the committee to revise it?
 - (1) PRO: Gen ed committee has changed and learned since IC was originally created and can be trusted to revise the outcomes.
 - (2) Additionally, many IC classes may have been intended for majors and not Gen Ed more broadly. And, a global perspective must be inclusive and intercultural.
- i) Clarification: Will courses being developed for IC be considered at this point?
 - (1) A: GE meets weekly for 90 minutes. The upcoming meetings will be used to develop a timeline and prioritize the various changes that will be needed. It is trying to determine what happens to courses in the pipeline still TBD
- j) CON: There is no evidence that one CT course can improve skills. Won't adding a writing outcome confound and dilute the CT aspect of the course?
 - (1) PRO: Possin's (2022) [Field Guide to Critical Thinking Assessment](#) looks at assessment for stand-alone CT courses and how it can work well for students. It was mentioned that page 222 of that guide would be particularly relevant to

this discussion. Paul Green's (2015) chapter on [Critical Thinking for Lifelong Learning](#) also provides various recommendations for improving Critical Thinking courses. Those sources and others value individual courses on CT and the use of writing as an assessment tool in those courses.

(2) CON: The outcome isn't fulfilled by more than one class at this time. What will change to ensure it will have a number of classes that can fulfill it?

(a) A: It is conceptualized that CT has multiple classes from multiple departments. Highlighting the outcome as IDA instead of putting it in a discipline-specific area of focus can further emphasize the need for other departments to create courses in this area.

k) Clarification: Because courses elsewhere can fulfill the Gen Ed, are we looking at not having every student meet all of our outcomes?

(1) A from Provost - Biggest KBOR concern is the transferability of courses and programs. If a student completes Gen Ed at Barton CC, and transfers it here, that student's Gen Ed will be completed. If a student transfers who has, for example, 21 courses, those courses will hopefully fit into our Gen Ed courses and in our buckets. If they transfer into the outcomes they will transfer into the buckets.

l) Q: If courses haven't been updated to new outcomes, what are the ramifications?

(1) A: The plan is to have every course in our Gen Ed eventually fit into our outcomes. Hopefully, departments would move courses into our outcomes-based program to help us do assessments.

(2) Q2: Could students complete GE without meeting our outcomes? Yes. We are not assessing student learning outcomes. We are assessing course outcomes.

(3) Q3: Are we approving a plan that does not have outcomes detailed? Yes, we are approving a framework.

m) The proposal was approved (27:10:1).

IX. Questions:

A. Any updates on the situation for Chinese Faculty? Partnerships and Technology is looking at that and waiting on rpk workload report.

X. Adjournment of the regular meeting at 4:55 pm

XI. Next regular meeting - Tuesday, January 24th, 3:30 PM, in the Ballroom, Memorial Union (email Rob Byer, at srbyer@fhsu.edu, if a Zoom option is required)