

12-3-2007

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, December 3, 2007

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, 2007" (2007). *Faculty Senate*. 106.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/106

This Article 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.

FORT HAYS STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
Minutes for Regular Meeting on Monday, December 3, 2007

The meeting was called to order in McCartney 104 at 3:33 p.m. by President Dan Kulmala.

1. Approval of Minutes of Prior Meeting

- a. The November 6, 2007 minutes were unanimously approved, after a motion and second by Trantham and Huntington. There were no changes to the meeting's sign-in roster. After being moved and seconded, it carried.

2. Announcements and Information Items (no action required): Dan Kulmala

- a. Board of Regents meeting
 - Universities' Dream Packages – Dan reported there were presentations by each institution. FHSU talked mostly about the Dare to Dream package, and the Math Institute.
- b. COFSP meeting
 - Voluntary System Accountability Program. Dan noted that members talked about a voluntary system of accountability program for evaluating an institution's academic progress.
 - Faculty evaluations—See KBOR Faculty Evaluation Statement Attachment from previous meeting—Does the statement still apply? Any changes?
- c. President's Cabinet
 - Discussed background checks on employees. We are not taking action on a change at this point.
- d. President Hammond: Dare to Dream
 - Dr. Hammond attended today's meeting to address and answer questions about the various initiatives and proposals. Dan presented a summary question, "How does a university go about engaging in entrepreneurial activities?" Dr. Hammond noted he has the document of a series of questions from the previous meeting. He described such a university as an institution that manages a business undertaking and assumes some risk. We run book stores, housing operations, and food service contracts, so some degree of entrepreneurship exists. Every university that he has been a part of has some entrepreneurship.
 - Do we own these businesses? We have facilities. We didn't get out of the bookstore business but realized that someone else could manage it better. KU Bookstore is run by KU. With Barnes & Noble, we are guaranteed a certain amount of money each year or a percentage of the profits, whichever is better. Technically, we could lose money if we didn't enter into that type of contract.
 - What are we proposing to change if we have entrepreneurial activities? Design Element 3 is a three-part element, as it impacts faculty, students, and staff. The way it impacts faculty is that our university is not set up to

maximize the entrepreneurial activity of our faculty. A lot of major research universities have offices to work with faculty regarding copyrights, etc. and some partner with faculty members. We, as primarily a teaching institution, have never invested in the kind of services and support of faculty who would want to spin off intellectual activity into a very successful entrepreneurial activity. Over the last eight or nine years, faculty have been telling Dr. Hammond that they want more research and to be more like a research university. As a result, the faculty senate helped make research one of our AQIP goals. During the last five or six years, we have invested more money in the sciences for equipment. The next step is, "Do we want to put together a support system for that?" KU and K State have such support services (legal support, copyright, shared ownership, technical service) for exploring entrepreneurial activities and research . . . that could become a potential business element. For example, Robert Rook wanted to develop a program that he chose to do outside of the faculty development process, and he wanted a "partner/business" relationship to be able to offer it at a variety of institutions. The first component change would be to help faculty who want to turn something they have invented or created into something for profit. A tangible example is that neither HLI nor TOEFL is sufficient for evaluation of English language skills. Maybe our faculty could come up with something that is better. We have 2200 students in China taking one of the tests. How would we support that kind of interest? We would explore the research and expertise of our faculty.

- How does that fit in with the conflict of interest statement we sign? What share would the University have in it? Dr. Hammond doesn't see any conflict of interest. KU and K State have retained copyrights with the plan to see if they can turn a copyright over to faculty and see if we can make a go of it. A concern presented was another possibility that when faculty members have ideas, they should present their ideas to the world for free, and not necessarily follow the example of KU and K State. We shouldn't get into selling our ideas. We sell instruction, but an hour spent on marketing is an hour spent away from students. Dr. Hammond said he has been hearing from faculty about wanting to own intellectual property and profit from intellectual property. He is open to faculty ideas. There was some discussion on differences in the sciences and hard sciences; for example, the benefits of the Gatorade invention at the University of Florida, and the benefits of the time-release invention at KU. Dr. Hammond noted it would change how the University operates. We are not set up to support that kind of activity. This is an opportunity to say, "Yes," if you want that. Dr. Hammond believes the creative juices of America are what make us great. America has created new products and new services and it has driven our economy.
- The second component has to do with the student—to try to create an academic environment that supports the academic skills of our students. Students could opt into it, if they want, and create a scholarship program. We are looking at students who receive scholarships from other sources such as the Hansen Foundation and then leave Kansas and don't return to us. We could offer scholarships that would help them start a business in Kansas. We would select bright students who want to go into business,

much like is done with doctors who have to come and practice in rural areas.

- There was a question about the effect on the teaching workload as we shift from teaching to an entrepreneurial environment. Dr. Hammond noted that we are not changing our mission. One of the things we do now is give faculty release time. We would hire more faculty and would be more attractive to faculty who are interested in research and in a university that provides the services. We are not proposing to change the value of teaching. It would not impact faculty who prefer to focus on teaching only and not take advantage of this. There was some discussion about the challenges to faculty when a faculty member in the department takes release time. There was similar discussion on sabbaticals. They are under Regents policy. Dr. Hammond agreed that those are the kinds of things to consider if we go that direction. Yet, there is no answer to that. Schools that do this have a lot of non-tenured track positions and temporary or part-time instructors. That would be a negative if we did this extensively and especially for smaller departments. It's a legitimate concern.
- Do you see any funding of businesses? One of the proposals the Kauffmann Foundation is making infers we could actually own it. To bring the bio-industry to Kansas, we would supply the land and support and maybe invest in the business to come here and open up. That's the model Kauffman is suggesting – to use the university to bring businesses to Kansas. How can we use our state universities to attract businesses and people to the state? With a Bio Science Institute, we would explore whether there are specific content areas for us, and stimulate interest and activity in those areas. We are talking about a variety of interests. We would take it and try to match it with business opportunities.
- Some departments are more equipped for entrepreneurial activities. As a result, some faculty might be left on the second tier level, some faculty research would not be marketable and they would be "second class." Faculty members have a passion for their subject. Some good faculty would be relegated to secondary positions so we would need to safeguard against that. Dr. Hammond agreed that some faculty members are more entrepreneurial than others, but we must think outside the box.
- There was a question about the impact on students. Businesses are to be run by students after they graduate. They would come on a full-ride scholarship, develop the concept during their last two years here, intern in the field, and return in their senior year to develop the actual business plan. The Small Business Association would support them
- Would the University be contemplating entrepreneurship in a business that wouldn't initiate with faculty? The apartment complex, for example.
- Would the University be contemplating any businesses that might enhance education? Yes, for example, the basic proposal of the Biology Department is a joint venture to support their agenda and give the students and graduate students opportunities to work in that field. If a project doesn't enhance the university, then it's not relevant. On the other hand, the student model can be whatever business they dream up. The

host community could provide the start up resources. Those businesses wouldn't be tied to our education mission as much as the faculty ones. Some universities run hotels and conference centers and they become a lab for the students. Our Wellness Center is a sample.

- Dr. Hammond discussed the classification system for the classified employee.support staff. By moving to a University Support Staff model, the staff believes they would be more involved with their future. How do the scholarships for students, the funding for faculty entrepreneurship, and the staff becoming University employees tie together? Dr. Hammond noted they are not tied together. The staff would be assuming a risk in order to have improved benefit opportunities; that's the entrepreneur part for them.
- There was some discussion about determination of student scholarships. Dr. Hammond is hoping that someone such as the Hansen Foundation would become involved. It could have a substantial impact in northwest Kansas communities. We have not determined the criteria. First, students would have to make a commitment. If they changed their mind, they would have to repay.
- We have not looked at the cost. There may be grant money to support the activities.
- Regarding conference centers or "business laboratories," how would the department be involved if the business makes profit or if it loses? There would be shared risk. It would depend on how the proposal is set up. Dr. Hammond sees it more as "seed money" rather than an impact on department budgets, much like the China initiative. The University may assume the risk, but likely not departments.
- How would the state legislature view the University? They wouldn't treat us much differently than currently which isn't very good. The legislature tends to reward entrepreneurship.
- Who writes the contracts? Board attorneys don't get involved. It's done locally. We probably wouldn't be doing a lot of this. The amount of support would be driven by how much activity there is.
- What is the timeline for decisions? We are going to be making some decisions quickly such as the name change. The Faculty Senate is to make recommendations by March.
- Summary – The University is historically a teaching institution. It would attract a different kind of candidate to the faculty pool.

3. Reports from Committees

- a. Executive Committee: Dan Kulmala
 - CoursEval: Piloted program – in progress – thanks to Fred Britten and Ken Trantham and Jake Glover for getting the pilot in place
 - Recommendations from committees still in progress.
 - Recommendations from committees
- b. Academic Affairs: Martha Holmes.

- No report – will meet next Monday
- c. Student Affairs: Jeff Burnett
- No report
- d. University Affairs: Jerry Wilson
- New Definition of Scholarship – Dr. Gene Rice came to two of the meetings. Proposal A to change the FHSU Mission statement – Jerry reported on the vote, that all agreed to the change.
 - Proposal B: Definition of Scholarship. Jerry reported there were four “yes,” one “no,” and one abstention. Proposal B was the most debated due to the last sentence. It seemed there may have been a comma in the wrong place, not sure what it is but department chairs may be given too much say in what would determine scholarship. Dan noted the comma was kind of like an “and.” It was noted that tenure and promotion follow the criteria voted on by the department but for merit, the Chair decides. Gene noted that the “battle” would be at the department level. Dan added it would encourage each department to examine what they see as scholarship if it hadn’t done so. It was moved by Doug and seconded by Ken to accept the proposals as presented by the committee.
 - Proposal A to change the mission statement passed unanimously, but discussion continued on Proposal B
 - Having been moved by Doug and seconded by Ken to accept the proposals as presented by the committee, discussion continued.
 - There was discussion about the reason for the revision. The intent was to open possibilities. Gene Rice explained that the Research Environment Committee was trying to provide a framework for faculty who are evaluating the work of faculty who are not in their discipline. Some want the original language as it appears in the MOA.
 - Reasons against the motion to accept Proposal B: when the current form was accepted, there was much debate about “creative activity.” There is so much disagreement in this room that it doesn’t work. Is there an option in the new one for “interdisciplinary work?” Each department should provide the criteria. There was concern that going back to the original would be going backward and be limited to “publication.” It was suggested that we either vote to accept or not. Regarding the first line of the proposal, it was noted that much of what we do in science is “replication.” Another concern was about the phrase, “beyond the FHSU community.” Some want the revision to return to the Research Environment Committee to be reworked and presented again in the future. Burnett moved that the Proposal be referred back to the University Affairs Committee and Squires seconded the motion. There was one vote in opposition and one abstention. Motion carried.
- e. By-Laws and Standing Rules: Win Jordan
- No report

- f. University Marketing and Strategic Academic Partnerships: Josephine Squires
 - Nothing new other than the report sent
- 4. Reports from Special Committees and Other Representatives**
- a. Writing across the curriculum: Dan Kulmala
 - Progress going well; report by mid-February
- 5. Old Business**
- 6. New Business**
- Faculty Senate Nominees and Appointees – Dan going to pull suggestions together about various memberships on committees; we will look at available positions by March
- 7. Adjournment of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting.** A motion to adjourn the meeting was approved. The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.