

Fort Hays State University

## FHSU Scholars Repository

---

Faculty Senate

---

3-6-2001

### Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 6, 2001

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all)

---

#### Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, March 6, 2001" (2001). *Faculty Senate*. 930.

[https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen\\_all/930](https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/930)

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

Minutes for Regular Meeting  
of  
March 6, 2001

**3:30 called to order**

**1. Announcements and Information Items (no action required)**

- 1a. Art Morin reported that the budget predictions may not bode well for faculty salaries. The faculty is being careful not to suggest use of faculty salary money to help balance budget.
- 1b. Art Morin reported that he, Provost Gould, and Paul have reached agreement on the need for research-based good teaching practices. So far they have only talked about the formation of a committee.
- 1c. Art Morin and Paul Adams would like to have workshops on continuous quality improvement.
- 1d. The deadline for submission of AQIP goals is April 7, 2001.

**2. Approval of Minutes of Prior Meetings**

- 2a. February 5, 2001 minutes. Approval of the minutes was moved by Paul Adams, seconded by John Durham and approved unanimously by the faculty.

**3. Reports from Committees**

- 3a. Academic Affairs - the committee brought forth three proposals:
  - (i) New BA/BS program in Organization Leadership. Curt Brungardt and Rick Peters were present to discuss the proposal. Martha Holmes mentioned that the proposal had been under discussion in committee for 3 months and that the vote in committee was 4-1-0. Doug Drabkin asked if there was a rationale for the "no" vote, and Martha Holmes responded negatively. Dick Leeson asked if there is a difference between the BA and BS, and Curt Brungardt responded that the only difference is the foreign language requirement. The question was called, and the proposal was approved by a voice vote.
  - (ii) GSCI 544/744: John Heinrichs was present to discuss the course. Martha Holmes reported that the vote in committee was 5-0-0 to approve the course with a change in number, which had been done. The faculty voted unanimously to approve the course.
  - (iii) Nursing course package: Martha Holmes reported that the vote in committee was 5-0-0 to approve the package with several changes, which had been received. The faculty voted unanimously to approve the package.
- 3b. By-Laws and Standing rules - no report
- 3c. University Affairs - Marty Shapiro proposed a change to the university's tenure/promotion policy. When tenure and promotions are reviewed, they should be by specific departmental criteria. There have been cases where additional criteria have appeared in reviews. Dick Leeson asked if the departmental criteria would be in addition to university-wide criteria, and Marty Shapiro answered affirmatively. Provost Gould asked if the Regents policy handbook would apply as well, and Art Morin suggested that additional language to clarify the issue be added. Amy Fisher said that we could probably assume that departmental criteria wouldn't contradict Regents or university criteria, and asked if the Provost examined the criteria for conflict. The Provost answered affirmatively. The motion was amended to add the suggested phrase, and was approved unanimously by the faculty. The Provost reminded the Senate that tenure and promotion are conditions of employment, subject to AAUP negotiations
- 3d. Student Affairs: no report

- 3e. External Affairs and Faculty Salaries - Merlene Lyman-Baird passed out a spreadsheet on comparison of faculty benefits between FHSU and its peer universities. Art Morin asked if this was a preliminary report, and Merlene Lyman answered affirmatively. Dick Leeson commented that North Michigan University has superior benefits and is represented by AAUP.
- 3f. Executive Committee: Art Morin mentioned that there was discussion of assessing the course approval process in the Academic Affairs Committee to determine whether course criteria are explicitly articulated, in spirit of making the process work better. Art Morin brought forth Resolution 008 from Executive Committee, to request that the Provost make the AQIP process more visible via WWW. Larry Gould provided brief report: Rob Scott is putting information on Web, he has more materials & will give them to Donna Northam for the library. Rob Scott indicated that Suzanne Klaus will make a direct link from Assessment page. The resolution was approved unanimously by the faculty.

#### **4. Old Business**

No old business

#### **5. New Business**

Art Morin initiated a discussion of the AQIP goals and passed out a handout with the current set of goals. The most pressing issue is the proposed 5th goal, along the lines of "underscore commitment to research, scholarship, and creativity" or "increase support for ...". Art Morin asked what measurable goals can be used to evaluate performance relative to goal. Increased # of publications? A quota system? A standard for increased grants? Another issue is how goal #2 relates to advising. Patricia Griffin began the discussion on this goal with a brief report. The current system is out-of-date, not user friendly, and not user-accessible. The new information system, on which the university is taking bids, would make the role of advisor more than just key entry. The new system would allow students to play around with possibilities. They are not looking to do away with advising; rather, the new system should help advisors. The administration would like to spread early registration load over the entire semester, and wants to increase relationship with students, increase efficiency, and encourage students to take responsibility. Steve Trout advocated a system to allow students to enroll themselves. Patricia Griffin said that Sunguard (one of the potential packages) allows this. She does not want students to be able to do whatever they want but to increase flexibility. Doug Drabkin supports what Steve suggests, and sees no reason to preclude students from enrolling themselves. This would develop a culture to encourage students to come to advisor. Amy Fisher asked how the system would work if students do enroll themselves. Patricia Griffin said that the advisor must release enrollment. Students at risk, and freshmen, would have to see advisors. Amy Fisher asked if parents would be upset if students enroll in wrong things. Patricia Griffin said that this could be a problem. Janice Smith said that Virtual College and graduate students often can't be on campus to enroll. She wants to do things to accommodate distance students. John Heinrichs commented that if enrollment was all electronic, advisors might be unable to encourage students to head in a certain direction. Patricia Griffin responded that efficiency would provide more opportunity to talk to students. Steve Trout opined that the proposal is highly commendable. Provost Gould said that he is amazed about productivity of program and the great variety of query options - this is one of the few times when technology can make a major difference. John Heinrichs asked if prerequisites, corequisites, and transfer equivalencies would be built in? Patricia Griffin and Provost Gould answered in the affirmative. Janice Smith said that as someone coming from a university with a newer system, students would love it. She recommends using common prefixes for Regents institutions. Patricia Griffin said that the transition process would be slow (up to 3 years). Provost Gould said that it is important to note that is about psychology, not technology - we need to create psychology of acceptance and must expect challenges. The program has not been selected, and the administration is still reviewing proposals (expected 30 month time frame). Patricia Griffin said she wants ideas and concerns from the faculty - please express them to her. Art Morin asked if there was a consensus that in-person advising is still important, but could be improved with a new computer system. There was general agreement on this

point.

Discussion then began on the proposed 5<sup>th</sup> goal. Art Morin noted that we do mention research in goal C. Doug Drabkin said he isn't sure what C means by selecting programs. Does that mean we look around for what is good and reward it? Steve Trout said he wasn't clear what a research program is. John Durham commented that we seem to be good at selecting programs for extinction. Provost Gould stated that according to Goals 2001, research is a priority. Furthermore, a large fraction of the money for sabbaticals and release time is not being applied for currently. Doug Drabkin asked if we will select programs and try to make them more distinctive. Larry Gould said that we will work on opportunities for improvement (another word for weakness). Doug Drabkin asked if we will work on the general climate for research. Janice Smith expressed the concern in her department that research and scholarly activities are critical to keeping life in faculty because we're out in the middle of nowhere. Art Morin asked if Janice meant the support should be a signal or symbolic. Janice Smith said the support needs to be more than symbolic. If service and teaching can be measured quantitatively for tenure, why not for research. Amy Fisher said that there is no way given faculty teaching loads to do research to meet a quota – it scares her if the university goes for a number count. Steve Sedbrook asked if "general climate" means to change our mission and whether more faculty and facilities would be made available? Doug Drabkin asked how goal C addresses the issue. Art Morin gave some potential language: Underscore our commitment to research, scholarship, and creative work. This would involve increasing sabbaticals, release time, and funding dollars and should result in increased production of art shows, books, and papers. John Heinrichs asked if more resources would be made available, or will whip be cracked? Art Morin responded that the whip would be cracked more for those getting resources. Rob Scott emphasized the need to have performance indicators. Paul Adams stated that resources are available that are not being taken advantage of (sabbatical money, release time). Joe Aistrup said that if these are going unused, perhaps resources should be used elsewhere. If support is increased, standards for output are needed. His department is opposed to the 5<sup>th</sup> goal. Dick Leeson asked if it would be up to departments to measure performance. This proposal is needed to separate us from community college. Provost Gould said that Goal C is an ongoing goal in strategic plan, AQIP objectives are in a three-year time frame. He is willing to recommend to president if we approve the 5<sup>th</sup> goal, but there must be accountability. Janice Smith said that measures are good because students don't think research is important. For example, the library needs to have measures (number of website hits, materials checked out, etc.). John Heinrichs said that the Geosciences department is opposed to the proposed goal. It seemed to be all risk with no benefit commensurate to the amount of hassle and paperwork required. Doug Drabkin said he is ashamed that money is not used and that a good measure would be to get sabbatical applications up, more than funds being made available. Joe Aistrup expressed his sense that something needs to be done - sharpening of what we do. Risk might not be a bad thing. Dick Leeson: Agreed with Joe, asks John Heinrichs if we need people to be motivated, if we want outcome of more scholarly work. John Heinrichs responded that his department does want the outcome (increased support), but doesn't think an AQIP goal is good way to do it. Dick Leeson responded that benchmarks are there because people need benchmarks. Carolyn Kells said that if not all of the sabbatical and release time funds have been used, it forces us to look at barriers like illness and no more time in the calendar. Art Morin asked if it is difficult to acquire reassign time in department? Carolyn Kells responded in the affirmative, that it is hard to find an additional person. Janice Smith said that as a junior faculty member, applying for release time money is too time-consuming. Paul Adams said that AQIP is all about process: continual improvement and identifying barriers. Perhaps we need grant-writing workshops. Steve Trout agreed with Paul, there is a disconnect between expressed interest in scholarship and the lack of interest in sabbaticals and release time. He thought that the faculty have a feeling that scholarship is the thing to drop when time gets tight. Paul Adams said that if faculty value the goal, then faculty would be involved in addressing problem. Provost Gould said that one reason for the development of the reassign time policy is to deal with the issue for small departments, but big departments have taken advantage. He mentioned that the requirement for paperwork on the new goal would be large. The university would have to develop 8-20 performance indicators by March 20 and might have to drop another goal. Art Morin asked what the measures are for goal 3. Rob Scott responded: retention,



satisfaction, and job placement. John Durham said that if the new goal is in, it represents an evolution not a revolution, and that a 2% or 5% improvement might be sufficient. Attention is a finite quantity – something will have to decrease in emphasis. He agrees with the Provost that some other goal must be removed. Janice Smith said that retention isn't student success and satisfaction isn't – how are we measuring that? Provost Gould agreed with Janice – the only real measure is whether students have learned, just like faculty productivity is measured by learning outcome. Doug Drabkin said that if we are measuring complacency or contentment, we should drop that goal. He asked Rob Scott if that really is what is being measured. Rob Scott said that the committee had battled over this issue. Provost Gould said that the 3rd goal actually measures the *environment* in which students can become successful (for example, sequencing courses), not success itself. Art Morin said that's why those specific measures are used. Doug Drabkin asked why not put sabbaticals under Goal 3? Provost Gould said that sabbaticals are a measure of Goal F. Amy Fisher said she thinks FHSU already has a goal of supporting research. Rather than going into a new AQIP goal we should go through the AQIP process for 3 years before adding any new ones. She can't find a replacement so there is no realistic possibility of increasing her research activity. Art Morin asked if this is a general problem? There were many nods from the members. Joe Aistrup said that the question is what we want to improve upon. We should challenge ourselves. Provost Gould said that FHSU is way below our expected levels of grant activity. Joe Aistrup indicated we should wait for a year or two before we actually put the goal in. He doesn't mind putting our feet to the fire. Rob Scott said that the 3-5 AQIP goals aren't the only things we want to improve on. Not putting the goal in doesn't mean we won't do it. Janice Smith brought up the issue of faculty retention and asked what environment we need? Doug Drabkin said that the work "environment" might be the key. Perhaps the research environment needs to be improved. Dean Faber's lunchtime talks were a good idea. Ray Johnson moved to include goal 5, that we already have a supportive environment – why reinvent the wheel? Paul Adams said that we identified it as a weakness, why not work on it? Steve Sedbrook said that this was a different proposal – members would need to discuss it with their departments. Doug Drabkin seconded Ray's motion. Art Morin said that it might be possible to get an extension on the AQIP goals and benchmarks. John Durham moved to table the discussion until the next meeting. Steve Trout seconded the motion to table, which was approved by a voice vote.

## 6. Reports from Liaisons

- 6a. Classified senate - no report
- 6b. Student Government: Ervin Eltze reported that Dr. Hammond attended the SGA meeting last week to explain why he opposes increases in tuition (this late in year would impose problems on students).
- 6c. General Education: Duane Renfrow reported that the Committee met and has several proposals (Personal Wellness and updates to the General Education advisor handbook). The committee also has looked at assessment of GenEd courses for recertification and is establishing subcommittees to look at the issue.
- 6d. Instructional Technology A number of items were reported by Tom Wiese:
  - (i) There is an ITV replacement coming, an IT-based network to 5 community colleges.
  - (ii) LearningSpace will be discontinued at the end of this semester.
  - (iii) A problem with forwarding of student email to non-scatcat accounts exists - students should be reminded to set this up.
  - (iv) a new student portal will debut in the fall. The Faculty Senate can see a demo if it wishes.
  - (v) A new English computerized classroom will be used to test wireless networking. There are security concerns with wireless networking.
  - (vi) The committee will be addressing a number of issues related to the new administrative computing system.
- 6e. Virtual College Advisory Committee - Donna Northam reported that the committee has met. A draft statement of instructional design modes for distance learning was presented in committee, policies for distance learning and disabilities (particularly how students inform the university that they have special needs), were discussed, and a quantity of information was presented on distance

teaching for Navy. There was also committee discussion on testing for Virtual College courses. Provost Gould reported that the administration, and particularly the Provost and Dean of the Virtual College, cannot participate in a forum about the Virtual College because of ongoing AAUP negotiations.

6f. Library Committee - Duane Renfrow reported that the committee is attempting to set a date for a meeting.

6g. Faculty and Staff Development Committee - has met.

6h. Report from AAUP Liaison - Doug Drabkin began by expressing his astonishment that the Provost and Dean of the Virtual College cannot participate in the forum - he thinks it an unfortunate misunderstanding. Negotiations are continuing and are focused on the Virtual College, sabbaticals, tenure/promotion, and salaries. All parties have agreed that increase in faculty salaries are desirable. AAUP wants to hear ideas from the Faculty Senate, but does not represent the senate.

## 7. Adjournment

Paul Adams moved to adjourn and Duane Renfrow seconded the motion, which passed unanimously. The meeting was therefore adjourned at 5:40 PM.