

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate
Agenda for Regular Meeting on Tuesday, November 2, 2010
(3:30pm, Stouffer Lounge)

1. Approval of Minutes and Attendance of Prior Meeting

(Attachments A and B)

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

2a. Faculty Senate Reports to Departments

2b. System Council of Chief Academic Officers

2c. Council of Chief Academic Officers (Attachment C)

2d. Kansas Board of Regents

- Tiered funding of Technical Colleges
- Academic Affairs –Minimum Requirements for a Bachelor degree lowered to 120
- Video clips of Kansas Regents System student testimonials
- Blog for all supporters of Kansas higher education: kansascommitment.net
-

2e. COFSP meeting

- Faculty Senate Presidents seeking issues from faculty by Nov.5 to discuss with Regents
- Faculty morale issue – (Attachment D: ESU topics; 8-page faculty survey on our website)
- Student readiness issue

2f. President's Cabinet

- Celebrating Past Success and looking at "Age of the Unthinkable"
- Alignment of Duty to Dream, AQIP, and Foresight 2020

3. Reports from Committees –

3a. Executive Committee: Rita Hauck, Chair

3b. Academic Affairs: Jeffrey Burnett, Chair

▪

3c. Student Affairs: Denise Orth, Chair

- 150 Student Who's Who nominations

▪

3d. University Affairs: Joe Perniciaro, Chair

▪

▪

3e. By-Laws and Standing Rules: Joe Chretien, Chair

▪

3f. University Marketing and Strategic Academic Partnerships: Sharla Hutchison, Chair

- Brand-IT! Faculty Sub-committee

4. Reports from Special Committees and Other Representatives

Research Environment – Draft FHSU Scholarship Goal: Connie Eigenmann-Malik (Attachment E)

AQIP and Institutional Effectiveness: Chris Crawford (Attachment F)

AAUP Virtual College Joint Task Force: Chap Rackaway

University Mission Revision Task Force: Chris Crawford

5. Old Business

6. New Business

7. Adjournment of Regular Faculty Senate Meeting

The Essential Learning Outcomes



Beginning in school, and continuing at successively higher levels across their college studies, students should prepare for twenty-first-century challenges by gaining:

★ Knowledge of Human Cultures and the Physical and Natural World

- Through study in the sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, histories, languages, and the arts

***Focused** by engagement with big questions, both contemporary and enduring*

★ Intellectual and Practical Skills, including

- Inquiry and analysis
- Critical and creative thinking
- Written and oral communication
- Quantitative literacy
- Information literacy
- Teamwork and problem solving

***Practiced extensively**, across the curriculum, in the context of progressively more challenging problems, projects, and standards for performance*

★ Personal and Social Responsibility, including

- Civic knowledge and engagement—local and global
- Intercultural knowledge and competence
- Ethical reasoning and action
- Foundations and skills for lifelong learning

***Anchored** through active involvement with diverse communities and real-world challenges*

★ Integrative Learning, including

- Synthesis and advanced accomplishment across general and specialized studies

***Demonstrated** through the application of knowledge, skills, and responsibilities to new settings and complex problems*

Note: This listing was developed through a multiyear dialogue with hundreds of colleges and universities about needed goals for student learning; analysis of a long series of recommendations and reports from the business community; and analysis of the accreditation requirements for engineering, business, nursing, and teacher education. The findings are documented in previous publications of the Association of American Colleges and Universities: *Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College* (2002), *Taking Responsibility for the Quality of the Baccalaureate Degree* (2004), and *Liberal Education Outcomes: A Preliminary Report on Achievement in College* (2005).

Major Topics Related to the Emporia State University Faculty Input Survey

1. Communication among campus entities

- a. There is a wide breakdown in communication between faculty and the administration (including upper administration, deans, and chairs).
- b. When committees are formed and huge amounts of time are spent, the final outcomes are not reported or communicated to the faculty. Examples are the strategic plan and the faculty load report.
- c. There is no stable place where current updates on campus happenings are reported.
- d. Extreme amounts of money are spent on various things, but no reports ever make it to the faculty level (i.e., Noel Levitz).
- e. The administration is stating demands for certain things, but not communicating how this is possible (e.g., indicated 10,000 student population, increased departmental marketing efforts, increased international student population).
- f. The current voice on campus seems to be headcount matters; quality doesn't. Retain and graduate regardless.

2. Faculty recognition and respect

- a. There seems to be no recognition of the faculty work and/or professional and community contributions.
- b. The administration has shown great disrespect for the faculty by the forced initiation of office hours policy and talk of time on campus.
- c. The lack of respect for the faculty has become apparent over the past two years, as faculty hiring has been frozen, yet several new administrators have been hired.
- d. Shared governance is not a reality. For example, advisory committees (Provost and Deans) are not seen as serious groups and are nothing more than informational funnels of things that have already been decided.
- e. Some faculty members are forced to work in environments that are highly inappropriate or unhealthy (no air conditioning, crumbling walls, no ventilation, etc.)

3. Faculty compensation and time demands

- a. There are too many committees.
- b. Committees seem to either have the wrong committee leaders and/or committee members, and this causes extended and/or ineffective meetings.
- c. Due to the extreme level of expectations, the time demands do not allow for collaboration and/or the creative process.

- d. There seems to be little effort to help faculty bond through coffee, recreational activities, etc.
- e. Salary compression is a concern.
- f. Without raises, nothing has been done to reward the faculty in other ways such as free passes or reduced prices to athletic events, free passes or reduced prices to the recreation center, free passes or reduced tickets to arts and music events, free parking, tuition reduction for faculty members' spouses/dependents, increased number of GTA and GRAs.
- g. The potential of a four day class week with the fifth day available for research or professional development may be attractive.
- h. The work load caused by extreme expectations has become unmanageable and has become known as the unending day.

4. Research needs

- a. Not only should scientific and experimental research be supported financially, but some funds should be set aside for practical research efforts.
- b. Research retreats may be helpful to aid faculty in their research efforts.
- c. Mini-grants to help stimulate research and creativity activity are needed especially for the junior faculty.
- d. There is just no research or creative activity time, as the time and technology demands of the faculty have become too great.
- e. A plan to allow faculty to be released for a portion of a semester/year to perform or complete a research project should be investigated.

5. Tenure process

- a. If research is going to be the "make or break" component of being promoted, then this should receive more financial, administrative, and clerical support.
- b. The whole process is antiquated and needs a complete review.
- c. There are inequities among departments in expectations and resources to meet tenure and promotion.
- d. When raises are able to be given again, the manner in which the faculty will be viewed for these raises (only for the current year, a sum of the past three years' work, flat raises, etc.) may affect tenure and promotion, as well as merit raises.
- e. The Board of Regents obviously views ESU as a regional university and not a research institution, so why are we required to produce so much research and to place so little emphasis on teaching?

Council of Faculty Senate Presidents

Faculty Input Survey - Emporia State University

SATISFACTION

1. Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Emporia State University?

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied

2. How satisfied are you with your department as a place to work?

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied

3. How satisfied are you with the resources Emporia State University provides to support your research and scholarship?

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
Somewhat satisfied

Satisfied
Very satisfied

4. How satisfied are you with the resources Emporia State University provides to support your teaching?

Very dissatisfied
Dissatisfied
Somewhat dissatisfied
Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied
Somewhat satisfied
Satisfied
Very satisfied

More specifically, please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: (Very dissatisfied, Dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Very satisfied, Not applicable)

5. Compensation:

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
Salary								
Start-up funds								
Health care benefits								
Retirement benefits								
Support for professional development and to present papers or conduct research								

6. Resources:

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
Office space								

Lab or research space
Classroom space
Library resources
Computer resources
Clerical and administrative staff
Technical and research staff
Support for securing grants
Support for teaching

7. Teaching/advising/research/administrative service:								
	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
Workload								
Teaching responsibilities (i.e., level, number, discretion over course content)								
Advising responsibilities								
Quality of undergraduate students								
Quality of graduate students								
Expectations re: scholarship and research								
Size of classes								
Advising load								
Time available for scholarly work								
Committee and administrative responsibilities								

8. Governance and administration:

	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
Communication with university leadership								
Ability to influence decisions in department								
Ability to influence decisions at institution								
Effectiveness of university governance								
Being informed about decisions made at university								
Opportunities to collaborate with my colleagues								
Departmental climate								
Department chair's leadership								
School/college climate								
Dean's leadership								
Department fit								

9. General issues:								
	Very dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat dissatisfied	Neither dissatisfied nor satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Not applicable
The way you spend your time as a faculty member								
Quality of colleagues								
Opportunities to collaborate with colleagues								
Diversity of the campus								
Sense of fit								
Tenure requirements								
Clarity of tenure process and								

expectations

10. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following aspects of work has been a source of stress for you over the past twelve months. (Not at all; Somewhat; Extensive; Not applicable)

	Not at all	Somewhat	Extensive	Not applicable
Timing of departmental meetings and functions				
Managing a research group or grant (e.g., finances, personnel)				
Securing funding for research				
Scholarly productivity				
Teaching responsibilities				
Advising responsibilities				
Committee and/or administrative responsibilities				
Review/promotion process				
Departmental or campus politics				
Current financial situation at the institution				
Current financial situation in the state				

HIRING/RETENTION

11. In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Emporia State University?

Very unlikely	
Somewhat unlikely	
Neither likely nor unlikely	
Somewhat likely	
Very likely	

12. To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave? (Not at all; To some extent; To a great extent; Not applicable)

	Not at all	Somewhat	Extensive	Not applicable
To increase your salary				
To improve your prospects for tenure				
To enhance your career in other ways				
To find a more supportive work environment				
To increase your time to do research				
To pursue a nonacademic job				
To reduce stress				
To address child-related issues				
To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner				
To lower your cost of living				
Retirement				
Other				

13. If you had it to do over again, I would accept my current position?

Strongly disagree	
Somewhat disagree	
Somewhat agree	
Strongly agree	

14. How do you rate your institution as a place to work?

Awful	
Bad	
So-so	

Good
Great

From: Chris Crawford/FHSU

Thanks very much to the committee for their interest in this goal. Tim and Larry and many others spoke highly of this goal during PC this morning.

From: Connie S Eigenmann-Malik/FHSU
To: Rita Hauck/FHSU@FHSU, Lawrence Gould/FHSU@FHSU
Date: 10/12/2010 11:49 AM
Subject: Fw: DRAFT FHSU scholarship goal

Dear Rita,

The Research Environment Committee met October 8, 2010, and "adamantly agreed" to draft an AQIP goal revision to improve the research environment for all FHSU constituencies. On October 12, 2010, the subcommittee met to draft the goal in time for Chicago discussions. We recommend the new AQIP goal to read as forwarded.

Connie S. Eigenmann-Malik, Ph.D.
Chair, Research Environment Committee

----- Forwarded by Connie S Eigenmann-Malik/FHSU on 10/12/2010 11:26 AM -----

From: Brett Zollinger/FHSU
To: John Heinrichs/FHSU@FHSU
Cc: Paul Adams/FHSU@FHSU, Gene Rice/FHSU@FHSU, Connie S Eigenmann-Malik/FHSU@FHSU
Date: 10/12/2010 11:05 AM
Subject: DRAFT FHSU scholarship goal

GOAL:

Foster and support collaborative internal and external scholarship between students and faculty, and among faculty.

DEFINITIONS:

"Students" includes all FHSU learners at all levels: on-campus, Virtual College, strategic partnership, undergraduate, graduate, and in nontraditional initiatives like KAMS.

"External" refers to collaboration like international faculty collaboration, regional faculty collaboration, Research Experience for Undergraduates at other institutions, etc.

"Internal" refers to collaboration ranging from traditional student-faculty collaboration to URE, KAMS and faculty collaboration with Virtual College students. It also refers to cross-disciplinary scholarship between students and faculty and among faculty.



New FHSU goals

Edward Hammond to: Faculty, Staff

10/20/2010 08:48 AM

From: Edward Hammond/FHSU
To: Faculty, Staff

Last week, an eight member FHSU team of faculty, students and staff, along with a member of the Kansas Board of Regents, attended the AQIP Strategy Forum . The goal of the team was to develop a new draft of strategic goals (AQIP Action Projects) that align to the new Kansas Board of Regents Foresight 2020 strategic plan and our "Duty to Dream". The outcome of our Strategy Forum was the creation of four new draft strategic goals for the University.

Learner Outcomes

- a. Improve essential/foundational skills
- b. Implement the Undergraduate Research Experience project

Enrollment Growth

- a. Serve more Kansas adult learners
- b. Increase Hispanic student enrollment

Alignment

- a. Continue alignment with NCKTC
- b. Review FHSU mission, vision, values, role and scope

Persistence

- a. Increase retention of traditional student population to 76%
- b. Improve persistence of virtual learners
- c. Facilitate transfer student success
- d. Develop English competencies for cross-border student success

In the following months we will have time to consult and a great deal of work as we prepare to transition to these new strategic goals. Thanks for your assistance in sharing these new goals and we look forward to fuller consideration across campus on how to best achieve these important objectives for the University.

Edward H Hammond
President

The FHSU Chapter of the AAUP is asking the faculty we represent what you would prefer if the AAUP were to successfully negotiate an increase in base salaries for the bargaining unit. This suggestion, while seemingly fanciful, has a basis in reality. On several occasions and in several public forums, Dr. Hammond stated his desire to increase salaries for faculty. This would not seem to be mere rhetoric since Dr. Hammond has suggested the same in a few casual conversations. From appearances, there may be an earnest effort by the Administration to make-up lost ground for the past two years of no faculty wage increases.

Prudence, however, dictates that AAUP should be prepared to act and react quickly in any negotiations that result in higher base salaries for faculty. To that end, the AAUP and its MOA bargaining team need to know the faculty's preference in allotting any salary increase. AAUP would like your input – whether or not you are a member of the local chapter. Your voice, your choice, is important for us to know.

Suggested options for salary increases:

1. only a flat % increase
2. only merit increases
3. only market adjustments
4. monies split between flat % and merit
5. monies split between flat % and market adjustments
6. monies split between market adjustments and merit
7. monies split between flat %, market adjustment, and merit

Discussion points to consider:

The Consumer Price Index, a measure of inflation, indicates prices today are almost identical to prices in 2008, thus no cost of living increase

Market adjustments would endeavor to “fix the floor” and allocate increases to those positions that lie the farthest from the market median of their field. Salary increases toward market adjustments will make FHSU more competitive in recruitment and retention of quality faculty, a regents and administrative goal.

In regard to questions 4-7, the final breakdown in disbursement of funds will be negotiated between AAUP and the administration, though there will be an option in the online survey for specific input.

The survey will be available online from Nov. 29-Dec. 3.

DISCUSSION AGENDA

VIII. Consideration of Discussion Agenda

A. Academic Affairs

Regent Hedges

1. Act on Request to Modify Regents Policy on Minimum Requirements for a Baccalaureate Degree

Gary Alexander,
VP, Academic Affairs

Summary and Recommendations

The Kansas Board of Regents Policy and Procedures Manual, Ch. IV.14, requires that bachelor's degrees in liberal arts, sciences or professional fields require a minimum of 124 semester credit hours. This item requests changing that policy to require a minimum of 120 semester credit hours for the baccalaureate degree. Staff recommends approval of this policy change.

Current Board Policy

Board policy (Ch. IV.14) states:

(b) "Baccalaureate degree" means a degree:

(i) Requiring the equivalent of at least four academic years of full-time postsecondary study consisting of courses totaling a minimum of 124 semester credit hours in the liberal arts, sciences or professional fields.

(ii) Incorporating in its program design the equivalent of two or more academic years of full-time study consisting of courses totaling a minimum of 60 semester credit hours from institutions that have a majority of degree conferrals at or above the baccalaureate level, and a minimum of 45 semester credit hours in upper division courses. Institutions are not permitted to make programmatic exceptions. Institutions may make a limited number of exceptions from the 60-hour requirement for individual students, up to a maximum of 6 hours.

(iii) The degree shall require distinct specialization, i.e., a "major," which should entail approximately the equivalent of one academic year of work in the main subject plus one academic year in related subjects, or two academic years in closely related subjects within a liberal arts interdisciplinary program.

(iv) The equivalent of the first two academic years of full-time study (associate degree programs ordinarily require 64, but in some cases may extend up to 72, semester credit hours) may be from institutions that have a majority of degree conferrals below the baccalaureate level. (5-16-02)

Proposed Modification

This item proposes a change to the KBOR Policy Manual to set the minimum number of credit hours required for baccalaureate degree completion at 120:

(i) Requiring the equivalent of at least four academic years of full-time postsecondary study consisting of courses totaling a minimum of ~~124~~ 120 semester credit hours in the liberal arts, sciences or professional fields.

This proposed revision has been discussed with the Council of Chief Academic Officers of the six public universities and has their support as a minimum credit hour requirement.

Rationale for the Proposed Change

The current minimum number of hours for Kansas baccalaureate degrees was set in 2003. Changing from a minimum of 124 to 120 semester credit hours makes Kansas' requirements consistent with the majority of other states across the country. As indicated in the attached chart, some 39 states currently require a minimum of 120

semester hours and at least two others have considered adopting this requirement. Given the high degree of student mobility today and the fact that many receive bachelor's degrees from an institution other than the one at which they began study, establishing consistency with regard to minimum baccalaureate degree requirements should benefit students by creating improved efficiency and transferability of credit.

Concern has been voiced that this proposed change represents a dilution of the quality of programs offered by the public universities. Considering that the 120 credit minimum is applied at the great majority of universities across the country—including some of the strongest universities and university systems in the nation—it is difficult to support this argument. In addition, no academic program at a Kansas university will be required to make program changes based on this proposed policy.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the proposed change.

Minimum Semester Hour Requirements by State as of 2010

State	Associate	Bachelor
1. Alabama	60	120
2. Alaska	60	120
3. Arizona		Adopts standards/criteria of the institutions accrediting agency
4. Arkansas		120
5. California		120
6. Colorado	60	120
7. Florida		120
8. Georgia		120
9. Hawaii		120
10. Idaho		128 (considering moving to 120)
11. Indiana	64	Proposed programs evaluated by standards of similar programs in public or private postsecondary institutions
12. Illinois		120
13. Kansas	60	124
14. Kentucky		120
15. Maryland		120
16. Louisiana	60	120
17. Michigan	60	120
18. Minnesota	60	120
19. Mississippi		120
20. Missouri		Program must be consistent with similar programs at other higher education institutions in the state
21. Nebraska		120
22. Nevada	60	120
23. New Hampshire		120
24. New Jersey	60	120
25. New Mexico	60	120

State	Associate	Bachelor
26. New York	60	120
27. North Carolina		120
28. Oklahoma		120
29. Ohio	60	120
30. Oregon	60	120
31. Rhode Island		120
32. Pennsylvania	60	120
33. South Carolina	60	120
34. South Dakota		128
35. Tennessee	60	120
36. Texas	60	120
37. Utah	60	120
38. Virginia		120
39. West Virginia		128
40. Wisconsin		120
41. Wyoming		120