

Minutes for Faculty Senate meeting on Monday 2nd December at 12:30 pm in KSUC 300

Attendance: Jonathan Brown, Richard Mosholder, Ginny Boss, Joseph Dirnberger, Barbara Wood, Robbie Lieberman, Christine Zelt, Kat Schwaig, Ron Matson, Diana Gregory, Andrea Knowlton, Jeff Yunek, Jim Davis, Tim Frank, Ken Hoganson, Hassan Pournaghshband, Cristen Dutcher, Abhra Roy, Humayun Zafar, Doug Moodie, Randy Stuart, Albert Jimenez, Marielle Myers, James Gambrell, Anissa Vega, Jillian Ford, Laurie Tis, Peter St. Pierre, Rene McClatchey, Mary Beth Maguire, Justin Pettigrew, Tim Hedeem, Todd Harper, Joanne Lee, Noah McLaughlin, Paul McDaniel, Jennifer Dickey, Rebecca Hill, Steve Collins, Daniel Rogers, Darina Lepadatu, Uttam Kokil, Michael Van Dyke, Bill Griffiths, Jerald Hendrix, Louise Lawson, Matthew Wilson, Scott Tippens, Walter Thain, Jeff Wagner, Ying Wang,

Administration

- 1) Acceptance of Minutes – Todd Harper (5 minutes)
 - i) Minutes were accepted and approved.
- 2) Provost Report – Dr. Schwaig (15 minutes)
 - a) Compression and Inversion: A dual-appointment agreement to bring in an outside consultant from UGA was reached. As a result, Provost Schwaig announced that meetings with the committee are currently being set up. She will update us at the next meeting.
 - b) Several Searches:
 - i) There will be a national search for the leadership position for the Division of Global Affairs. Dr. Sheb True currently holds that position as interim. The search will be launched in the spring.
 - ii) A Search for the Vice-President of Finance is currently being conducted. Candidates are currently visiting campus.
 - iii) A Search for the Chief Institutional Officer has concluded its candidate visits, and the committee will be making a recommendation soon.
 - iv) A Search for the Vice-President of Student Affairs is currently on-going.
 - c) Senator Noah McLaughlin asked whether any decision had been made about the Global Learning Scholarship. Provost Schwaig responded that the decision about the Global Learning Fee will stand in terms of that fee being reduced. However, the President and Provost are committed to funds to help offset the loss incurred by the reduction of the fee, such as raising donor funds. Currently, the Provost's office and Dr. Sheb True are working with the Office of Development to see what funds might be raised there. In addition, the President and Provost have already allocated \$280,000 to help offset losses from the fee.
- 3) Deans Council liaison – Jennifer Purcell's approval

- a) President Doug Moodie announced that Senator Jennifer Purcell had been nominated as Deans Council Liaison. He then asked for additional nominations. None were given.
- b) A motion was made and seconded to accept Senator Purcell's nomination. Motion passed unanimously.

4) Task force, etc. reports – Ron Matson, Pam Cole (15 minutes)

- a) Dr. Matson updated the Senate on various taskforces.
 - i) Compression and Inversion Taskforce had already been announced by Provost.
 - ii) Taskforce on Centers and Institutes met on the 22nd of November. They examined the history of the process, especially between 2015-17. Dr. Matson has asked Deans and Chairs to report centers and institutes affiliated with their colleges and departments so that the taskforce can get an accurate count. This will be a starting point for this committee. Dr. Ed Adkins has provided a great deal of information through a D2L site from the previous taskforce on centers and institutes. The overall goal of the taskforce is to codify and simplify the process for creating, maintaining, and dissolving centers and institutes.
 - iii) Faculty Awards Committee has met. A final report was completed and submitted to the Provost on the 5th of November. Currently, the Provost's office is working with the committee on fine tuning some of the suggestions. In addition, the committee is working on rewording the application process as well as restructuring the various awards committees. Dr. Matson hoped that the process would be finished before the winter break.
 - iv) Taskforce to discuss Merit Raises. The goal of this committee is to establish a transparent system in case there are merit raises for next year. They met on the 15th of November to discuss what Deans and Chairs had done last year. Issues were raised whether to give a flat amount or a percentage. No decisions were made.
 - v) Taskforce on Post-Tenure Review. Dr. Matson has submitted a report with recommendations as well as additional material that was requested by the Provost and President concerning post-tenure review at sister institutions.
 - vi) Taskforce on Summer Terms. They have had one preliminary meeting. An additional meeting will take place later in December. Dr. Matson had nothing to add.
 - vii) Senator Collins asked about what was found concerning PTR at other institutions. Although he did not have the report in front of him, Dr. Matson did note that most sister institutions do nothing. One institution does provide a one-time reward for travel or supplies. One institution does provide a dollar amount for PTR. (Dr. Matson that it was \$1000-1500; however, he could not remember for certain.) When asked how many schools within the system did not respond, Dr. Matson said that he thought that there were five, but could not be certain without the report in front of him.
 - viii) A senator asked about the task force on merit raises and what the methods or criteria would be for looking at merit raises. Nothing is set to change right now. Currently, each college decides merit raises differently. (For the time being, that will likely not change, nor will there be a university-wide method and set of criteria.) The goal of the committee is to make sure that whatever methods are used is transparent.

b) Pam Cole made two announcements.

- i) USG General Education Revision: A system-wide committee met to examine core competencies (called Domains) and to submit recommendations to Executive Vice-Chancellor Tristan Denley. The Vice-Chancellor has taken those recommendations and will present a summary and possible models at the next system-wide committee meeting in January. Dr. Kris DuRocher, KSU Director of General Education, represents the university on this committee. We will likely receive more specific information during the Spring semester. Right now, it is not clear what the final revision will look like.
- ii) Academic Program Review (in some places called Comprehensive Program Review). She introduced Dr. Jen Wells, Director of Assessment, who will help lead the Academic Program Review. The first piece for the taskforce will be to determine APR will be to develop a template. Here are some of the categories that the taskforce will look at as it considers various templates: 1) Curriculum and Assessment, such as Curriculum requirements, program assessments, program changes, etc.; 2) Student characteristics, such as enrollment, demographics, recruitment, retention, etc.; 3) Faculty Characteristics, such as credentials, scholarships, grants, workload, etc.; 4) Resources and infrastructure, such as support staff, resources, facilities, technology, and budget. We hope that the process is faculty driven.

- (1) Dr. Jen Wells than spoke. They are applying feedback from a focus groups to make this more faculty driven. There will be several pieces to the timeline: orientation, self-study, external reviewer selection, submission of self-study to external reviewer, external review, provost feedback, and final submission. Early May would confirm programs. August, programs would meet. Then September and October would be the self-study. The Spring Semester would include selecting the external reviewers, submitting the self-study to the external reviewers, external reviewer visit and report, and program's response to the external report. During the summer, the Provost would review the self-study, the external report, the program's response to and plan regarding the external report. August would see the summary reports finalized and uploaded. (Important: this is for programs without an accrediting body. The taskforce will be looking at what to do differently with programs that are accredited so that there is no duplication of effort.)
- (2) A Senator asked whether there were any documents that spelled this out. Ms. Wells noted that this is currently in draft form; however, a document will be circulated for feedback in the near future.
- (3) Another Senator asked how that feedback will be brought back to group. Ms. Wells noted that once the committees for looking at APR are formed, then they will develop a plan to provide ample time for feedback to the committee.

5) Reports – see attachments

Old Business

- 6) GEC – motion to call for a task force to consider membership – Doug Moodie
 - i) President Moodie made the following motion for a taskforce (item 6ii).
 - ii) *The Faculty Senate charges the General Education Committee (GEC) to develop a Task Force to make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding the membership of the GEC. The Task Force should be comprised of one representative from each degree-granting college plus Kris DuRocher to represent the Provost.*
 - iii) President Moodie and Dr. Cole then provided the following justification, which President Moodie had outlined when he sent the agenda (item 6iv).
 - iv) *The GEC needs to be able to deal quickly but effectively with the new USG guidelines for the common General Education Core that are expected next year (maybe March 2020 for implementation in Fall 2021). The GEC may identify/elect representatives from within their own membership or they may go outside their membership to other teaching faculty in their college. If a college currently has only one representative, that individual may identify a proxy to serve on the Task Force. Concerns have been raised about the GEC weighing too heavily towards certain colleges and for being too large to work effectively. The deadline for submitting the list of members for the Task Force to the Senate Executive Committee is 18th January 2020. The Task Force is charged with bringing forth 3 viable options to the Senate for discussion. These models should be presented to Faculty Executive Committee no later than the March 16 Faculty Executive agenda.*
 - v) Motion carried 28 in favor, 2 against.

New Business

1. Mathematics Placement Policy – Bill Griffiths – see attachment (10 minutes)
 - i) Senator Bill Griffiths noted that the Math has two paths to Calculus, a) two courses Math 1111 (College Algebra) and Math 1112 (Trigonometry), or b) a one-semester Math 1113, which combines both courses. The decision was made to eliminate Math 1112 and, in its place, put a revised Math 1113 as pre-calculus. Thus, the proposal is now for two semesters, Math 1111 (College Algebra) and Math 1113 (Pre-Calculus), or, for those who qualify, one semester of Math 1113. (Proposal is formally stated below in 1ii.)
 - ii) Mathematics Placement Policy Students seeking to enroll in the following courses without taking pre-requisite courses may do so under the following conditions:
MATH 1113 · High school GPA ≥ 2.8 · AND · ACT math score ≥ 23 OR SAT math score ≥ 570 OR · By Placement Exam · · MATH 1190 · High school GPA ≥ 3.2 · AND · ACT math score ≥ 26 OR SAT math score ≥ 620 (600 if taken prior to March 2016) OR · By Placement Exam MATH 1160 · High school GPA \geq

- 3.2 · AND · ACT math score ≥ 26 OR SAT math score ≥ 620 (600 if taken prior to March 2016) OR · By Placement Exam
- iii) While this would normally be a UPCC issue, the fact that this effects the math placement policy, which is published in catalogue and the student handbook, that necessitates the proposal being brought to Faculty Senate.
 - iv) Senator Randy Stuart asked if the faculty in math want this, and, if they do, then she was willing to make a motion. Dr. Griffiths responded in the affirmative, and a motion was made as well as seconded.
 - v) Another Senator wondered if the Senate was qualified to discuss issues of Math. Dr. Griffith argued that the Senate was qualified to deliberate on a General Education requirement such as this.
 - vi) Dr. Cole noted that this is a policy that needs to come to the senate since it effects all students. If it were it a policy that only affected a few groups of students, then it would not need to come before the Senate.
 - vii) Senator Steve Collins asked whether Math was eliminating a lower level course in order to establish more rigor in both classes. Dr. Griffiths noted that this really affects those on an approach to calculus. They are eliminating a course that tried to combine College Algebra and Trigonometry in a way that did justice to neither area and thus did not prepare its students. Moreover, there are courses that are being developed for those students who don't need College Algebra as the first course.
 - viii) Senator Louise Lawson noted that they are proposing a statistics path.
 - ix) Motion passed with 28 in favor and 2 against.

2. Can lecturers vote for P&T committees? – Bill Griffiths

- i) Senator Bill Griffiths presented a proposal that would allow departments the ability to decide who can vote for P&T committee members. Currently, University policy states that only TT faculty can vote for P&T committee members, even though many P&T committee review lecturer portfolios for promotion. (Conversely, University policy does not allow for lecturers to participate in voting for committee members who will review the portfolios.) The proposal would allow departments the say in who is able to vote for P&T committee members. (Important note: This is not about the make-up P&T committee. Those rules would remain intact.) (Proposal stated below as 2ii)

- ii) Motion: The Faculty Senate recommends that academic departments, through their by-laws, be enabled to determine the voting eligibility for their department P&T committees.
- iii) Senator Randy Stuart asked whether it would only be senior lecturers since only people higher in rank can vote for those who are lower. Dr. Griffiths clarified that this was not to appoint lecturers to P&T bodies, but to allow departments the ability to let lecturers vote on qualified candidates to serve on the P&T committees.
- iv) A Senator stated that her department already allows everyone a vote for qualified candidates on those committees. Dr. Griffiths responded that he was simply wanting to legitimize this process.
- v) Senator Daniel Rogers added that they used to all lecturers and TT faculty the ability to vote for qualified candidates until they inquired with Academic Affairs, who advised them that the current policy forbade them.
- vi) Senator Griffiths made a motion for the proposal, and it was seconded.
- vii) Motion passed with 29 in favor and 1 against.

3. Graduate College - Jennifer Purcell

- i) Senator and Former Present Purcell presented the following proposal. (3ii)
- ii) *The Faculty Senate resolves to establish an ad hoc committee of 5 graduate faculty to evaluate the policy-related function of the GPCC and, more broadly, to clarify, formalize, and codify decision-making authority and processes related to the graduate enterprise, including but not limited to the curriculum, program oversight, academic policies, and operations, per USG and KSU policy and principles of shared governance. The committee will work with the GPCC Executive Committee and Graduate College Dean or his representative and will present written monthly updates on its progress and present its findings and recommendations during a Senate meeting no later than the March 2020 Faculty Senate meeting."*
- iii) One Senator wondered whether there should be two committees, a concern that he felt was expressed at a recent Graduate College meeting. Dr. Purcell stated that she felt that the two committees would be helpful and complement each other.
- iv) Senator Randy Stuart asked if Dr. Purcell had discussed this committee with Dean Dishman. Dr. Purcell noted that she had and that he was supportive of this effort.
- v) Motion passed with 29 in favor and 1 against.

4. Meeting adjourned at 1:30 P.M.