



January 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, Jan 28th 12:30-1:45pm Marietta Ballroom A-B

- I. Call to Order**
 - A. Welcome – Dr. Jennifer Purcell
 - B. President’s Update – President Pamela Whitten
 - C. Provost’s Update – Interim Provost Ron Matson

- II. Approval of the Agenda**

- III. Approval of Minutes**

- IV. Reports**

- V. Old Business**
 - A. Elsevier Subscription – Dr. David Evans
 - B. Curriculum Process Handbook Language Proposal – Dr. Pam Cole
 - C. Faculty Workload Handbook Language Proposal – Dr. Ron Matson
 - D. Distance Learning Updates & Proposed Online Course Rubric – Dr. Tammy Powell

- VI. New Business**
 - E. Elections
 - 1. FS Liaison to the Chairs and Directors Assembly
 - 2. FS Liaison to the Deans Council
 - F. Student Global Learning Fee – Dr. Lance Askildson
 - G. Review of University Shared Governance

- VII. Informational Items**
 - H. Faculty Workload Q&A Resource

- VIII. Announcements**
 - I. National Conference on Undergraduate Research – Dr. Amy Buddie

- IX. Adjournment**



November/December 2018 Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Attendance		
December 3, 2018		
Role	Name	
LIAISONS		
Staff Council	Angela Beam	Y
Student Government Association		
Part-Time Faculty Council	Joanne Lee	Y
Chairs and Directors Assembly	Robbie Lieberman	Y
Deans Council		
EX-OFFICIO		
President	Pamela Whitten	Y
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs	Ron Matson	Y
Senior Associate VP for Academic Affairs		
Associate VP for Academic Affairs	Val Whittlesey	Y
SENATORS		
Faculty Senate President	Jennifer Purcell	Y
College of the Arts		
Art and Design, School of	Craig Brasco	Y
Dance	McCree (David) O'Kelley	
Music, School of	Jana Young	
Theatre and Performance Studies	Jim Davis	
College of Architecture and Construction Management		
Architecture	Tim Frank	
Construction Management	Charner Rodgers	
College of Computing and Software Engineering		
Computer Science	Ken Hoganson	
Information Technology	Ming Yang	Y
Software Engineering	Allan Fowler	Y
Coles College of Business		
Accountancy, School of	Cristen Dutcher	Y

Economics, Finance and Quantitative Analysis	Abhra Roy (Murat Doral- proxy)	Y
Information Systems	Humayun Zafar	Y
Management, Entrepreneurship, and Hospitality, Leven School of	Doug Moodie	Y
Marketing and Professional Sales	Sandra Pierquet	Y
Bagwell College of Education		
Educational Leadership	Nik Clegorne	Y
Elementary and Early Childhood Education	Marrielle Myers	Y
Inclusive Education	Joya Carter-Hicks	Y
Instructional Technology	Anissa Vega	Y
Secondary and Middle Grades Education	Bryan Gillis	Y
WellStar College of Health and Human Services		
Exercise Science and Sport Management	Laurie Tis	Y
Health Promotion and Physical Education	Peter St. Pierre	Y
Social Work and Human Services	Rene McClatchey	Y
Nursing, WellStar School of	Mary Beth Maguire	
College of Humanities and Social Sciences		
Communication and Media, School of	Justin Pettigrew	Y
Conflict Management, Peacebuilding and Development, School of	Heather Pincock	Y
English	Jeanne Bohannon	Y
Foreign Languages	Noah McLaughlin	Y
Geography and Anthropology	Paul McDaniel	Y
History and Philosophy	Marianne Holdzkom	Y
Interdisciplinary Studies	May Gao	Y
Government & International Affairs, School of	Steve Collins	Y
Psychological Science	Daniel Rogers	Y
Sociology and Criminal Justice	Brian Starks for Darina Lepadatu (Fall)	Y
Technical Communication and Interactive Design	Uttam Kokil	Y
College of Science and Mathematics		
Chemistry and Biochemistry	Michael Van Dyke	Y
Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology	Joe Dirnbeger	Y

Mathematics	Josip Derado (Sarah Holliday- proxy)	Y
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Jerald Hendrix	
Physics	Russell Patrick	
Statistics and Analytical Sciences	Josip Derado (Sarah Holliday- proxy)	Y
Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology		
Civil and Construction Engineering	Matthew Wilson	Y
Computer Engineering	Scott Tippens	Y
Electrical Engineering	Walter Thain	Y
Engineering Technology	David Stolberg	Y
Mechanical Engineering	Simin Nasserri for Mohammed S. Mayeed (Fall)	
Mechatronics Engineering	Ying Wang	
Systems and Industrial Engineering	Lin Li	
University College		
Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality, Michael A. Leven School of	Jonathan Brown	
First-Year and Transition Studies	Richard Mosholder	
Leadership and Integrative Studies	Ginny Boss	Y
Honors College		
Horace W. Sturgis Library	Barbara Wood	Y
Part-Time Faculty Council	Joanne Lee	Y
VISITORS – Chairs and Directors Assembly		
Dean and Assistant Vice President of Library Services	David Evans	Y
Interim Associate VP of Curriculum	Pamela Cole	Y
Chair of the Department of English	Sheila Smith McKoy	Y
Interim Executive Director for Technology Enhanced Learning	Tammy Powell	Y
Chair, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry	Mark Mitchell	Y
Chief Institutional Auditor	Lesley Netter- Snowden	Y

Associate Dean, CHSS	Carmen Skaggs	Y
Associate Dean, CHSS	Thierry Leger	Y
Associate Dean, CHSS	Chien-pin Li	Y
Director, General Education	Kris DuRocher	Y
Library	Bonnie Acton	Y
Dean, Graduate College	Mike Dishman	Y
UPCC Chair and Associate Professor of Human Services	Jennifer Wade-Berg	Y
GPCC Chair and Associate Professor of Biology	Scott Nowak	Y
Library	Cheryl Stiles	Y
Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Director of Policy	Kevin Gwaltney	Y
Office of Institutional Effectiveness, SACSCOC Liaison	Danielle Buehrer	Y

Faculty Senate Meeting: Monday, Dec 3rd 12:30-1:45pm Both meetings in KSU Center Room 300

I. Call to Order

1. Welcome – Dr. Jennifer Purcell

The meeting was called to order at 12:32pm.

2. President's Update – President Pamela Whitten

President Whitten: Thank you for keeping the level of calm and sanity across the University at end of the semester.

First, I want to speak generally to the motion or momentum of putting students at the center of everything. One so you know what is coming because there will be a lot of faculty discussion in the Spring about this. Ben Scafidi (Coles College) is leading a team of faculty looking through some data. They are attempting to explain why the average undergrad had 145 credit hours at graduation when they usually only need 120 hours to graduate (we know some program have exceptions and need more credits). Why are students putting in a whole extra year? We will need to look at a lot of different answers for that and heads up that's coming

Second, we didn't have a universal waitlist in the past and we have done that this fall for students that enrolled. A lot of the classes had very long waitlists.

We didn't do that assuming we can take everyone. We want the data to understand trends of student demand. We took those data and added 80 new sections (3000 seats) for high demand classes. There are a lot of students that need relief in the short term. We also know that students who graduate on time take summer classes and the Deans have all been asked to increase summer enrollment by 20%.

Third, I want to remind you that I take every opportunity to advocate for raises. I have no prediction what it will look like this year. We are making the argument to the Chancellor and making the same argument to our local representatives. The battle is on to try to pursue that.

We have VP of Research candidates on campus this week. Whoever is hired will work towards creating an infrastructure for faculty in all the areas of research they do.

We will be doing a reboot of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion in the Spring. Look ahead for that.

I also wanted to note as I am finishing up my first semester here, that I attended the College of the Arts sold out musical performance and it was the best I've seen since I've been in GA. Saturday night we also had a sold out performance from our Dance students, and Saturday we had a very wet but wonderful win against Wofford. As long we keep going we're happy.

Finally, we are done with the experiment of being a runway. It was a very interesting event and we were so lucky that no one got hurt.

3. Provost's Update – Interim Provost Ron Matson

Ron Matson: Several people have asked me where are we in terms of P&T review. The files are coming to me for review in the Provost's office.

Val Whittlesey: The course syllabus template has been decommissioned. It was a 25K cost and we do not have enough people using it. We will see if we can build something in house.

Ron Matson: Thank you to everyone for all the work you are doing and wish you happy holiday.

Jennifer Purcell asked the Senate to show our gratitude to Val Whittlesey as she returns to the faculty.

II. Approval of the Agenda

Approved.

III. Approval of Minutes

Approved.

IV. Reports

Approval to receive electronically.

V. Old Business

A. Faculty Salary Studies – Dr. Jennifer Purcell

Jennifer Purcell announced that we will be receiving and disseminating the Faculty Salary Studies completed in Spring 2018 soon. They will be forwarded to Senators as soon as she receives them.

Danielle Buehrer (Interim VP for Institutional Effectiveness) said that she just needs to compose the memo for the two studies.

VI. New Business

A. Elections

1. Vice-President/President-Elect

Nominees Doug Moodie and Humayun Zafar each gave short presentations from the floor.

A vote was taken by paper ballot.

Doug Moodie was elected to serve as Vice-President/President Elect starting in January 2019.

B. Elsevier Subscription – Dr. David Evans

Dean Evans explained that the cost issue for the Elsevier subscription was quite egregious. He said they have come with a 55% increase and there is no money in the Library budget to pay for that. There are national and global issues with Elsevier. The Chancellor had approached the Assistant Chancellor to get an outside consultant to negotiate a cap on prices. Elsevier has set the price point at 287K for their journals alone. This is just for a one year deal and they can come back the next year and raise the price again. At this point there is no money to do this.

Senator Humayun Zafar asked if this would be a pattern with today it's Elsevier and tomorrow it is Wiley?

Dean Evans replied he is concerned about that. Subscriptions go up 4-6% increase each year. When the economy picks up the vendors want more of your money. As a contingency he would roll over about 60K of payments into the next fiscal year. This is not really a good practice. The enrollment and tuition situation means that the money does not exist. It is 100K to operate the Library over the next 6 months. Even small publishers will be increasing their prices.

We have been successful with Galileo GIL through the state we collaboratively purchase ProQuest/EBSCO and they've kept those prices stable. When five Universities in the state are individual customers there's not much leverage.

Senator Allan Fowler asked if there was data on the usage and how frequently this is used?

Dean Evans said we do and some is included in the meeting packet. Of the 1600 titles it is very skewed to the top journals and then flattens out. We believe 95% of (200K hits) the usage is driven by undergraduates with faculty using 8-10K hits. Alternative methods would entail cutting other things (88 databases) according to usage and it would eliminate certain disciplines entirely.

As a contingency 10K is set aside to go behind a paywall. We have Interlibrary Loan, Unpaywall, preprint companies, and Elsevier site is indexed with other databases. In other databases it is not full text unless the journal is Green or Gold open access journal. In those cases, the faculty members pay Elsevier to make content available.

Senator Justin Pettigrew asked what the difference is between paying for Elsevier vs. Galileo and GIL?

Dean Evans explained that Elsevier won't negotiate with Galileo so KSU has to negotiate directly. So we lose full text access but we have indexing access through other databases.

Senator Heather Pincock thanked Dean Evans and said she appreciated the difficult position Elsevier has placed KSU and other Universities in. She explained that when this was discussed at the FSEC we were asked to consult with colleagues at Florida State University (FSU) who were faced with a similar problem and also forced to contemplate canceling their subscription. When we did that we found out that they engaged in a two-year long process to get faculty buy in before ending their subscription, they developed a significantly more robust contingency plan, that could of course be a resource issue in terms of what they have available certainly, and that they also continue to negotiate with Elsevier in hopes of securing a better offer.

The following motions was introduced (Pincock):

The Faculty Senate requests that the leadership team of the KSU Library, in consultation with the Office of the Provost and the Library Advisory Committee:

- 1) Remain open to renegotiating the subscription price with Elsevier and report back to the Faculty Senate about any subsequent counter offers that are received (both for a la carte and total subscription offers).**

- 2) Develop a more detailed contingency plan to ensure that KSU students and faculty have full text access to the Elsevier journal content they need after the subscription expires on Dec. 31 and present this plan for approval of the Faculty Senate in January 2019.**

- 3) Develop and implement a method for assessing the success of the above contingency plan and report back in August 2019 to the Faculty Senate on the results.**

Seconded (Zafar).

The vote result was:

YES: 32

NO: 0

Therefore, the motion was approved.

Dean Evans said he would be happy to take these steps and asked the faculty to go to their Deans to advocate for the library to receive 2% of the Educational and General funding (E&G) annually.

C. Curriculum Process Review Recommendations – Dr. Pamela Cole

Jennifer Purcell confirmed that a good number of Senators were present during the earlier meeting where the Recommendations were presented and discussed. She asked Dr. Whittlesey to address the feedback shared in the earlier session and the adjustments that would be made as a result.

Kevin Gwaltney (Office of Institutional Effectiveness) summarized the two revisions agreed to at the previous meeting:

- 1) To strike language referring to “eliminate the need for Distance Learning independent review” (Recommendation #5). This language will be edited to better reflect how DL can be involved earlier.
- 2) To add language about faculty involvement in the development of Academic Program Review process (Recommendation #8).

Val Whittlesey (AVP of Curriculum) explained that some had asked about the new staff position “Director of Curriculum Support”. The new Director of Curriculum Support Office (CSO) will be a staff position. The person needs to be steeped in all the various requirements for curriculum procedures and able to handoff to various people around campus (ex. GenEd). We are thinking this person is best to be a staff position because it’s about policy compliance and ensuring proposals are error free

and they are not making curriculum, resource, or viability decisions (Recommendation #2).

Pam Cole (Interim AVP of Curriculum) said that one thing stressed during the earlier meeting was that the Curriculum process has not been changed since adopted in 2014. The working group has looked across the country at other models and determined that more support is needed.

Jennifer Wade-Berg (UPCC Chair) reviewed recommendation (#4) to extend curriculum committee terms to three years to build capacity and institutional memory. She noted this would require a change to the Faculty Handbook and would require a Senate vote to move forward. She added that the process is not being changed a lot but developed and enhanced to make it more efficient and responsive and to give control back to the Faculty (so that changes are not made later in the review process without Departments being aware). She explained that the proposal would be developed at the Department level in concert with the Curriculum Support Office (currently a team in Academic Affairs that would be made into an Office) and that all errors are worked out prior to entering it into Curriculog.

Scott Nowak (GPCC Chair) explained that changes to the workflow would be to add an initial review step. The responsibility for the proposal resides with the Department. The CSO reviews proposals for compliance, policy expectations, in keeping with mission, and issues of resourcing. This will be a dialogue to help the faculty draft a successful proposal. It will be sent back to the Department Chair for entry into Curriculog and the go through the standard workflow (Recommendation #2).

Jennifer Wade-Berg (UPCC Chair) said she wanted to clarify in response to questions earlier that the CSO does not approve the content of a proposal. They are there to facilitate a conversation to make sure that the Department, Chair, Dean have made sure the proposal is resourced adequately and policy compliant. They are not a decision-making body they are a support office.

She also discussed the need for training on the actual curriculum process and how to move curriculum through that can actually

meet the needs of students (Recommendation #3). She said this will slow the process down a little bit, but we don't just want to fix a symptom of a problem; we want to think about curriculum holistically.

Val Whittlesey added that one of the other key units CSO will work with is the Registrar so that issues with course codes, course descriptions, etc. will be identified (and addressed by the faculty) earlier.

Jennifer Wade-Berg said that the recommendation (#5) for two non-voting members to the UPCC and GPCC are needed to have more voices at the table when a proposal comes through the process. Distance Learning currently has a three-day approval window in the process (but the proposal is pushed through if no response). Institutional Effectiveness (IE) also needs a (non-voting) voice at the table. She noted that UPCC and GPCC push proposals back often, but they want these things to all be considered before it arrives to the University committees.

Scott Nowak noted that a very constructive dialogue has resulted from IE presence that has already been practiced with GPCC and they are looking to codify this relationship.

Jennifer Wade-Berg said that UPCC and GPCC should be deliberative bodies not a copy-editing service and that they are seeking to use faculty time more effectively. She mentioned the need to retool and streamline the forms (Recommendation #6). She also mentioned that the entire process of Academic Program Review (Recommendation #8) needs to be faculty driven and better aligned with programs that have accreditation with outside bodies (to ensure non-duplication of efforts). She then invited questions from the floor.

Senator Humayun Zafar asked about the proposed training and whether it was already in play because he had received an email to sign up for these trainings on January 9? He also asked how, in light of the budget situation of the Library just discussed, can KSU afford a bureaucratic addition?

Ron Matson (Interim Provost) responded that the resources will come from the Provost's Office. He said they are looking across the board and things can be moved around. It's a judgment call.

Senator Humayun Zafar said the concern is related to resource allocation and whether we have an inefficient use of resources or a need for more resources. If this process is inefficient then why not direct the people currently involved in the process (ex. Department Chair) to address these problems?

Pam Cole responded that in the College of Education they had to do a rework of 30 programs at one time. They realized there were so many policies that it wasn't possible for any faculty member to know all of that information. She developed a 50-page document as a guide. Here we have a much larger scale of that type of thing. It's not something that a faculty member needs to be doing. We need somebody to coordinate all of that and that will be very helpful.

Val Whittlesey gave the example of minimum and maximum hours for minor vs. majors, upper level/entry level and different BOR, KSU, SACSCOC policies. She said this is not all she does and has therefore missed some things and that has consequences. On the Gen Ed example which is 42 hours, students are taking 54 (we are creating bottlenecks and not following BOR policies) so these issues have consequences for students.

Danielle Buehrer explained that she has done a crosswalk of both catalogues, KSU websites, USG, IPED, USDept. of Ed. to determine what do we actually offer to report to SACSCOC. We have been reporting differently to all those entities and institutions are required to pay back financial aid if we are out of compliance. USG institutions paid 20 million dollars back last year.

Senator Humayun Zafar pointed out that there are P&T implications for faculty when resources are not being committed to things like journal subscriptions and instead to Curriculum Support and that P&T requirements and workload expectations should be

reconsidered in keeping with those resource allocation decisions. Resources dedicated to faculty do not seem to be the priority.

Senator Marrielle Myers asked what other steps or actions have been taken to address these problems before the creation of a new position and office?

Val Whittlesey responded that there are already staff in the office. It's really an added staff person to oversee those existing staff.

Jennifer Wade-Berg said that we have tried multiple things to try to address these and we can go through them.

Scott Nowak said that an example was the implementation of an executive committee at GPCC to catch issues. They reviewed 2600 pages of proposals, caught nearly 70% proposals that were not catalogue ready, everything from syllabi listed as TBD, credit hours not adding up, non-existent electives etc. Last year, they still had 40% of proposals that were not in compliance. They ran into shared governance issue where faculty present proposal (or a designated proxy) who agrees to changes but never reports back to their Department meaning the final proposal was never approved through the appropriate shared governance bodies (Department and College level Curriculum Committees). He said they have tried other options and they feel this is the best next option.

Val Whittlesey added that many peer institutions have a model like this and they've talked to them and it's working.

Jennifer Wade-Berg responded that we eat up so much time at our (UPCC) meetings.

There are 40-50 proposals in any given meeting. Faculty are having to read these very meticulously to catch these issues. If we correct these errors we are violating shared governance and if we send it back we are seen as "the bad guy".

President Whitten said that she has been convinced that the process in the past had problems even with the best of intentions. We know we need exciting and innovative curriculum for our students. As faculty we've got to get your brains on it. However, if something that had come forward expected an individual faculty member to understand all of these policies and procedures, she would not approve it. It has been explained that this function already exists in the Provost office. We are seeking a staff member to oversee it. I would prefer that we reallocate resources to take this clerical process work off the backs of faculty.

Senator Laurie Tis said she can see the big yellow warning box (on the slides) saying "KSU needs to show evidence" and said this has become a December 3rd emergency decision. You've already sent out an email that says we are going to start training in January with a 10-point suggested roll out in 36 calendar days across break. The suggestions are realistic, but the timeline is way off and lacks specificity. She said she would respectfully suggest that some of these changes can be voted on today and implemented and others need to be brought back to the voting bodies with more details and thoughtful implementation.

She said she didn't think anyone disagrees that the process needs improvement but asked if they are really saying that this vendor is going to be on campus and fix it in 15 days? I just don't buy it.

Scott Nowak responded that these 10 recommendations don't all need to happen in 36 days. You're right. The main voting guidance needed from this body is to designate the two new ex-officio members to the curriculum committees and the change to three-year terms. We are not going to implement Academic Program Review. That can't happen right away. We need to have dialogue on that. Right now, we feel the best course of action is to launch the office, designate the person with staff that are already present, and implement the new curriculum workflow of dialogue between Departments and this Office. We need your vote to move forward on the terms and the non-voting members of the Curriculum Committees. Many things on this list need to be revisited in the Spring. We have to demonstrate to SACSCOC that we have begun to implement changes. We have to show actual decisions, votes, and committee meetings by the site visit in March.

Senator Laurie Tis responded that to show something has happened you mean a Curriculum Office?

Scott Nowak said yes but it is not just one thing.

Pam Cole said that we need an individual to coordinate and who knows who to go to for questions. Other things like Recommendation #8 will take more time. We need a starting point for continuous improvement.

Val Whittlesey said that they pulled proposals from 2017-2018. There were 650 undergrad and 325 grad. We need a person to make sure we are following all policies and procedures. This person would be deep in KSU, BOR, SACSCOC, Registrar office policies.

Senator Brian Stark said he would urge the group to focus on expediting the minor changes (Recommendation #7).

Danielle Buehrer said she wanted to address the “bright yellow box”. She said that an audit was conducted during the self-study phase and identified unreported substantive changes. Recently, last month she had to report 13 substantive changes (and has a couple more she still has to report). These were program closures that were never deactivated until much later. There are financial implications to this. SACSCOC is coming in March. If we don’t change things they are going to find us in noncompliance. We have to show SACSCOC meeting minutes from UPCC and GPCC that should start in January.

Senator Justin Pettigrew said that this seems to ultimately be a financial decision at its base. He said he agrees that we will see the cost savings of hiring this person to oversee this whole process but how long will it take to see these cost savings? How do program closures have anything to do with Curriculog? Why is this a staffing problem and not a program problem? He said he was having a difficult time understanding how KSU is going to take away resources from research (ex. the primary journal that he uses via Elsevier subscription) and reallocate resources to staffing.

Senator Marrielle Myers said that the concerns are related to resource allocation. We are hiring a person while faculty are being told to do more for less. We are always told there are no pots of money yet there are pots of money for certain things. A program coordinator does this exactly this work for a program but faculty in those roles may no longer be compensated for that work.

Senator Joanne Lee stated that she is a member of SACS and that we need to give the office what it needs in order to meet the criteria for SACS. SACS requires we have found a problem and addressed a solution. If this is not done, we will not pass that standard. She said she did not want to work at an institution that is not accredited.

The following motion was introduced:

We approve the recommendations presented today with continued discussion of the details for implementation. (Lee) Seconded. (Starks)

The vote results were:

Yes: 12

No: 10

[While abstentions were not asked for or recorded, the FSEC did confirm that the Faculty Senate had a quorum at the time of this vote].

Therefore, the motion was approved.

Kevin Gwaltney said that on the concern that the training information already went out that did not come from us. They have made a suggestion for when training would occur and reserved rooms in the event they are approved.

Pam Cole added that the email was meant to consult those who would be involved in the training if it is approved to coordinate calendars and was not supposed to be an official announcement.

Senator Jennifer Purcell thanked the group for their work. She asked that there are ongoing discussions with the Senate given that the vote clearly reflects substantial concerns. She asked that there be further discussion and opportunities for feedback as it is implemented.

Senator Doug Moodie asked for a point of information. Are you going to bring a detailed proposal for Faculty Handbook changes related to UPCC and GPCC?

Senator Jennifer Purcell said the Senate would like to see the specific language as it will appear in the Faculty Handbook. This does not preclude moving forward but we will ask to see the exact language in January.

Related to that (as an information item) any members of Senate committees that are making changes to their Bylaws, please send these to Senate so they can be reviewed and approved in order for changes to be made in the Faculty Handbook.

Senator Jennifer Purcell asked for a motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes. Moved. Seconded. Approved.

D. Faculty Performance Agreements (FPA) – Dr. Sheila Smith McKoy

Sheila Smith McKoy (Chair, Department of English) asked for the Senate to consider this initial proposal and give approval for this team to go to work on a full proposal. She explained that this idea came out of the CDA “top ten” issues working group. It would be modeled on the practice at NC State where instead of an annual Faculty Performance Agreement there is what they call a Statement of Mutual Expectations (SME) that remains in place from time of hire (Ex. 60/30/10 in Teaching/Scholarship and Creative Activity/Service) and is only revised when major changes are made to a faculty member’s appointment or workload agreement. The hope is that this will be a better way to express and discuss expectations. We would basically have a more permanent FPA.

The following motion was introduced:

Allow the FPA process project to move forward (with the inclusion of Faculty Senate representation) with the intent of bringing a detailed proposal back to Faculty Senate. (Clegorne) Seconded.

Vote results:

YES: 28

NO: 0

Therefore, the motion was approved unanimously.

- E. Distance Learning Updates & Proposed Online Course Rubric – Dr. Tammy Powell

Tammy Powell (Interim Executive Director for Technology Enhanced Learning) explained that due to the elimination of the Quality Matters process, they are transitioning from a program of course certification to a program of instructor certification for online and hybrid courses. She referenced the draft of the rubric that would apply to hybrid and online courses that had been circulated to Senators in the meeting packet and asked for comments and questions about the rubric and/or new process.

Senator Anissa Vega asked if the rubric specifies a difference between course designers and course facilitators?

Tammy Powell said the rubric itself does not, but the new policy does. She said that for Part-Time Faculty they have a special training in line with ACA guidelines that they will roll out in February. That will allow Part-Time faculty to facilitate master courses both hybrid and online. If you are Full Time Faculty, if you have already had a course approved through the previous KSU Quality Matters (QM) process you are certified. If you have not completed the KSU QM process previously, you will take a training that will be offered in the spring and in the summer in order to teach online or hybrid in the Fall.

Senator Anissa Vega asked how the rubrics are going to be applied to the two different audiences? Designers vs facilitators?

Tammy Powell responded that the rubric covers requirements from Federal Financial Aid, SACS, ADA guidelines etc. and that it applies to both facilitators and instructors.

Senator Jennifer Purcell asked if it is possible to send a version with track changes between now and the January Senate meeting and to vote on a revised version of the rubric then.

Tammy Powell responded that the training needs to be rolled out in February, so she is open to getting comments if she gets them soon.

Senator Jennifer Purcell asked if the DLAC (Distance Learning Advisory Committee) would be meeting to give feedback.

Tammy Powell responded that they met last week.

Murat Doral (Proxy for Senator Abhra Roy) said that QM was a difficult process and asked what is going to be the different between what you are proposing and QM?

Tammy Powell explained that going forward, if you have already had a course approved through QM in the past, you are done. You can create any course you want and teach any course you want as long as it follows the various guidelines and your Chair approves it etc. There is no more course review. The Distance Learning Center will review and provide support upon request. There will be no more peer review. It's one and done. The other change applies to hybrid courses. You need to be trained to teach hybrid courses.

Murat Doral asked that the process be kept efficient.

Tammy Powell explained that there were 41 standards in QM and that the KSU rubric contains 17. She said we've worked hard and have high quality distance learning and we hope to maintain that.

Senator Daniel Rogers said he did not have questions about the rubric but about the new process of certification, the required training, the timeline for implementation etc. Will there be another time set aside to discuss those?

Senator Jennifer Purcell responded that for now we are discussing the rubric as presented but it sounds like we may want to have an agenda item in January to address those additional concerns.

A motion was introduced to vote on the rubric online. Seconded. Approved.

The motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:01pm.



Combined Meeting for Curriculum Process Review Updates Minutes

Monday, Dec 3rd 11am-12pm KSU Center Room

Attendance		
December 3, 2018		
Role	Name	
LIAISONS		
Staff Council	Angela Beam	
Student Government Association		
Part-Time Faculty Council	Joanne Lee	
Chairs and Directors Assembly	Robbie Lieberman	Y
Deans Council		
EX-OFFICIO		
President	Pamela Whitten	
Provost and VP for Academic Affairs	Ron Matson	Y
Senior Associate VP for Academic Affairs		
Associate VP for Academic Affairs	Val Whittlesey	Y
SENATORS		
Faculty Senate President	Jennifer Purcell	Y
College of the Arts		
Art and Design, School of	Craig Brasco	
Dance	McCree (David) O'Kelley	
Music, School of	Jana Young	
Theatre and Performance Studies	Jim Davis	
College of Architecture and Construction Management		
Architecture	Tim Frank	
Construction Management	Charner Rodgers	
College of Computing and Software Engineering		
Computer Science	Ken Hoganson	
Information Technology	Ming Yang	Y
Software Engineering	Allan Fowler	Y
Coles College of Business		

Accountancy, School of	Cristen Dutcher	
Economics, Finance and Quantitative Analysis	Abhra Roy	
Information Systems	Humayun Zafar	
Management, Entrepreneurship, and Hospitality, Leven School of	Doug Moodie	Y
Marketing and Professional Sales	Sandra Pierquet	
Bagwell College of Education		
Educational Leadership	Nik Clegorne	Y
Elementary and Early Childhood Education	Marrielle Myers	Y
Inclusive Education	Joya Carter-Hicks	Y
Instructional Technology	Anissa Vega	Y
Secondary and Middle Grades Education	Bryan Gillis	Y
WellStar College of Health and Human Services		
Exercise Science and Sport Management	Laurie Tis	Y
Health Promotion and Physical Education	Peter St. Pierre (Kandice Porter- proxy)	
Social Work and Human Services	Rene McClatchey	Y
Nursing, WellStar School of	Mary Beth Maguire	
College of Humanities and Social Sciences		
Communication and Media, School of	Justin Pettigrew	
Conflict Management, Peacebuilding and Development, School of	Heather Pincock	Y
English	Jeanne Bohannon	Y
Foreign Languages	Noah McLaughlin	
Geography and Anthropology	Paul McDaniel	Y
History and Philosophy	Marianne Holdzkom	Y
Interdisciplinary Studies	May Gao	
Government & International Affairs, School of	Steve Collins	
Psychological Science	Daniel Rogers	Y
Sociology and Criminal Justice	Brian Starks for Darina Lepadatu (Fall)	Y
Technical Communication and Interactive Design	Uttam Kokil	
College of Science and Mathematics		
Chemistry and Biochemistry	Michael Van Dyke	
Ecology, Evolution, and Organismal Biology	Joe Dirnbeger	Y
Mathematics	Josip Derado (Sarah Holliday- proxy)	Y

Molecular and Cellular Biology	Jerald Hendrix	
Physics	Russell Patrick	
Statistics and Analytical Sciences	Josip Derado (Sarah Holliday- proxy)	Y
Southern Polytechnic College of Engineering and Engineering Technology		
Civil and Construction Engineering	Matthew Wilson	
Computer Engineering	Scott Tippens	
Electrical Engineering	Walter Thain	
Engineering Technology	David Stolberg	Y
Mechanical Engineering	Simin Nasser for Mohammed S. Mayeed (Fall)	
Mechatronics Engineering	Ying Wang	
Systems and Industrial Engineering	Lin Li	
University College		
Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality, Michael A. Leven School of	Jonathan Brown	
First-Year and Transition Studies	Richard Mosholder	
Leadership and Integrative Studies	Ginny Boss	Y
Honors College		
Horace W. Sturgis Library	Barbara Wood	Y
VISITORS – Chairs and Directors Assembly		
Chair, Department of English	Sheila Smith McKoy	Y
Chair, Department of Leadership Studies	LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey	Y
Chair, Department of Information Technology	Becky Rutherford	Y
Director, School of Communication and Media	Barbara Gainey	Y
Chair, Department of Mechatronics Engineering	Kevin McFall	Y
Chair, Department of Theatre and Performance Studies	Rebecca Makus	Y
Chair, Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education	Neporcha Cone	Y
Chair, Department of Physics	Kevin Stokes	Y
Chair, Department of Construction Management	Khalid Siddiqi	Y
Interim Chair, School of Government and International Affairs	David Shock	Y
Chair, Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice	Dawn Baunach	Y
Chair, Department of Geography and Anthropology	Susan Kirkpatrick Smith	Y
Chair, Department of Psychological Science	Chris Randall	Y

Interim Chair, Department of Information Systems	Herb Mattord	Y
Chair, Department of Mathematics	Sean Ellermeyer	Y
Chair, Department of Instructional Technology	Traci Redish	Y
Interim Chair, Department of Software Engineering and Game Des.	Chi Zhang	Y
Director, School of Conflict Management, Peacebuilding and Dev.	Joe Bock	Y
Interim Chair, Department of Statistics & Analytical Sciences	Sherry Ni	Y
Chair, Department of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality	Christian Hardigree	Y
Chair, Department of Health Promotion and Physical Education	Kandice Porter	Y
Interim Chair, Department of Dance	Harrison Long	Y
Director, WellStar School of Nursing	Yvonne Eaves	Y
Interim Chair, Department of Inclusive Education	Kate Zimmer	Y
Chair, Department of History and Philosophy	Alice Pate	Y
Chair, Department of First-Year and Transition Studies	Ruth Goldfine	Y
VISITORS – Deans’ Council		
Dean, Coles College of Business	Kathy Schwaig	Y
Interim Dean, College of the Arts	Ivan Pulinkala	Y
Dean, University College	Lynn Disbrow	Y
Interim Dean, College of Humanities and Social Science	Kerwin Swint	Y
Dean, College of Computing and Software Engineering	Jon Preston	Y
Dean, Graduate College	Mike Dishman	Y
VISITORS		
Associate Professor of English	Ashley Shelden	Y
Director of University Honors Program	Lynn Stallings	Y
Interim Associate VP of Curriculum	Pam Cole	Y
Manager of Curriculum Support	Jamie Grimes	Y
UPCC Chair and Associate Professor of Human Services	Jennifer Wade-Berg	Y
GPCC Chair and Associate Professor of Biology	Scott Nowak	Y
Library	Cheryl Stiles	Y
Academic Affairs	Amy Jones	Y
Registrar’s Office	Ana Edwards	Y
Office of Financial Aid	Ron Day	Y
Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Director of Policy	Kevin Gwaltney	Y
MBA Program, Coles College	Dennis Marrow	Y
Office of Institutional Effectiveness, SACSCOC Liaison	Daniell Buehrer	Y

Jennifer Purcell (Faculty Senate President) thanked everyone for coming and invited Val Whittlesey, (Associate Vice President for Curriculum) to speak.

Val Whittlesey thanked everyone for coming for this initial meeting saying that the matter is time sensitive and that her team would explain why shortly.

She explained that the Curriculum Review Task Force formed a month and a half ago after the curriculum pause was announced in order to do a review of the curriculum process. The Task Force's charge was to develop a more streamlined and effective process because the existing process has been in place for many years and not been reviewed for a long time.

She outlined that the presentation would go as follows:

Pam Cole (soon to replace Val as AVP Curriculum) will give an introduction and overview.

Danielle Buehrer (Interim VP of Institutional Effectiveness) will explain issue related to compliance and reaccreditation.

Jennifer Wade Berg (UPCC Chair) and Scott Nowak (GPCC Chair) will present the recommendations and answer questions.

Pam Cole explained that we have great programs at KSU that have been recognized throughout the state and nationally and that our goal is to ensure quality assurance and integrity with our programs. The group spent a lot of time thinking about how much KSU has grown. She noted that this past Spring there were two times that the catalogue was delayed in being printed and that when another extension was requested it prompted the curriculum pause.

She explained that KSU started using Curriculog in 2014 by putting a paper and pencil process inside the system and as the years have passed we have learned that if there is a problem it has to go all the way back or has to be resolved outside the system which creates confusion. We have many bottlenecks and the process is getting slower.

She identified common errors in proposals related to grammar, credit hours not adding up, forms missing, and requirements missing. She explained that proposals are progressing very rapidly through the system and that the Curriculum Committees process over a thousand pages every year. She noted that there are new concerns about the viability and sustainability of programs and stressed the need to streamline the process. The group looked at other large institutions and how they do things and is primarily proposing to offer support to faculty and administrators.

Danielle Buehrer explained that she recently had to submit 14 unreported substantive changes (related to program closures that had not been reported to SACSCOC) as part of the reaccreditation process. This has great implications beyond being in noncompliance and could result in the required repayment of financial aid monies to the Department of Education.

She explained that there are multiple types of substantive changes through the Curriculum process that must be reported including: opening and closing of programs and opening and closing of off campus instructional sites. Currently, by the time these changes come to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness it is too late. There is a need to be ahead of it and work collaboratively with Financial Aid, Registrar, and Institutional Effectiveness.

The pause has been a relief because she was unable to get a final answer from anyone on what programs we are currently offering at KSU and what we have been submitting to the various reporting bodies do not match. This is serious because the University can be accused of falsely advertising our available Certificates and Degrees.

A plan to address these issues is not sufficient for SACSCOC. We need evidence of execution. Due to the reporting of 14 substantive changes we must show we have made changes to address this issue. It is a time sensitive issue for accreditation.

Jennifer Wade-Berg and Scott Nowak presented an overview of the 10 recommendations from the Curriculum Review Task Force.

Recommendation 1: Slow down and review before things go into Curriculog. Discussion needs to happen before proposals get into the system. This conversation begins at the Department between the Curriculum Committee, Department faculty, Chair, and Dean. This conversation should occur before it is in the system.

Recommendation 2: Additional support. Create and hire a staff position “Director of Curriculum Process”. This person will work in conjunction with departments and colleges to ensure the proposal is “clean” meaning “error free” and has been looked at through multiple lens (BOR, SACSCOC, Registrar, Financial Aid etc.). This person is not a decision maker on Curriculum and cannot veto a proposal. They are there to help support faculty getting the information into Curriculog because many don’t do it enough to remember every detail. They will be knowledgeable about KSU curriculum policy, BOR policy, GenEd policy, Registrar policy etc. and this person’s job would be to get that proposal in shape early on.

Recommendation 3: More training in the curriculum process for all faculty involved in the curriculum process. There are proposed training dates for January.

Recommendation 4: Extend terms of curriculum committee members from 2 years to 3 years to build institutional capacity. Faculty “assent” is needed to move forward with these changes.

Recommendation 5: Add non-voting members to UPCC and GPCC from Distance Learning and Institutional Effectiveness. They currently attend as guests but need an official non-voting role in the dialogue.

Recommendation 6: Develop streamlined Curriculum proposal forms.

Recommendation 7: Develop an expedited process for minimal changes (from Dean to Registrar). This would not be implemented yet—recommendation is to investigate implementing this.

Recommendation 8: Design an academic program review (with faculty input from the start). This would also take place in the Spring.

Recommendation 9: Improve communication between Registrar and the Curriculum Support Office (CSO). Enhance the existing CSO and have this team would work on all things related to curriculum

Recommendation 10: Lift the moratorium if these revisions are approved.

Scott Nowak then explained that there aren't many changes to the process. The big change is with the origination of proposals. The Director of Curriculum Support will be a key player at that stage now. The originating faculty member is to consult the department chair, department faculty, and Dean about a proposal. The CSO consults with originating faculty member to address possible conflicts with existing curriculum, credit hours, resourcing, faculty needed etc., and the proposal does not enter Curriculog until all of this has been addressed.

Val Whittlesey explained that there have been cases in the past where lots of changes are made to a proposal after it leaves the Department. Departments then don't know all these changes were made and should have voted on them.

Scott Nowak added that this creates a shared governance issue when presenting faculty members agree to changes that they don't communicate back to their department. With the recommended changes the ownership will be at the Department level. Once the proposal enters Curriculog the workflow is identical from there forward. The only substantive change in the process is the creation of the CSO.

Questions

Kevin McFall (Interim Chair of the Department of Mechatronics Engineering) asked if the Director of Curriculum support would be an expanded role of what Amy Jones (Assistant Manager of Curriculum Systems) does?

Jennifer Wade-Berg and Val Whittlesey answered that yes, this person will supervise an office with that role in it. In addition to checking if the proposal is correct, the office will review how it aligns with BOR, SACSCOC etc. There will only be one new position with existing folks continuing to support that work.

Kevin McFall asked what form the prospectus (pre Curriculog proposal) would take and expressed concern that it would be yet another form added to the process.

Jennifer Wade-Berg responded that they hope to develop a template aligned with the streamlined form. Further she explained that the CSO would not bar faculty conversations between departments. Because they won't know all the substantive issues with the proposal.

Kevin McFall asked if there is a possibility of an expedited process for changing a prerequisite on a course?

Val Whittlesey said that many comparators do have policies for minimalist proposals that we want to model on but didn't have time to develop that yet, so it is recommended as a next step.

Kevin McFall asked about what the backlog is going to be when the pause gets lifted?

Jennifer Wade-Berg said that the exceptions in place will be the start of the backlog and that old proposals will need to start over and go through the new process and take the new training.

Val Whittlesey said it's very likely that we will have just an Interim Director (of Curriculum Support) initially until we get this up and running.

Anissa Vega (Senator for Department of Instructional Technology) shared that she had a concern about recommendation #5 and the additional of the Distance Learning rep being added to the Curriculum committees because the proposal reads that this "Eliminate the need for DL to be independent review". If

we don't have a review process to support the mitigation of transactional distance, we will see DWF go up and this cannot be reviewed in a syllabus.

Jennifer Wade-Berg said that it is not to say the Distance Learning Center is going away; they are remaining their own group. It is not meant to take over the DL's separate review of those classes.

Anissa Vega responded that the language reads as if it is when it says: "this will eliminate the need to have DL as an independent review body".

Val Whittlesey said it wasn't Distance Learning as much as it was the AVP (of Technology and Enhanced Learning) which is gone now that was reviewing proposals. We can remove that language.

Amy Jones (Assistant Manager of Curriculum Systems) said that only a handful of proposals were actually approved this way because previously it was a 3-day window and then pushed forward automatically if there was no response from the AVP.

Doug Moodie (Senator for Leven School of Management, Entrepreneurship and Hospitality) asked about scenarios where a department comes up with a proposal that involves the work of other departments or they remove a program that other departments rely on without consultation. Will the CSO be looking at these interactions?

Jennifer Wade-Berg answered that the CSO will make sure the conversation has happened. Departments must run the impact report and CSO verifies that it took place.

Marianne Holdzkom (Senator for Department of History and Philosophy) asked where the money for the new staff administrator position is coming from?

Jennifer Purcell asked why it is a staff role and not a faculty role?

Val Whittlesey said that the group discussed this. The thought is that this person is making sure that policy is being followed. They are not making budget, curriculum, or viability decisions. We need a person who can do this position over the "long haul" and faculty are unlikely to carry this as a service load for an extended period. She noted that UGA has this model and a CSO that we have been following for some time. We have talked to them and it seems to work well for them.

Scott Nowak added that the group reviewed curriculum process of 15 comparators and that almost all have staff rather than faculty in this type of role.

Jennifer Wade-Berg added that this person will need the bandwidth to work on grammar and specific details that may not appeal to faculty. She said they would take it back to the group and not preclude it. They would look at two designs for the position.

Jennifer Purcell said that to clarify her previous question, this position seems to assume an AVP for Curriculum (faculty administrator) but a new Provost may reorganize Academic Affairs.

Val Whittlesey said that titles may change but we assume the Director will report to someone over curriculum in Academic Affairs.

Nic Clegorne (Senator for Educational Leadership and Higher Education) said that the role seems to require deep type editing of every proposal and that he had supreme concerns that one person can handle that for the entire University.

Jennifer Wade-Berg answered that there are already people in that office that will support the Director in this work.

Val Whittlesey explained that they need someone to do the SACSCOC, BOR, KSU policies and that just the GenEd piece alone is a handful. It needs a full-time person.

Danielle Buehrer added that they will work with Director of Financial Aid, Registrar's office and others to ensure all of that.

Pam Cole added that right now we have a lot of proposals that need more support and offering that through the enhanced CSO will streamline the process.

Val Whittlesey explained that the BOR has minimum policies for credit hours, KSU has its own policy. This person would check for those details. We've had issues with programs launching without the right number of credit hours, for example.

Nic Clegorne noted that depending on the type of changes you are making you are often saying the same thing over and over again and the need for revisions later in the process leads to incongruence. He said he cannot stress enough how important it is to make sure there are the fewest repetitions possible and the fewest words possible in the streamlining of the forms.

Val Whittlesey agreed and noted that we have not streamlined the form since we went to Curriculog.

Rebecca Makus (Interim Chair of the Department of Theatre and Performance Studies) asked when will the pause be lifted?

Jennifer Wade-Berg said as soon as the President gives us permission then we can get the team back together to streamline the forms.

Val Whittlesey added as soon as we get approval from the shared governance bodies to move forward.

Robbie Lieberman (Chair of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies) asked for clarification about what a vendor is being hired for? And also asked for clarification about who the new training is for?

Jennifer Wade-Berg explained that the vendor referred to creation of a model where all forms required in Curriculog are packaged together. For example, if you do a course change that effects the program, there are two separate forms. We are working with the vendor of Curriculog to do those things. The edits to the forms will come from this body and with the note that we are seeking to streamline repetitious questions and eliminate the N/A problem so that there is a way you can give us the information needed to make a decision.

Val Whittlesey and Jennifer Wade-Berg said that the training would be for proposal originators, Department Curriculum Committees, Chairs, Deans, UPCC and GPCC members. Everyone involved in the curriculum process. The training will not be “how to use Curriculog” like we have had in the past. We need a training on the actual curriculum process.

Sheila Smith McKoy (Chair of the Department of English) asked how long the Curriculum Director will have to get feedback returned? Since the VP of Curriculum position may not continue to exist, what do we think will be at the Vice Provost level and why can't this work be done under the auspices of that office?

Val Whittlesey responded that this person will report to whatever her position becomes. The person at the Vice Provost level really doesn't have the time to read every proposal and make sure all the policies are being followed because they are doing so many other things. Last year we had 600-700 undergrad proposals and 300 grad proposals. She said because she is not doing this day in and day out she can't remember all the policies and procedures and that there is a need to have a person who is doing this day in and day out.

Jennifer Wade-Berg added that when it gets to UPCC and GPCC and we do these changes, it's too late. When we give that feedback we are criticized. It needs to be done earlier so that Departments are part of the process and getting that feedback from the start.

Danielle Buehrer added that language matters. For example, program deactivation vs. termination—these terms have different meanings for SACSCOC and BOR. CSO needs to be well versed on terms and catch these things early.

Jennifer Wade-Berg added that there will also be training dates at the Marietta campus but they have not yet been set.

Christian Hardigree (Chair of the Department of Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality) asked at what level in the review process will the analysis of course descriptions and learning objectives in comparison with CIP codes occur? Will that be included in the training?

Val Whittlesey answered that yes it will be included in the training. The Director of Curriculum Support will be looking at those and giving input to the proposal originator and Department Chairs.

Christian Hardigree asked who is ultimately responsible in the review process for that?

Jennifer Wade-Berg said it will be the Program Director.

Mike Dishman (Dean of the Graduate College) said it is the entire University.

Jennifer Wade-Berg said it belongs to all of us it's not just one person.

Pam Cole said she sees this as a continuous improvement model. We will implement and look at what worked and didn't and we will make it better. This process has worked elsewhere, and I think it can work here as well but I would like to see us coming back and doing feedback on the process.

Val Whittlesey said this person will report to a person like me, a faculty administrator office is always there to help if issues come up with the CSO.

Christian Hardigree said she wanted to clarify that this is owned by the faculty and not the decision of one person to make.

Mike Dishman: It is the responsibility of the University to make sure it is accurate. The origination belongs to faculty and the at the department level and needs to make sure that all the way up to the University there is a clear understanding. At the end of the day we need to ensure that there are no surprises in the process. When the proposal goes in you should already know it is in good shape and been assessed for viability.

Val Whittlesey referred to a past conflict between two programs over CIP codes and explained that those do come up to the AVP or Associate Provost for resolution and this will continue to happen for University wide issues of that kind.

Jennifer Wade-Berg thanked everyone for letting them come and present and said that they would be asking, with the changes in mind that we will put in, for ratification of the document so that we can continue and also put a note that we are going to come back in the Spring for additional improvements. We are going to keep doing this to get a process that works for all of us.

Jennifer Purcell said she appreciated the discussion of faculty involvement in Recommendation #8 for Academic Program Review. She noted that this is not explicitly noted in the document and asked that this language be added.

Jennifer Wade-Berg said that she can't do it in an hour but that she can tell the Senate it will be in there when they vote.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00pm.

**Response to the Faculty Senate Motion Concerning Elsevier
Submitted by Library Dean David Evans**

1) Remain open to renegotiating the subscription price with Elsevier and report back to the Faculty Senate about any subsequent counter offers that are received (both for a la carte and total subscription offers).

The Library has not stopped negotiating with Elsevier. Prior to the most recent contract the library had six months to negotiate the price that was funded. In the most recent situation the Elsevier Representative gave the Library Administration notice of the cost increases 3 weeks before the deadline to not renew which gave no time to negotiate an acceptable contract. Only after declining their offer of a 255% increase and cancelling the 2019 renewals is the library able to have a voice and leverage in the negotiation process.

Currently GALILEO is exploring how centralizing the acquisition of e-journals on a statewide basis might leverage economies of scale, result in cost-efficiencies, and reduce duplicative efforts across campuses. GALILEO is optimally positioned to provide centralized e-journal packages to academic institutions across the state. Enormous buying power exists among the Academic libraries. Galileo's previous efforts have proven that collective buying power can be leveraged to achieve cost-avoidance in the provision of online library resources. This is critical in a time of shrinking library budgets and increasing content costs

Points to consider regarding some options:

"A la carte" offers are based on a deposit account that rewards the earliest and first requestors of the users of the service. When funds run out of the account, no further request can be fulfilled unless more money is appropriated. I am looking at possible redirection of other budget items and differed June payments into next fiscal year. We are also looking to cancel some other resources that have little use.

"Total subscription offers" would only meet the top 29 titles (based on what was available to fund) if the purchasing decision is based on Elsevier usage data. The downside is that entire programs would be excluded.

KSU Libraries and Elsevier will resume informal discussion on January 9, 2019. Formal discussion will resume in March 2019 only after meeting with the Library Advisory Committee and the Provost. For the record, The Provost Office has been aware of the issues with Elsevier and the issues have been discussed with the Faculty Advisory Committee during the two previous committee meetings. Library Administration will continue to meet with both and to request that library liaisons continue the discussions with their faculty contacts in the academic programs.

2) Develop a more detailed contingency plan to ensure that KSU students and faculty have full text access to the Elsevier journal content they need after the subscription expires on Dec. 31 and present this plan for approval of the Faculty Senate in January 2019.

There is no detailed contingency plan that can ever be crafted that will “ENSURE” students and faculty have full access to Elsevier Journals. The ONLY “Esurance” is better funding for the libraries on a consistent basis. Asking for 2% of the E & G funding is a start.

Universally, all libraries rely on Inter-library borrowing and inter-library use to fulfill request to journals outside the library’s budget for journals. The Library system has an excellent Inter-library Loan department that is fully staffed to fulfill request of students and faculty who need article published in Elsevier Journals. The library system has made provisions for payment of articles behind paywalls if that is necessary. In addition, the library is a member of the Atlanta Regional Council for Higher Education (ARCHE) that allows faculty and students walk-in access and use of UGA Libraries, Emory Libraries, Georgia State University and Georgia Tech Libraries.

On the library system website, we have a prominent link to Elsevier that explains the situation, list the journal titles, and has a list with links to pre-prints and open access sites. In addition, when a user is looking for a specific Elsevier title it will direct them to a database that has indexed the title and also have a link to request Interlibrary loan.

3) Develop and implement a method for assessing the success of the above contingency plan and report back in August 2019 to the Faculty Senate on the results."

The library will continue to monitor the Inter-library loan and inter-library use traffic specific to Elsevier requested titles. We will also monitor “turnaround time”. This will guide us regarding access and if that access is timely. The library will also monitor our request to the Copyright Clearance Center and any paywall cost on a monthly basis.

In terms of existing assessment of Elsevier usage:

From data supplied by Elsevier and Ebsco for the year 2018:

2,473s out of a total of 2,518 Elsevier Titles had 1 or zero usage per day during 2018 (98.2% non-usage rate). Only 40 Titles had more than 1 usage per day.

I also cross-checked the title usage with our other large supplier Ebsco.

Of the 14,066 titles available in 2018, 13,919 titles where used 1 or less times per day. That is a 98.9% non-usage rate. Only 147 titles had more than 1 usage per day.

Graduate Policies and Curriculum Committee, GPCC (permanent) – assigned to the Faculty Senate and advisory to the Dean of the Graduate College.

- a. Purpose: The GPCC receives graduate course and program proposals from colleges and departments and ensures their compliance with University policies and goals for graduate education. This committee also approves changes in post-baccalaureate curriculum, including the addition or deletion of courses, approval of new programs or concentrations, and changes in program requirements. The committee recommends or reviews changes in graduate policies and procedures, and monitors assessment of graduate programs. Its recommendations will be directed to the Dean of The Graduate College, the Provost/VPAA, and the President for their action, and to the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate for its use in monitoring the activities of this committee. The committee also makes recommendations regarding the curriculum development and review process to the Faculty Senate.
- b. Membership:
 1. Voting:
 - i. TF 18: two members of the Graduate Faculty (Full or Provisional status) within each college housing a graduate program. No more than one member from the Graduate Faculty within a college may be a graduate program director or coordinator.
 2. Ex-officio (non-voting):
 - i. All graduate program directors or coordinators;
 - ii. The Associate and Assistant Deans of The Graduate College;
 - iii. The Office of Graduate Admissions;
 - iv. A representative from Academic Publications;
 - v. A representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness;
 - vi. Executive Director of Technology Enhanced Learning
 - vii. An elected librarian;
 - viii. AD 3: the Dean of Graduate College;
 - ix. The Registrar or his/her appointed designee;
 - x. SD 1: one graduate student elected by the Graduate Student Association;
 - xi. Two faculty from any academic college without a graduate program.
- c. Term: 3 years

Undergraduate Policies and Curriculum Committee (UPCC) – assigned to the Faculty Senate and advisory to the Faculty Senate and the Provost/VPAA

- a. Purpose: This committee evaluates proposed changes to the undergraduate curriculum for consistency with university policies and goals and forwards approved proposals to the Provost. This body provides periodic reports of its actions to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. As needed, this body makes policy recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding the undergraduate curriculum development and review process.
- b. Membership:
 1. TF 21: two elected from each degree granting college and one elected from the General Education Council;
 2. AD 3 a member of the Provost/VPAA office, a librarian, registrar;
 3. A representative from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness;
 4. Executive Director of Technology Enhanced Learning
 5. SD 2: two undergraduate students appointed by the President of Student Government in consultation with the Vice President for Student Affairs.
- c. Term: 3 years

Draft 2018-2019 KSU Faculty Handbook

Revisions to Clarify Workload Policy (28Oct18, ver 2)

2.2. Workload Model for Teaching Faculty

The purpose of this model is to provide a common vocabulary to describe the varied work faculty members do as well as an agreed framework for discussions of that work. The model establishes some core standards, for instance that a typical semester-long, three-credit course ordinarily represents 10% of faculty effort for the academic year, and that all faculty must allocate at least 10% of their time to professional service activities essential to the life of the institution. The model also requires that each department establish, in writing, appropriate class sizes (equating to the 10% teaching effort) for the various courses taught; and, equivalencies for non-standard faculty activities (e.g., supervision of significant student research), be formally negotiated and incorporated into the faculty assessment process. Likewise, disciplines with writing-intensive courses, laboratory courses, studio and field experiences, etc., or with unusually heavy supervising and mentoring responsibilities, shall establish teaching load equivalencies through the shared governance process on the basis of this model. The model does not dictate, or even favor, any particular mix of activities. That mix is for individual faculty members and their chairs to agree upon (with their dean's approval) based on institutional needs and KSU's shared governance process. But the application of the model's core standards and the common vocabulary across campus should enable KSU to distribute faculty work more wisely and fairly, to assess it more accurately, and to reward it more appropriately. **In order to ensure this distribution, the norms for workload effort expected in the area of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty are 60%, 30%, and 10% respectively. Workload adjustments are made from these norms. Faculty who are not meeting expectations on one workload model will be placed on a different model.**

The Workload Model and Shared Governance:

Each department and college will establish flexible guidelines as to expectations of faculty members in the following three faculty performance areas:

- Teaching;
- Scholarship and Creative Activity (S/CA); and
- Professional Service.

These guidelines, as well as the individual Faculty Performance agreements negotiated under them, will be established through KSU's shared governance process by bodies and officers detailed in the University Handbook under "Shared Governance." Given that department review guidelines are most discipline-specific and are approved by deans and the Provost as consistent with college and university standards, department guidelines are understood to be the primary basis for P&T decisions. As with other faculty-focused KSU policy documents, amendments to the University's Workload Model are made by administrators and Faculty Senate working consultatively through the shared governance processes outlined in the University Handbook.

The Workload Model and Faculty Performance Agreement (See also KSU Faculty Handbook [Section 3.2](#) - Overview of Faculty Responsibilities.)

Each individual faculty member shall divide his/her professional efforts among the three faculty performance areas noted. That division of effort will be reflected in a Faculty Performance Agreement (FPA) between the individual faculty member and the University (see KSU Faculty Handbook [Section 3.12](#)). Negotiation of individual FPAs allows for diversity across colleges and departments and, within departments, among individual faculty members. Colleges and departments, in consultation with faculty stakeholders, determine which FPA combinations best suit their college and departmental objectives. FPAs may change from year to year and even from semester to semester as needs and opportunities change. Consistent with the University's culture of shared governance, the details of an individual FPA are worked out in consultation between the chair and the faculty member and are subject to final approval by the dean. **Faculty who are not meeting expectations on one workload model will be placed on a different model better utilizing their capabilities and fitting department/college needs.** If the faculty member and the chair cannot reach agreement on the FPA, the dean will make the final determination.

Instructional Responsibilities

Illustrative Example of the Workload Model

Some examples of possible FPA workload combinations appear below. **The norm for workload effort expected in the area of teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 60%, 30% and 10% respectively.** The examples reflect various percentages of effort in the three faculty performance areas. The examples given are merely illustrative. Individual FPAs can vary almost infinitely, as agreed by the faculty member and chair and as approved by the dean.

Some Illustrative Workload Examples*

*Actual FPA percentages for each faculty member will be negotiated with the department chair as part of annual review.

Teaching Emphasis	Workload
4-4 course load Teaching	80
S/CA	10
Service	10
Total	100

Teaching – Scholarship/Creative Activity Balance*

3-3 course load Teaching	60
S/CA.....	30
Service.....	10
Total	100

Baseline Norm expectations for tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty*Teaching – Service Balance**

3-3 course load Teaching	60
S/CA.....	10
Service.....	30
Total	100

Teaching – Scholarship - Service Balance

3-3 course load Teaching	60
S/CA.....	20
Service.....	20
Total	100

Scholarship/Creativity Activity Emphasis

2-2 course load Teaching	40
S/CA.....	50
Service.....	10
Total	100

Administration Emphasis

Service.....	70
S/CA.....	10
Teaching.....	20
Total	100

3.3. Basic Categories of Faculty Performance

The basic categories of faculty performance at KSU are teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service. The Faculty Performance Agreement delineates the relative emphasis of an individual faculty member's activities in these three areas. The typical faculty member will focus his or her work in the specific areas that reflect their knowledge and expertise in advancing the University's mission. In all cases evaluation of faculty performance will be based on evidence of the quality and significance (see KSU Faculty Handbook [Section 3.4](#)) of the individual faculty member's scholarly accomplishments in his or her respective areas of emphasis. **Faculty who are not meeting expectations on one workload model will be placed on a different model.**

A. Teaching

This category of faculty performance refers to a wide variety of instructional activities that engage faculty peers and others to facilitate student learning. Teaching also includes activities such as mentoring, advising, and supervision. **The norm for workload effort expected in the area of teaching for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 60%.** By definition, scholarly teachers (see KSU Faculty Handbook [Section 3.4](#)) demonstrate mastery of the current knowledge and methodology of their discipline(s). Teaching effectiveness at KSU will be assessed and evaluated not only from the perspective of the teacher's pedagogical intentions but also from the perspective of student learning. Such assessment may employ multiple methods, including a variety of classroom techniques. Instruments to assess student perceptions of their own learning should not be the sole means but may be used in conjunction with other instruments. Depending on the faculty member's situational context, evaluation of teaching and curricular contributions will not be limited to classroom activities but will also focus on the quality and significance of a faculty member's contributions to larger communities. Examples include curricular development, community-engaged teaching practices, program assessment, student mentoring and supervision, public lectures and workshops, teaching abroad and international exchange, and academic advising.

In addition to documenting teaching effectiveness in terms of student learning, faculty should provide other measures of teaching effectiveness, such as some, but not necessarily all, of the following: teaching awards, evidence of handling diverse and challenging teaching assignments, securing grants for curriculum development or teaching techniques, accomplishments involving community-engaged pedagogy, peer observations, and contributions to the achievement of departmental teaching-related goals.

B. Scholarship and Creative Activity

Scholarship and creative activity at KSU is broadly defined in the institution's mission statement as a wide array of activities that contribute to the advancement of knowledge, understanding, application, problem solving, aesthetics, and pedagogy in the communities served by the University. **The norm for workload effort expected in the area of scholarship/creative activity for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 30%. The minimum workload effort in this area expected for a tenure-track or tenured teaching faculty expecting to be tenured and/or promoted is 20%.** Scholarship and Creative

Activity will include a broad array of scholarship with the expectation that in order for something to be considered scholarship it must meet the expectations of scholarship as established by the department, school, or college. These professional activities become recognized accomplishments when the work exhibits the use of appropriate and rigorous methods, is formally shared with others, and is subject to informed critique and review (peer-review). Documentation and evaluation of accomplishments in scholarship and creative activity will focus on the quality and significance of the work. Merely listing individual tasks and projects does not address quality and significance. Faculty members are encouraged to disseminate their best teaching practices to appropriate audiences and to subject their work to critical review.

College and departmental guidelines must identify the specific criteria for determining quality and significance of scholarship and creative activity appropriate to that college's and department's disciplines and scholarly contexts.

Accomplishments will be judged in the context of their use of current knowledge, their impact on peers and communities who are stakeholders in the processes, and the products of the scholarship and creative activities. In evaluating scholarship, faculty members are expected to demonstrate the quality and significance of the faculty member's accomplishments.

In certain fields such as writing, literature, performing arts, fine arts, architecture, graphic design, cinema, and broadcast media or related fields, distinguished creation should receive consideration equivalent to that accorded to distinction attained in more traditional areas of research. In evaluating artistic creativity, an attempt should be made to determine the quality and significance of the faculty member's accomplishments. Criteria such as originality, scope, richness, depth of creative expression, and recognition by peers may be used to evaluate quality and significance. In disciplines such as music or drama performance, conducting, directing, design, choreography, etc., are evidence of a candidate's creativity.

Contributions to the development of collaborative, interdisciplinary, cross-institutional, international, or community-engaged research programs are highly valued. Documenting collaborative research might involve evidence of individual contributions (e.g., quality of work, completion of assigned responsibilities), work facilitating the successful participation of others (e.g., skills in teamwork, group problem-solving), and/or the development of sustained partnerships that involve the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources. KSU recognizes publishing in pedagogical journals or making educationally focused presentations at disciplinary and inter-disciplinary gatherings that advance the scholarship of teaching and curricular innovation or practice.

C. Professional Service

Professional service involves the application of a faculty member's academic and professional skills and knowledge to the completion of tasks that benefit the University, the community, or the profession.

Professional service includes service to the department, school, college, university, profession and community. The service activity must be related to a person's status as a faculty member. For example, faculty members might draw on their professional expertise to engage in a wide array of scholarly service to the governance and professionally related service activities of the department, college, or university. Service is a vital part of faculty governance and to the operation of the University. Evidence of the quality and significance of institutional service can support promotion and tenure. Governance and professionally related service create an environment that supports scholarly excellence and the achievement of the University's mission. Administrative faculty are encouraged to engage in service activities such as faculty development, fundraising, fiscal management, personnel management, and public relations. Whatever the individual's relative emphasis in the performance areas, all faculty members are expected to devote at least 10% of their time to professional service activities, that are essential to the life of the institution (See KSU Faculty Handbook [Section 2.2](#)). **That is, the norm for workload effort expected in the area of service for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 10% (120 hours/year).**

Scholarly service to communities external to the University is highly valued and frequently enhances teaching, scholarship, and creative activity. Service to the community should be related to the faculty member's discipline or role at the University. For example, a faculty member might engage in professionally related service to a community agency, support or enhance economic development for the region, provide technical assistance, or facilitate organizational development. Likewise, some scholarly service activities might rely on a faculty member's academic or professional expertise to serve their discipline or an interdisciplinary field. This type of service might also include developing linkages with partner institutions both locally and globally.

In all types of professional service, documentation and evaluation of scholarly service will focus on quality and significance rather than on a plain recitation of tasks and projects. Documentation of the products or outcomes of professional service should be provided by the faculty member and considered as evidence for the evaluation of his or her accomplishments. Documentation should be sufficient to outline a faculty member's agreed-upon responsibilities and to support an evaluation of effectiveness.

Faculty will be expected to explain and document the quality and significance of their service roles. The faculty member should provide measures of his or her role such as:

- an explanation of the scholarly work involved in the service role;
- copies of minutes, number of hours met;
- copies of products developed;
- measures of the impact or outcome of the service role; and/or
- an explanation of the unique contribution of leadership roles or recognition by others of contributions.

Those in administrative roles should demonstrate the quality and significance of their leadership and administration, especially how effectively they foster the requisite fiscal, physical, interpersonal,

intercultural, international, and intellectual environment (e.g., improving the quality and significance of scholarship or service in their unit). In sum, administrative faculty act as leaders by assisting colleagues in their unit to achieve and surpass university, college, and departmental goals in teaching, scholarship and creative activity, and professional service.

3.4. Evaluation of the Quality and Significance of Faculty Scholarly Accomplishments

A. Definitions of Scholarly Activity and Scholarship

“Scholarly” is an umbrella term used to apply to faculty work in all performance areas. Scholarly is an adjective used to describe the processes that faculty should use within each area. In this context, scholarly refers to a cyclical process that is deliberate and intentional, systematic and planned, measured and evaluated, revised and rethought. Scholarship is also a noun used to describe tangible outcomes of the scholarly processes. This tangible product is disseminated in appropriate professional venues relating to the performance area. In the process of dissemination, the product becomes open to critique and evaluation. What follows is a description of how faculty work in each performance area might be scholarly and could result in scholarship.

While the professional activities of faculty vary, every faculty member is expected to demonstrate scholarly activity in all performance areas, as described below. Furthermore, tenure-track faculty members must produce scholarship in at least one of their performance area(s) of emphasis. **The norm for workload effort expected in the area of scholarship for the typical tenure-track/tenured teaching faculty is 30%. The minimum acceptable for tenure and/or promotion is 20%.** The performance area(s) with scholarship expectations must be agreed upon by the faculty member and the faculty member’s supervisor. In other words, although faculty members are expected to engage in scholarly activity in all the performance areas identified in their FPA, they are not expected to produce scholarship in all areas. Evaluation of all scholarly accomplishments and scholarship will be based on evidence of the quality and significance of the work. KSU’s scholarly and scholarship expectations support the Board of Regents policy (BoR Policy Manual [8.3.15](#)), Enhancing Teaching and Learning in K-12 Schools and USG Institutions.

Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Teaching

Scholarly teachers plan their class activities in order to ascertain outcome data regarding student learning. Faculty members typically revise their courses from semester to semester; the scholarly faculty member makes these revisions deliberately and systematically assesses the effect of the revisions on students’ learning. The following semester, the scholarly faculty member makes more revisions based on the previous semester’s outcomes if such revisions are warranted. Professional development activities such as attending workshops and conferences related to teaching are examples of scholarly accomplishments in teaching. This process can result in scholarship when the faculty member makes these processes and outcomes public and subject to appropriate review.

Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Scholarship and Creative Activity

Scholarly researchers and artists approach their scholarship and creative activity in a systematic and intentional manner. They have clear goals and plans for their work.

Such faculty engage in programmatic scholarship and creativity as opposed to random, haphazard scholarship and creative activities that have less chance of building a substantial body of work. Researchers and creative artists transform their work into scholarship when the work is formally shared with others, exhibits the use of appropriate and rigorous methods, and is subject to informed critique and review, including the usual process of peer review and publication, showcasing, or presentations. Professional development activities such as attending workshops and conferences related to scholarship and creative activity would be an example of scholarly accomplishments, but not necessarily scholarship, in this area.

Examples of Scholarly Accomplishments in Professional Service

Faculty members who perform scholarly professional service use their knowledge and expertise in a service opportunity to the University, the community, or their profession. Appropriate documentation of scholarly service describes the role of the faculty member in each service activity, how he or she uses their expertise in the role, and clearly demonstrates the outcome or impact of the service activity. Reports of service lack a scholarly dimension when they merely list committee assignments, provide no evidence of the nature of activities or results, provide evidence of outcomes but no evidence of the individual's role, have no review by others, or provide no evidence of how the service work is consistent with professional development or goals. Although all professional service may not be scholarly, faculty should document the quality and significance of all service activities. Scholarly service can move toward scholarship as it meets some or all of the following criteria:

1. the service is documented as intellectual work
2. there is evidence of significance and impact from multiple sources
3. there is evidence of individual contributions
4. there is evidence of leadership
5. there is dissemination through peer-reviewed publications or presentations
6. there is dissemination to peers, clients, the public, patients, etc.
7. there is peer review of the professional service.

Faculty members who are in administrative positions often provide oversight to initiatives that strengthen and enhance the mission of their unit. Building innovative programs, policies, and procedures can require scholarly investigations (e.g., research or literature reviews) and can lead to outcomes and products that are shared at professional meetings or in professional publications. For example, a department chair might develop a mentoring program in his or her department that is shared in professional meetings or publications and becomes nationally recognized.

B. Quality and Significance

Quality and significance are the primary criteria for evaluating faculty performance. Quality and significance of scholarly work are over-arching, integrative concepts that apply equally to all areas of faculty performance. A consistently high quality of scholarly work, and its promise for future exemplary scholarly work, is more important than the quantity of the work done. The criteria for evaluating the quality and significance of scholarly accomplishments include the following:

Clarity and Relevance of Goals

Faculty members should clearly define the goals of scholarly work in their respective areas of emphasis and the relevance of their scholarly work to their Faculty Performance Agreement. Clarity of purpose and relevance of goals provide a critical context for documenting and evaluating scholarly work.

Mastery of Existing Knowledge

Faculty members must be well-prepared and knowledgeable about developments in the relevant context of their scholarly activity. The ability to educate others, conduct meaningful scholarship, produce creative works, and provide high quality assistance through professional service depends upon mastering existing knowledge and background information. Faculty members should use appropriate techniques, methods, and resources in their scholarly work.

Effectiveness of Communication

Faculty members should communicate effectively with their audiences and subject their ideas to critical inquiry and independent review.

Significance of Results

Faculty members should demonstrate the extent to which they achieve their expressed goals and to which their scholarly accomplishment(s) may have had significant professional impact. Customarily in the academy, such significance might be confirmed by various credible sources (e.g., academic peers, community participants, or other experts), as well as by published documents such as reviews, citations, acknowledgments, or professional correspondence regarding one's work.

Consistently Ethical Behavior

Faculty members shall conduct their work with honesty, integrity, and objectivity. They shall foster a respectful relationship with students, community participants, colleagues, and others who participate in or benefit from their work. Faculty members shall uphold recognized standards for academic integrity (see also KSU Faculty Handbook [Section 2.13](#)).



Memo

The Division of Global Affairs
3391 Town Point Road
Suite 1700
Kennesaw, GA, 30144
Phone: (470) 578-6336
Email: educationabroad@kennesaw.edu

To: 2019 Education Abroad Faculty

From: Iyonka Strawn-Valcy, Senior Director of International Programs

Cc: Dr. Lance Askildson, Vice Provost of Global Affairs

Date: December 4, 2018

Re: Changes to the Global Learning Scholarship

Comments:

On November 28, the Kennesaw State University Mandatory Fee Committee voted to phase-out the current International Fee.

The International Fee is an \$11 per semester mandatory fee paid by matriculated KSU students and used to fund annual allocations from the Global Learning Scholarship fund. During the present fiscal year (FY 2019), the fee will remain unchanged at \$11 per semester. The International Fee will be reduced to \$6 per semester for FY 2020 (effective 7/1/19) and then reduced to \$0 for FY 2021 (effective 7/1/20).

While the International Fee is being phased-out, Kennesaw State University continues to be committed to international education and global engagement. The President's Office is committed to looking for new resources to mitigate the impact of the loss of the international fee, and the Division of Global Affairs is working closely with the Global Learning Scholarship Committee and the Office of Fiscal Services to develop a plan that will ensure similar levels of financial support for education abroad at KSU. We will share developments on this plan as soon as they are available.

FAQs - Faculty Workload Document

These FAQs are to answer questions asked about the Faculty Workload document distributed by Dr. Noble and her working group in October 2018.

1. Is the purpose of the document to increase expectations or to codify existing expectations? [The recommendations were made to ensure equity, accountability, and transparency across the academic colleges. Ensure transparency about workload. They are to codify existing expectations as long as those expectations were clear.](#)
2. What type of document will be produced by colleges and departments? Will a new document be produced, such as a “workload document,” or will there simply be revisions to existing P&T guidelines? [For now, what is expected is a “workload document.” It can be a standalone document although in some colleges it is part of their P&T guidelines. The exact format is determined by the college and/or department.](#)
3. If a new document is produced, what other documents will need to be revised? For example, if the new document is a “workload document,” will the P&T guidelines or departmental bylaws need to be revised? [As mentioned above, it could be that the P&T guidelines will need to be revised. It depends on what are currently in those guidelines. Do they provide metrics that the all faculty can use in determining whether or not a faculty member going up for promotion and/or tenure has fulfilled the expectations?](#)
4. Which college and departmental committees should work on this document? CFCs and DFCs? College and departmental P&T committees? Ad hoc committees? [Yes... all of the above. Who does it is up to the faculty in the college and/or department.](#)
5. How might college and department committees work at the same time? [They can work simultaneously, with some discussion between them, because they are looking at different things. The department is more specific than the college.](#)
6. What should be the role of the deans or chairs in the development of these documents? [The deans and chairs provide oversight, they make sure that there is consistency within the college and that the department can support what is being suggested. They help ensure that the workload guidelines provide for the flexibility required in meeting college and university mission/needs while providing for the workload of the individual faculty so that they can meet the expectations they have. If the chair/dean find problems with the workload document being proposed, the chair and/or dean can and should meet with the department to discuss and modify the document as needed.](#)
7. What measurements need to be included within the document? (Clear expectations for the required metrics as well as any optional or suggested metrics would be helpful.) [I suggest you talk to your dean and/or look at what some of the guidelines from other colleges. For example,](#)

your dean was provided with one, possible, potential example of what might be included in a workload document from the College of Science and Math. That might be a starting point from which you can develop your guidelines.

8. Apart from measuring the quality and significance of research and service, should these documents include other items, such as whether faculty can move among different tracks, what will be the process and criteria for faculty moving from one track to another, how will that decision will be made, and who will make that decision? The workload document is only dealing with how effort is partitioned/measured. Decisions about determining metrics for quality and significance are in the P&T guidelines. How you move between tracks (e.g. do you have to be working at the level of the next track before moving into it) can be determined later. The decision will be made based on need of the department, the faculty member's productivity and interests. As is currently the practice, the workload a faculty member is on is worked out between the faculty and the chair with approval of the dean during the FPA process.

9. How many hours constitute a work week? It varies. While full-time exempt employees on a contract, faculty are paid to accomplish a job, not by the hour. It is generally recognized that the typical full-time exempt faculty member may spend substantially more time than 40 hours per week on his or her contracted obligations as a KSU Faculty member.

10. What is the difference between the "workload" document and the P&T guidelines? The workload guidelines tell you how to "count" activities that make up what a faculty is expected to do over a year or semester. How much effort in teaching, service, and scholarship is expected at any one time? It should also include taking into account things like class size equivalencies, labs, supervision and other teaching activities. It may also take into account the fact that different types of scholarship and/or service might require different amounts of effort. For example, what kind of activity would be expected to say a faculty is doing 10% or 20%, or 30% scholarship or service or teaching?

P&T guidelines tell you what is expected in terms of teaching, service, and scholarship deliverables over a period of time. It describes what is expected in order to be promoted and/or tenured and for annual merit expectations. Besides quantity of activity (how many courses taught, papers published, presentations given, journal articles reviewed, committees served on, etc.) the P&T guidelines include metrics of **quality and significance** that are used to determine whether or not someone should be promoted and/or granted tenure. (The faculty handbook talks about quality and significance vis a vis promotion and tenure and I would refer your faculty to the Faculty Handbook).

11) Will our new R2 status changes anything? No, the R2 status does not change the overall workload policy. But it is good practice to update expectations and standards on a regular basis to ensure they reflect current standards.