



January 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda

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

Attendance		
January 28, 2019		
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		
SENATORS		
Faculty Senate President	Jennifer Purcell	Y
College of the Arts		
Art and Design, School of	Craig Brasco	Y
Dance	McCree (David) O'Kelley	Y
Music, School of	Jeff Yunek	Y
Theatre and Performance Studies	Jim Davis	Y
College of Architecture and Construction Management		
Architecture	Tim Frank	Y
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	Y
Information Systems	Humayun Zafar (Doug Moodie- proxy)	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	
Inclusive Education	James Gambrell for Joya Carter-Hicks (Spring)	Y
Instructional Technology	Anissa Vega	Y
Secondary and Middle Grades Education	Bryan Gillis	
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	Y
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	Todd Harper	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	Darina Lepadatu	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	
Mathematics	Bill Griffiths (proxy Sarah Holliday)	Y
Molecular and Cellular Biology	Jerald Hendrix (Michael Van Dyke- proxy)	Y
Physics	Russell Patrick	
Statistics and Analytical Sciences	Bill Griffiths (proxy Sarah Holliday)	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	Mohammed S. Mayeed	Y
Mechatronics Engineering	Ying Wang	
Systems and Industrial Engineering	Lin Li	Y
University College		
Culinary Sustainability and Hospitality, Michael A. Leven School of	Jonathan Brown	
First-Year and Transition Studies	Richard Mosholder	Y
Leadership and Integrative Studies	Ginny Boss	
Honors College		
Horace W. Sturgis Library	Barbara Wood	Y
Part-Time Faculty Council	Joanne Lee	Y
VISITORS		
Dean and Assistant Vice President of Library Services	David Evans	Y
Interim Associate Vice President for Curriculum	Pam Cole	Y
Interim Executive Director for Technology Enhanced Learning	Tammy Powell	Y
Vice-Provost and Chief International Officer	Lance Askildson	Y
Assoc. Director of Undergraduate Research, NCUR Co-Chair	Chris Cornelison	Y
Associate Professor Political Science	Andy Pieper	Y
Assistant Professor English	Pete Rorabaugh	Y
Staff Senator, President Elect	David Tatu	Y
Chief Institutional Auditor	Lesley Netter-Snowden	Y
Chief Business Officer	Julie Peterson	Y
Associate Controller-Budget	Jamie Fernandes	Y
Assistant Director of Access Services, Library	Chris Sharpe	Y
Institutional Effectiveness	Kevin Gwaltney	Y
SGA Senator (SPCEET)	Vincent Coakely	Y
SGA President	Carly Keller	

I. Call to Order

A. Welcome – Dr. Jennifer Purcell

Jennifer Purcell called the meeting to order at 12:32pm. She said that President Whitten was on her way and would provide her update when she arrived.

She introduced Carly Keller, the newly elected SGA President. Ms. Keller shared that she was sworn in last Wednesday. She encouraged faculty to reach out if they have any questions.

Jennifer Purcell shared that the Faculty Senate looks forward to working with Ms. Keller and the SGA.

B. Provost's Update – Interim Provost Ron Matson

Interim Provost Matson said he had no specific updates other than those items he would address on the agenda later in the meeting.

C. Curriculum Update – Interim AVP of Curriculum Pam Cole

Pam Cole announced that the vote on the Faculty Handbook language has been postponed so she can clarify the accurate number of representatives on the UPCC and GPCC.

She said lifting of the curriculum pause is a little over half way in terms of giving programs the first launch—which is when the originator communicates with the Curriculum Support Office (CSO) and they've loaded their things in and the CSO is ready to launch it and move it forward. Making good progress on that.

She also shared that she is working primarily on communication with different units on campus related to Curriculum and has asked each College to identify a liaison/representative to facilitate communication. She asks that faculty communicate with her directly by email if there are questions or confusion about the process.

She also shared that she is working on streamlining forms and clarifying what is needed on forms to reduce errors and simplify the process.

She gave a status update on the lifting of the curriculum:

Wave I-- courses, Wave II deactivations/discontinuations are underway. Wave III will be focused on program revisions (no new program proposals yet) -- this should be coming out mid-February.

D. President's Update – President Pamela Whitten

President Whitten welcomed everyone back to a new semester and shared the following updates:

- 1) KSU had an outstanding MLK event. A big luncheon on the floor of the Convocation Center. Surpassed the RSVPs. Great speaker. She said it sets the bar pretty high for us for the coming years.
- 2) She just kicked off Creed Week at the campus. Second year we are doing this. Important opportunity to discuss the values and tenets at KSU.
- 3) Chief Diversity Office—new search, chaired by Nwakaego Nkumeh (Vice President

- and Chief Legal Affairs Officer). She thanked Dr. Malewski for his service in the role.
- 4) Recent announcement from Carnegie of change in classification from R3 to R2. Interesting because the R3 status was eliminated. 6% Universities in US have the R designation. Deans have brought back an R2 Road Map this semester and she is hoping that many faculty are involved in your Colleges to provide input.
 - 5) Several new staffing appointments:
 - a. Lance Burchett- VP of Advancement (from Arkansas).
 - b. Mark Byrd- Head of Institutional Research (from Wayne State).
 - c. Phaedra Corso- VP of Research (from UGA).
 - d. Provost Search ongoing and hope to have completed by this week and to announce very shortly.
 - 6) Noted KSU's recent top ranking with respect to admission yield rates.
 - 7) Regarding Student Success—we determined early in August that we had several students very close to graduating and short a small amount for their tuition and fees. Asked Trustees with a 4-hour window for those funds and received them. 134 students received a gap scholarship—87% of them graduated in December.
 - 8) Opening a 24/7 study facility on both campuses.

II. Approval of the Agenda

Motion. Seconded. Passed unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes

Motion. Seconded. Passed unanimously.

IV. Reports

Jennifer Purcell said she would circulate these electronically to Senators.

V. Old Business

- A. Elsevier Subscription – Dr. David Evans

David Evans reported in response to the motion passed at Nov/December meeting that negotiations with Elsevier had never stopped. After canceling the subscription Elsevier had contacted him for an informal meeting, which has already occurred and there will be a formal resumption to negotiations in March. He noted that he will meet with the Library Advisory Committee prior to that negotiation.

He will be looking at a la carte options which Elsevier calls a deposit account and allows for article by article requests to be prepaid. It won't be cheap, and he will put the funds he has towards this, but it will run out.

In response to the language in the motion about “ensure access” he said that there is no library that can ensure access without resources. He said that as all libraries we will rely on Interlibrary Loan (ILL) and walk in access at other USG libraries.

He reported that 57 requests were received by ILL in January 2019 and were met 100% . The average turnaround was 3 days. He anticipates this will be even shorter once all the other Universities are fully open for the new semester.

Regarding usage he said that of the 2500 Elsevier titles, 98.2% are used one time or less per day meaning that there is lots of content that is never used at all (and it is the same with EBSCO with

14000 it was 98.9% of the database used one time/day or less). In Elsevier there are about 40 titles with high usage—to purchase access to these only would probably be in excess \$150K.

Senator Justin Pettigrew asked if the usage data could be further parsed to remove the 1 vs. 0 usage journals in both Elsevier and Ebsco, do the percentages still look the same?

David Evans said he would have to look into that. He said it is hard to tell who is using which journal when.

Senator Justin Pettigrew noted that for a university of our size with this number of journals, it seems there would be a large number that are accessed only once, and people aren't going back to them.

David Evans said the Library has done what it can to make the content discoverable using metadata, Search of Google Scholar. This is how people work—students are working on a project and they all find an article.

Senator Heather Pincock confirmed that there was a revised version of Dean Evans' report since the materials were shared with Senators and asked that Senators have an opportunity to see the revised version before voting to approve.

**Motion— To accept the revised report virtually with an online vote.
Seconded. Passed unanimously.**

B. Faculty Workload Handbook Language Proposal – Dr. Ron Matson

Ron Matson explained that after the Workload Task Force and then Provost Noble released the Workload recommendation last Fall, we had worked to incorporate the language into the Faculty Handbook and displayed the language for Senators to review (which also included in the meeting packet).

Senator Noah McLaughlin said that the main thing he and his department were focused on was the phrase “faculty who are not meeting expectations will be placed on a different model”. The multiple models seem good. But passive voice and vagueness of the phrase is concerning. Who makes these decisions, with what frequency are they made?

Ron Matson replied by asking who does it now?

Senator Noah McLaughlin replied that it is the Chair and P&T Committee.

Ron Matson replied that the workload is done by the Chair and faculty member and then if there is a problem it goes to the Dean. There is no change with that. What it does say though is if this year you are supposed to be doing one thing and there are no products, then you can be changed to another workload. That simply explicitly states what is already in practice.

Noah McLaughlin replied that saying workload models can be changed is one thing, but the current language suggest that your Chair just tells you your workload. He asked if this is the intent of the document?

Ron Matson responded yes that is correct. Workload decisions go to the Dean if there is a disagreement between faculty member and Chair. There is nothing new about that.

Senator Todd Harper said that he would like to see it reframed. For a faculty member's Chair to say I think your strengths lie in this area is very different from saying you're not performing, and I punish you. He said he would rather see language that suggests that the movement is negotiated and focuses on strengths of the faculty member rather than this form of punitive measure.

Ron Matson replied that the language does not refer to a punitive measure at all in his view. The new language is needed because some people (both faculty and Chairs) think that workload readjustments cannot happen. He pointed out that it refers to shared governance and consultation between faculty and Chair. He said the new language clarifies what has already been in the document and that he does not see it as punitive.

Senator Todd Harper asked but isn't that already there. He said there is a big difference between "who might be better served in other areas" and "not meeting expectations".

Ron Matson said we can talk about wordsmithing but that he didn't see it as any different. He referred to the flipside of a scenario of being on a 2/2 and that thinking that you cannot be moved to a 3/3 and this is to clarify that yes you can and that is within the purview of the Chair to look not just at you but at the whole department and that there are deliverables expected of that person. That is where the P&T Committees come in in the 3rd and 5th year. But this here relates to workload and not the P&T.

Senator Justin Pettigrew asked how this becomes punitive. What makes the way that this is said or worded punitive?

Senator Noah McLaughlin said the language feels punitive because of the passive voice. It implies that regardless of a faculty member's professional goals, if they aren't producing they can be placed on a 5/4 teaching load.

Senator Steve Collins suggested that what may allay some concerns, in addition to the suggestion Todd made to make it seem more of a collaborative exercise, is to add to language in red— "in consultation with the Chair and approval by the Dean." That may seem redundant but that the first part of the paragraph could make it seem that if everything is going well and there aren't any points of conflict then you can negotiate a change. The language in red seems that in situations where the Chair determines you are not meeting the expectations that the Chair can largely unilaterally make that decision and it's not a conversation with the faculty member.

Ron Matson said he would be open to suggested language because he doesn't see where the problem is. He said the possibility already exists and has for his 29 years at KSU. It says that if they cannot reach agreement the Dean comes in at that point. He said the existing language already states what Senator Collins was proposing.

Senator Sandra Pierquet asked if the language is already there then why do we need revised language at all. She shared that she read it as punitive. It sounds like you're bad,

you suck, you go over there. She asked if she was alone on this.

Several **Senators** replied that no she was not.

Ron Matson said the language is needed because Chairs are telling him it's not within their purview (when it is). The whole point is to make the expectations clearer.

Senator Sandra Pierquet suggested adding the other side in. You may also be moved to a different track if you are exceeding expectations.

Ron Matson said that is obviously the case and is obviously in there already. He said he was fine with wordsmithing to clarify the flexibility aspect.

Senator Laurie Tis added that there are multiple reasons why a faculty member would want to change workloads and that we hope this is more of an agreed upon mechanism and the language needs to reflect that rather than implying a chair can change everyone's workload and play favorites.

Ron Matson said that that there has to be in the Annual Review the documentation of the deliverables.

Senator Laurie Tis said she had seen that too, faculty promising to produce year after year without results.

Ron Matson said he appreciated her saying this and that he was open to wordsmithing. He said if you just got an NSF grant and can buy yourself out of teaching to a 1/1 that is fine or if somebody wants to teach more they can. He said that's always been there but there seems to be a misunderstanding about how that is implemented.

Senator Todd Harper said that in this model, scholarship is clearly favored. There are those of us who are excellent at scholarship, there are excellent teachers and also those who do a lot of service. Whatever the Chair does with the faculty member—we should strive for the best model for that faculty member and reward those who are good in every area.

Ron Matson said he agreed with that and disagrees that this focuses on any one performance area. The Handbook includes illustrative models and refers to infinite variety.

Senator Allan Fowler said that what's not in here (the Handbook language) is that this could be a time dependent decision. As you know a publication or an NSF grant takes some time to get. What's in here does not reflect that.

Ron Matson replied that it is purposely that way because timelines do vary. This is where the annual reviews are done on an annual basis to show progress. We know there are no guarantees when things are published but we can distinguish between promises without evidence of work in progress.

Senator Allan Fowler suggested changing "will be placed" to "could be placed".

Ron Matson said that we could make this change.

Senator Jeff Yunek said that the purpose is to make explicit that there's flexibility but the verbiage (to him) is more focused on the negative case. He supported the idea of stating both scenarios: doesn't meet or exceeds expectations they should develop a more appropriate workload in consultation with the Chair.

Senator Noah McLaughlin said that he would use stronger language to make clear that if it's not working then you will sit down and work out a way forward.

Ron Matson said he was open to different wording and that it was just important to make it clear what can happen.

Senator Nik Clegorne returned to the point about privileging research over teaching. He noted that one place where that's true is if a faculty member gets moved to a 5/4 then you are no longer on a tenure track.

Ron Matson said that they are trying to clarify expectations and that all of us who are Professors regardless of the adjective in front are going to need to be research active.

Senator Justin Pettigrew asked about p. 42 the Teaching/Service balance, is that even real anymore?

Ron Matson said yes. Absolutely.

Senator Noah McLaughlin said that on the Teaching Service Balance, Scholarship/Creative Activity is at 10% which is below the minimum for a tenure-track faculty member.

Ron Matson said it is still possible. He said he might be on that when he goes back to Biology.

Senator Nik Clegorne noted that you wouldn't have to be on it for 6 years, you could be on it for 2 years and then research intensively for 3 years and still be tenure track.

Ron Matson said yes that could also be possible.

Senator Darina Lepadatu said that it sounds like faculty moved to teaching track are demoted and the concern in her department relates to equity. If you move an Associate Professor to a 5/4 faculty load it's the same load that the Lecturers have with much lower pay. How can we have faculty on the same load with such a big salary difference? It opens up a lot of legal issues.

Ron Matson said that first of all more and more departments are treating Lecturers like Tenure Track faculty in terms of SCA expectations when clearly that's not their expectation and this is unfair. You also have to look at this from a different perspective. At the end you may be correct, but people are not hired at this level. At the end of my career if I'm on a 5/4 load and making more than a Lecturer there is nothing I can do about that because they don't have the stuff on their CV that shows the earlier accomplishments. On the other hand, a person on a 60/10/30 and tenure

track but we've said you're not going to get tenured that way, the difference is that a Lecturer has a presumption of renewal and a tenure-track faculty does not.

Motion—To form a committee of Senators to work with Ron Matson on the Faculty Handbook language regarding faculty workload and bring a recommendation back in February.

Senators Todd Harper, Allan Fowler, Noah McLaughlin volunteered to serve on this committee.

Second. Passed unanimously.

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

Tammy Powell (Interim Executive Director of Technology Enhanced Learning) explained to Senators that per the Provost's decision, there is no required online course review process and no training requirement for online teaching. Chairs will decide who can teach online.

She explained that the Distance Learning Center will continue to offer and develop training and is developing a badge system for their trainings. Workshops are currently available, and a digital badge is already offered for the accessibility workshop.

She noted that faculty can be compensated for creating online courses—that money for this comes from the Departments and Colleges. DLC is working on the application process. The Online Coordinators for each College are also meeting today to discuss the different College policies in development on this and learn from each other.

Senator Noah McLaughlin asked about the timeline for the badge system?

Tammy Powell said the accessibility digital badge is already available. Workshops going on now will have badges. She explained that there are two different systems in use at KSU and they are waiting to see who the University is going to go with to finalize the plans. Everything new offered by DLC will come with a badge.

VI. New Business

E. Student Global Learning Fee – Dr. Lance Askildson

Lance Askildson (Vice-Provost and Chief International Officer) explained that on November 28, the University Mandatory Fee Committee voted to phase out the \$11 per student International Fee which had funded the Global Learning Scholarship. This year—to July 2019 the fee remains \$11. Then it reduces to \$6 and in July 2020 it will phase out to 0.

His office has been working with the President to find other ways to fund the Global Learning Scholarship (GLS). He explained that KSU is able to pay for one type of cost via state funds—instructional expenses (faculty expenses)—and that they are looking for ways to subsidize the overall cost by paying for the instructional expenses. The goal is to maintain that same level of support. He explained that they are still very much in the trenches in figuring out what instructional costs we can cover this year. By reducing dependence on the student fee this year, they can save it for future years and there is also a plan to ramp up our fundraising efforts to fund scholarships to cover the remaining costs that used to be covered by the GLS.

Senator Todd Harper asked where the new funds to cover faculty instructional costs would be coming from?

Lance Askildson replied that some will come from discretionary DGA funds, but the bulk of the funds are coming from the President. Division of Global Affairs (DGA) has been working with the Budget Office on that. In short, the funds are coming from the University.

Senator Heather Pincock asked if he could be more specific about where “from the University” the funds were coming from?

Lance Askildson replied that he didn’t know exactly where it is coming from. This would be a question more for Budget.

Vincent Coakley (SGA Senator for SPCEET) asked if the money provided would be equal to what the GLS now provides?

Lance Askildson said yes and that over time we will be drawing from some fee money that still remains as it draws down, some fundraised money, and some state funds to continue to subsidize where necessary. To answer the question – there will be no impact on students this year and we’re hoping no impact into the future.

Senator Todd Harper thanked Lance and President Whitten for coming up with a solution and as a study abroad faculty he is very happy to hear that we are finding solutions.

Lance Askildson responded that he wished to acknowledge the President’s support in working out a solution and that she had reassured him this was in no way a divestment from study abroad.

Senator Heather Pincock asked if students would be informed that their fees are being reduced?

Lance Askildson replied that the International Fee is not being eliminated it is being reallocated.

Senator Heather Pincock clarified that the overall amount of student fees isn’t going to be reduced?

Jamie Fernandez (Associate Controller-Budget) stepped in to explain that the International Fee had been reallocated rather than eliminated. She explained that KSU has refinanced on one of its public-private ventures, a bond paid facility. The refinancing required a \$19 increase to student fees (because the facility can only be funded through student fees). Rather than increase student fees, which President Whitten did not wish to do, they recognized that the Board of Regents has indicated it may not support the International Fee going forward. This is not because they don’t value the purpose but because only three other institutions charge the International Fee and they won’t approve any going forward. KSU Budget office in consultation with the President therefore decided to reallocate the \$11 International Fee over a 2-year period to cover costs of the bond paid facility.

Lance Askildson added that while he was certainly disappointed that the International fee was being phased out, he wasn’t surprised because he had heard rumblings of its elimination since

arriving to KSU in 2013. Under President Olens it was actively being discussed. He said he was pleased about where we are given the likely trajectory of the fee and that we are working hard to mitigate any negative effect for students.

F. Elections

1. FS Liaison to the Chairs and Directors Assembly
Todd Harper
2. FS Liaison to the Deans Council
Marielle Myers

Jennifer Purcell asked that any additional nominations be emailed to her by 5pm today.

**Motion to vote for these positions online. Seconded.
Passed unanimously.**

G. Review of University Shared Governance

Motion to extend the meeting to 2pm. Seconded. Passed unanimously.

Jennifer Purcell explained that a discussion of shared governance practices had begun in the FSEC and carried into the University Council's recent meeting. She said there has already been a discussion of how shared governance works at the level of Colleges but that there is also a place for a discussion of shared governance at the University level. She said based on feedback from Senators, we are committed to shared governance and we already say what it is in the Faculty and University Handbook, but we need to examine how that plays out in practice. She said her hope is that Faculty Senate could lead/facilitate a conversation—noting that the timing is perfect with the arrival of a new Provost and several Deans searches underway. She also noted that many conversations on this topic were rushed during consolidation and that it is a good time to come back to review the relevant documents and get a sense of where we are now with our current size and mission to have conversations among ourselves and with our administration to get us on a path moving forward. She welcomed input from Senators.

Senator Doug Moodie said that he thought one thing we need to look at is how we use the University Council (UC). The last few years the UC hasn't done much at all and its current duties are not very extensive. However, it is the only formal group where students, staff, administrators, Deans, and faculty are all together and would be good place for some issues that come up from parking to higher level issues where it's worth getting a discussion between all the existing bodies. The UC could be used better.

Jennifer Purcell responded that the University Council convened this month and is referenced in the handbook but doesn't have any bylaws so could certainly be leveraged more to discuss issues that span across the shared governance bodies such as CAR, Part-Time Faculty Teaching etc. and other issues that it would be important to take up in consultation with each other.

Senator Joanne Lee said she appreciated the discussions we have had of shared governance. She said that her vision of it is a slice of the pie and that we need to think about the level of communication and inclusion taking place and that any kind of system you put in place needs support. For example she said a pizza pie in front of you is also on a tray (ie. supportive mechanism) and we need to look at how it works and to develop those mechanisms.

Vincent Coakley asked what do you see as the relationship between SGA and Faculty Senate?

Jennifer Purcell replied that if you look at the University Handbook both bodies are included under shared governance and that ideally, we are working in collaboration when appropriate. Some issues would of interest only to a specific body but ideally that we are consulted on policy changes and being used as think tank to share ideas from our various perspectives. Our Handbook states that changes are made in consultation with those who are affected.

Vincent Coakley asked do you feel like that's been the way things have been handled in the past?

Jennifer Purcell said that it was a good question and that it manifests in different ways at different times and that there are times that shared governance takes time and in some cases we don't have that time. That is a shift in the norm and different from what we are accustomed to. Part of the conversation is to look at internal expectations and external factors that can't be dismissed.

Senator Todd Harper said he'd like to see a University wide and open discussion of shared governance. He said that as you know there is a lot frustration, some that goes back to consolidation and some that after all of the initiatives in the fall people are feeling burned out and overwhelmed. He said inviting everyone to review the Handbook language, to dialogue and allow frustration to come out, and to seek solutions would be a good idea. He acknowledged that these bodies are advisory but that many of us would like to see better use of that, being informed up front and having a role in the process. He said a forum open to the entire University community would go a long way to raising morale of the campus particularly at a time when raises appear out of sight.

Jennifer Purcell agreed and said she'd like to see the Faculty Senate lead this discussion. She noted that when she speaks of shared governance she includes culture, inclusio, and communication.

Motion for the Faculty Senate to take the lead to organize and host a forum or summit addressing shared governance in order to:

- 1) **Review language in the University Handbook**
- 2) **Allow for frustrations and concerns to be expressed**
- 3) **Discuss ideas for improving shared governance practice**

Seconded.

Approved Unanimously.

VII. Announcements

H. National Conference on Undergraduate Research – Dr. Chris Cornelison

Chris Cornelison (NCUR Co-Chair) asked that Senators share information about class redirection due to NCUR on April 11-13.

Senator Marianne Holdzkom asked how will parking work on campus during NCUR?

Chris Cornelison answered that parking should not be changed because guests and conference attendees will be taking shuttle buses from their lodging locations.

Staff Senator Tiffani Reardon asked how parking enforcement would be during NCUR?

Chris Cornelison said it would proceed as it does normally.

Staff Senator Tiffani Reardon announced on a related note that CETL is offering a workshop on transparent assignments for NCUR.

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 1:58pm.