Faculty Senate Meeting: February 27, 2023 (12:30 PM – 1:45 PM)

12:30-1:45

Virtual Meeting

Senators: Glen Meades, M. Harper, M. A. Karim, Jeff Wagner, Darina Lepadatu, Daniel Ferreira,Jeffrey Yunek,Sumit Chakravarty,Ann Mills, Randy Stuart, Albert Jimenez, Dabae Lee, Daniel Rogers, Susan Smith,Nicholas Ellwanger, Minhao Dai, Austin Brown, William Griffiths, Kent Altom, Lantz Holtzhower, Heather Pincock, David Bray, Ying Xie, Tom Okie,Ying Wang, Paula Guerra, Stephen Collins, Peter St. Pierre, James Stinchcomb, Snehal Shirke, Noah McLaughlin, Hassan Pournaghshband, Cameron Greensmith, Michael Carroll, Ken Hoganson, Lin Li, Craig Brasco, James Davis, Rebecca Hill

Guests: Dale Vogelien, Christy Storey, Judy Reardon, Johnathan Steppe, Tamara Livingston, Jaime Cruz-Ortiz, Chandra Floyd, Karen McDonnell, Michelle Head, Amber Smith, Anissa Vega, David Garofalo, Alexander McGee, Amy Buddie, Geza Kogler, Phaedra Corso, Paul Parker, Lori Lowder, Aaron Howell, LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey, Tyler Reinagel, Sonia Toson ,Doreen Wagner, Scott Nowak, Pam Cole, McCree O'Kelley, Nwakaego Nkumeh Walker, Ian Ferguson, James Taylor, Tricia Chastain, Lesley Netter-Snowden

**MoM**

Opening Remarks

Welcome – M. Todd Harper

Online Faculty Senate Meeting Expectations

a. Voting will be carried out electronically (link will be available in the chat window) and will be tracked. **Please only vote if you are a senator.** A non-senator voting will result in an immediate permanent ban from the faculty senate.

b. Use the “Raise your hand” feature in order to be recognized. iv. As we move forward with our senate meetings, the FSEC has heard from its members and agrees on the need to hold to correct parliamentary procedure. Motions will be preferred over discussion items so that we typically have action items on the floor. We would like to point out that there will be less time in our meetings used to announce our business items, so it will be more important than ever to be familiar with all documents pertaining to our meeting. To further promote discussion, the president of the faculty senate will begin by calling for dissenting opinions. If there are no dissenting voices, we will be able to call for a vote directly and increase efficiency in our meetings.

c. Please get familiar with Robert’s Rules of Order: https://assembly.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/roberts\_rules\_simplified.pdf

**Old Business:**

1. Approval of Faculty Senate January Minutes. (M. Todd Harper 12:30) : Hearing no objection, they are accepted as presented.

Information: FSEC is meeting with the buck group after the Spring Break.

1. **Course Evaluation Survey** (See attached proposals along with three motions below) (Darina Lepadatu 12:30-12:50); 10 mins for motion1, 5 mins for motion2, 5 mins for motion 3.

Darina: Have received feedbacks based on which updates have been made. Please take this survey to cinsult with colleges to have a vote in March meeting.

Dropped student success 5 item question. Open ended question : “Please comment how instructed supported your learning”

Tom Okie: I am very much in favor of "support your learning" instead of success for Q5

Glen Meades: supported your learning" is better as students often see "success" as just a grade and not learning.

Ying Xie: Can more questions be added or be customized to the college?

Darina: In august we had a FS vote which ensured unique questions.

Dabee Lee: Minor edits to the questions.

Susan Smith, I think this language has been proposed for Q2, and it does seem a little better to me: "The instructor created a learning environment in which I felt comfortable participating."

Daniel “Is there some way evaluations can be fixed so instructors of records are not evaluated for Graduate Teachings?

Stephen Collins: I want to find out what in the eyes of students is not working and also what is working.

**Extra Credit:** Darina: Question 7 stays. No consensus on extra credit. We want to see if extra credit can be allowed based on feedback rate.

David and Randy: Extra credit should not be applicable for adult students.

**Motion on extending the course evaluation:** to 4 weeks(1 month), also recommendation from students not to force them during last week.

1. Graduate Incomplete Policy Revision (Juliet Langman, 12:50-1:00)

Paul Parker: Dean Langman has provided document, I am happy to take any questions and concerns.

Heather Pincock: This appears to be exact same as last and senators are requesting the policy to be more aligned to undergraduate.

Paul Parker: We feel graduate should be considered separate from undergraduate. If this is passed, we will try to tailor the undergraduate policy in future.

Heather Pincock: As some MS programs last only a year, maybe it should be treated separately from PhD. Program.

Jeff Yunek: One side of the policy is more lenient than other side. The misalignment is because graduate is more flexible than undergraduate.

Since our time has ended: either we vote or we extend discussions by a motion to extend for next meeting.

Randy Stuart: Second to Ken Hoganson Move to postpone, voting, please.

Motion to postpone : approved by 83% to march.

**New Business:**

1. KSU’s New Records Management Policy (Informational Item) (Tamara Livingston, 1:00-1:10)

Record and Information Management information and KSU’s RIM policy: aligns us with existing USG guidelines. Over 40 series of records collapsed into 5 categories. Allows determining how long to keep and when to dispose them. A majority of records are transitory(5 year retention rule).

1. Transfer Policy Revision and Clarification (Paul Parker, 1:10-1:15): Grade point average proposal. Additional to the whole gpa; to be added to catalog to provide the Hope GPA, created via GA student financial Information. To clarify the student GPA calculation and presentation: this will clarify that only KSU courses are to be consider for GPA calculations.

Dale Vogelien: Paul, the information in this proposal looks very clear.  Thank you!

Motion has been approved by 98%

1. Undergraduate Catalog Policy Revision (Jaime Cruz-Ortiz, 1:15-1:25): Jamie Cruz-Otriz

Friendly proposals from UPCC. Changes to 3.7.2, mostly un-substantive changes. Main change: addition of a third category for expedited proposals. Removing superfluous information. Adding missing information.

Randy Stuart: every time we have department chair; it needs to be changed to chairs/directors. There are some duplications.

Jeffery Yunek: Motion to approve the proposal considering the clarification language from Randy Stuart.

Motion passed with 100% vote.

1. Graduate Catalog Policy Revision (Anissa Vega, 1:25-1:35)

Anisa Vega: The graduate and CSO office have made the graduate policy referral easier and in the process made non substantive changes.

Heather Pincock: Significant substantive change to require enrollment during summer. Students are not funded in summer so this will create burden for them. Section 2.3.1 in main document.

Anisa Vega: This is already in place, Paul’s office will know if and how to enforce.

Rebecca Hill: As faculty are not reimbursed , maybe its not required to have this policy.

Anisa Vega: We are not trying to change the policy with this proposal, we are just being very clear on what the policy is.

Jeffery Yunek: Should we discuss further or follow the motion to postpone to March.

Randy Stuart: every time we have department chair; it needs to be changed to chairs/directors.

Motion to postpone the voting on the proposal to March, with substantive discussion with Anisa Vega.

Todd Harper: We may also need a policy change in addition.

Motion to postpone discussion approved :Yes, 37%

Move to extend the meeting for 10mins: Approved by 80%

1. Centers and Institutes Policy Revision (LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey, 1:35-1:45 Separate the procedural instruction to the policy for centrers and institutes. The directors of the institute and centers will engage in APR with the dean, avp or vpr.
2. Heather Pincock: how do we ensure the five year plan is feasible and what if the targets are not met. How will these situations be handled?

Minhao Dai: This is just to assess the center and not the people?

LaJuan: The program directors may be intertwined.

Motion to approve: Approved 97%

Motion to adjourn: Approved 1:53 PM.

Appendix:

Course Evaluation Motions

**Motion 1.** The Taskforce on Course Evaluations proposes the attached course evaluation survey.

**Motion 2.** Instructors may provide 1% extracredit if response rates are over 50% and no more than 2% extracredit if response rates are over 75%. Extracredit incentives may be adopted optionally by instructors.  Digital records also need to be

**Motion 3.** **T**he course evaluation period will be extended to 4 weeks prior to the last day of the semester (for a regular 15 week semester).