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Opening Remarks

Welcome – M. Todd Harper

Online Faculty Senate Meeting Expectations

a. ~~Please complete the attendance survey (link in the chat window) if you are a senator or a guest~~.

b. 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.

c. 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.

d. 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 April and May Minutes. (M. Todd Harper 12:30)

New Business

1. Approval of Minutes (M. Todd Harper 12:30-12:35)

M.A. Karim(Engineering): last MOM motion to approve: . approved

1. Call for Nominations to CDA (1 position) and Adult Learning Community (1 position) (M. Todd Harper 12:35-12:40)

CDA liaison: Todd and Heather served as CDA liaison.

1. Vote on nominations for Adult Learning Community (Joel Crombez, Sociology), Parking and Transportation (Rebecca Peterson, Criminal Justice), and Community Engagement (Shannon Tovey, Elementary and Early Education; Elizabeth Martin,Architecture ; Sarah North, Computer Science; Abigail Alexander, World Languages and Cultures ; Charles Parrott, Theatre ; Cyril Okhio, Electrical Engineering ; Katherine Ingram, Exercise Science and Sports Management. (M. Todd Harper 12:40-12:45)

ALC: Joel Crombez, Sociology, approved

Prof. Martin is not available for this semester; the position is for the academic year. ( nomination will be changed)

All the other candidates are approved. Some colleges did not nominate.

Jeff:Yunek(Department of Music): division of assembly for tabular vote, since we are in unison, tabular vote not required.

1. Peer Groups for Compensation Study (M. Todd Harper 12:45-12:50)

The compensation study has begun. The university is forming the peer groups and Todd has sent document listing the peer institutions. Please review it, it has gone to FSEC which has approved, as the list matches Kennesaw’s profile.

1. UITS (Veronica Trammell 12:50 – 1:00)

1. Cyber security month: new training to complete, October 1st to 31st. Two trainings one for April and another for October. This training is required for all KSU.

2. Fish alert for Fishing attempts, to bring alert to different attempts for fishing

3. Nojib Web will become read-only. Onebase will replace. Please feel free to reach out to UITS.

4. Guest wifi: we have a registration portal for the guest. Enter your email address and then a password will be provided. Password for only one week., register again thereafter.

5. Technology portal: service.kennesaw.edu (also ticket tracking)

6. Status page: status.kennesaw.edu (for maintenance and updates and outages).

7. Service now does not have an app version; they are working on it.

8. Twice a year training: mandate from the state and USG has mandated it.

9. How am I supposed to know if request from outside is legit: KSU today

10. For junk email , please mark it not junk.

1. PTR Document and Revisions (M. Todd Harper 1:00 -1:45)

PTR discussions

**Todd Harper**: Timeline for the document. Sep 31: the provost has asked all the bodies to provide the revisions and the document itself. They will then look if the revisions are consistent with the BOR policy. If not consistent, they will reject with explanation.

Oct 17th, all USG institutions who have not yet submitted, will submit. The review for those who have submitted has been tough. Linda Noble (1st review) and Stuart Rayfield (follow up review) are doing it. Legal team is also participating.

Nov 18th, USG provides feedback. Institution takes revisions.

Jan 2023, faculty begin designating student success and professional growth on fpa. Colleges revise guidelines.

January 2024: full implementation of PTR guidelines.

We have number of strong revisions which are at risk if voted down. PTR guidelines will be presented with vote. Georgia Tech approved its guidelines, but did so with a resolution that it sent to the USG protesting the process.

We are going to start out with consent agenda, ….

Susan Smith will take some of the editing for any language that is revised.

**Todd Harper:** Motion to approve the consent agenda.

Randy Stuart (Marketing & Professional Sales): question on consent agenda: In service section of PIP. Why are we saying a faculty who is not doing good in service, should work with someone with strong record in rca.

Stephen Collins (Government and International Affairs): it should say service, it’s a typo.

Noah McLaughlin (Department of Foreign Languages): Number 5 in the failed PIP, can it be changed to unsuccessful PIP?

Jeff:Yunek(Department of Music): this is just a motion in a package of motion, just a quick up/down vote will do.

Noah McLaughlin: Motion to change from failed PIP to unsuccessful PIP? No debate. Move to vote, All in favor. Motion passed.

Jeffery Yunek: Motion to approve the consent agenda approval. Motion carried.

**Todd Harper:** Proposal #6: **Continued profession growth:** After speaking with Stuart Rayfield, it would be included in student success. Faculty will be designated in FPAs profession growth and will be evaluated on this.

Stephen Collins: did not find anything in BoR document that faculty demonstrate professional growth?

Heather Pincock(Conflict Management, Peacebuilding and Development): BoR policy manual (not part of the changes that happened last year).

*8.3.7.3 Criteria for Tenure*

*Minimum for All Institutions in All Professorial Ranks  
The minimum criteria for tenure are demonstrating Excellence and effectiveness in teaching and instruction; Outstanding involvement in student success activities; Academic achievement, as appropriate to the institution’s mission; Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community; and, Professional growth and development.*

**Todd Harper:** It is also included under Annual component of the BoR document(third page).

Tom Okie (History and Philosophy) : what are we trying to include in professional development?

**Todd Harper:** Something we have to discuss with the department chair.

Noah McLaughlin: professional development, time and funds? How will this be folded in the workload model.

**Todd Harper:** We don’t have structure available for this , but pragmatically we are adding to it.

Stephen Collins: Professional growth, is a nebulous term. If we can treat it the way we are treating student success that it is recognizing we address student success as something we all do all the time. If student success is not going to be a separate line in FPA.

**Todd Harper:** We will say which category and what student success will we do.

Stephen Collins: I was thinking it will just be the narrative reflecting in the annual review. We should not make this an exercise that distracts us, unlike what happens in K-12.

**Todd Harper:** Amendment to change profession development to continuous profession growth .

**Motion approved the amendment was to change the wording "professional development" to "continual professional growth"**

**Proposal #7:** (Michael Carroll, Architecture) Reward for successful PTR (score 3) should be recognized, either monetarily or otherwise.

Daniel Ferreira (Environmental Science): Financing might be affected, so the administration may use it to shoot the whole thing down.

M.A.Karim: some can be selected via lottery if financial is a constraint.

Michael Carroll: we do not have control over, it does not have to be monitory, but given our salary levels and it being once every five years, it should be considered.

**Motion to approve Proposal #7: Approved.**

**Proposal #8:** Appeals Process

Stephen Collins: Since annual reviews have much greater weight now, there should be an independent appeals process (appeals committee within the department, could be DFC or P&T or some other committee). This determination is not definitive, but one more voice. The dean now considers the feedback of the chair and the appeals committee.

Tom Okie (History and Philosophy): can this not be also for PTR?

Stephen Collins: There is a appeals process for unsuccessful performance improvement plan. There could be also for PTR but that would be a separate process.

Daniel Rogers (Psychological Science ): since this was rejected by USG , will this be acceptable?

Steven Collins: This is an opportunity for senate at large to improve this document and have a voice in this issue.

**Motion to approve Proposal #8: Approved**.

**Proposal #9**: Clear criteria for score of 4 or 5

Darina Lepadatu (Sociology): the clarity on the scores could be:

3 : meeting expectations , 4: exceeding expectations on 3 out of 5, 5:minimum 4 out of 5.

Overall score: is Deans score, which is what the dean gives.

Albert Jimenez(Education Leadership): we will need to get a score of 3 in all the categories?

Minhao Dai (Communication and Media): The committee at department level scores on all 4 levels ; will it be department score or deans score. What about if someone goes early?

**Todd Harper:** deans score will be the final score. Not sure on early PTR.

William Griffiths (Mathematics): elective PTR should not be different than normal PTR.

What does meeting expectations and exceeding expectations. In my department its difficult to get that, so how about: 4: exceeding expectations on 2 out of 5, 5:minimum 3 out of 5?

Move to propose table #9 is not yet ready

Darina Lepadatu**: Withdraw Proposal #9.**

**Proposal #10:**

Jillian Ford(Social Studies Education): Faculty members have option to bring in a witness member to Annual Review.

**Todd Harper:** This could be part of the consent part. Where can we put it in?

Jillian Ford: can we have a vote now and decide where to add it later?

Glen Meades(Chemistry): Should this not be simply a part of the previous amendment giving the option of a review?

Jeff Yunek: Vote to extend and then motion.

**Vote to extend session approved.**

William Griffith: Like to idea of the faculty advocate for the entire PTR process.

Jillian Ford: this could be a part of larger discussion to have a faculty advocate for the PTR process.

William Griffith: for both the PTR and regular P& T.

Jillian Ford: **Proposal #10 withdrawn**

Steven Collins: pending matter needs to be resolved: GT amendment to their plan, approved this document with the provision that its under protest? Will that be a separate motion?

William Griffith: Motion to approve the guideline as we have amendment but not approve as not amended

Jeff Yunek: We are voting on the amended document

William Griffith: we do not approve the original is not approved but approve the amended document.

Jeff Yunek: does the provost modify the amended proposal?

**Todd Harper:** He will review the amendment, and which does not meet the BoR guidelines will be removed.

William Griffith: Vote on the amended document

Steven Collins: We are playing this under protest . It has weakened the tenure process, and this is not a voice of support.

Heather Pincock: Vote no, we don’t have to vote yes for the provost to use the changes.

William Griffith: what about the addendum from Jillian Ford?

Jeff Yunek: We could draft some statement in October to send it to downtown. Also, 2/3 majority not required for the proposal to pass.

Steven Collins: We should be clear that we are doing this under duress without waiting for a month.

**Todd Harper:** Vote on accepting the amended document. Vote:58 yes-42 no

William Griffith: Motion to approve the PTR documents as we amended today:

**Todd Harper:** Vote sent out again: 54% yes-46%

M.A. Karim: Vote on not accepting the prior document?

Darina Lepadatu: Please send out the updated document if motion passes.

**PTR revision document passes.**

Jeff Yunek: Motion to adjourn. Adjourned. (2:10 PM)