Faculty Senate Minutes: December 07, 2020. (Virtual Meeting)

Attendance:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Aaron Howell | Guest or Administrator |
| William George Griffiths IV | Senator |
| Jennifer Dickey | Senator |
| Dawn Baunach | Guest or Administrator |
| Michael Van Dyke | Senator |
| Abhra Roy | Senator |
| Paul McDaniel | Senator |
| Michelle Head | Guest or Administrator |
| Chris Sharpe | Senator |
| Christine Zelt | Guest or Administrator |
| Jeff Wagner | Senator |
| Amy Buddie | Guest or Administrator |
| Thierry Leger | Guest or Administrator |
| Heather Pincock | Senator |
| Daniel Ferreira | Senator |
| Jeff Yunek | Senator |
| Daniel Rogers | Senator |
| Andrea Knowlton | Senator |
| Tim Blumentritt | Guest or Administrator |
| Cristen Dutcher | Senator |
| Rebecca Hill | Senator |
| Sanjuana Rodriguez | Senator |
| Jim Davis | Senator |
| Md. Faruque Hossain | Senator |
| RON MATSON | Guest or Administrator |
| Giovanni Loreto | Senator |
| Steve Collins | Senator |
| Austin Brown | Senator |
| Snehal Shirke | Senator |
| Walter Thain | Senator |
| Ann Mills | Senator |
| Hassan pournaghshband | Senator |
| Noah McLaughlin | Senator |
| Doug Moodie | Senator |
| Lei Li | Senator |
| Peter E St Pierre | Senator |
| Sara Giordano | Guest or Administrator |
| Irene McClatchey | Senator |
| Randy Stuart | Senator |
| Joanne Lee | Senator |
| Humayun Zafar | Senator |
| Mohammad Jonaidi | Senator |
| Laurie Tis | Senator |
| Mary Beth Maguire | Senator |
| James Gambrell | Senator |
| Jeff Delaney | Guest or Administrator |
| Nicholas Ellwangwe | Senator |
| M. Todd Harper | Senator |
| Ying Wang | Senator |
| Lin Li | Senator |
| Anissa Vega | Guest or Administrator |
| Eric Arneson | Guest or Administrator |
| Dean Andrew Phillip Payne | Guest or Administrator |
| David G. Buckman | Senator |
| Diana Gregory | Senator |

**Opening Remarks**

1. Meeting called to order at 12:30, December 7, 2020.
2. Welcome – Humayun Zafar. Dr. Zafar asked Senators to consider the following expectations.

## Online Faculty Senate Meeting Expectations

* + 1. Please complete the attendance survey (link in the chat window) if you are a senator or a guest.
    2. 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.
    3. Use the “Raise your hand” feature in order to be recognized.
    4. 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 even 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.

## New Business

1. Approval of minutes (November 16th, 2020 meeting)
   1. Minutes Approved
2. Online Spring meetings – Humayun Zafar
   1. Dr. Zafar announced that all spring meetings will be held online.
3. [Cross leveling policy](#_bookmark0) – Xiao Huang and Nihal Khote
   1. Drs. Huang and Khote introduced the cross-leveling policy. They reminded Senators of the history of the motion as well as the fact that they had been asked to revise the policy after it was rejected at the November meeting. In terms of the history, they noted that KSU has never had a cross-leveling policy. The lack of policy became especially problematic when they tried to push through an MAT proposal through UPCC, but had to resolve a cross-leveling issue first. At that time, they were asked by UPCC to consider drafting a cross-leveling policy. Working with Dr. Anissa Vega, they created a policy that was later rejected by the Faculty Senate on the grounds that it did not take into consider certain elements, such as the cross-leveling of special topics courses. Both the UPCC and GPCC asked Drs. Huang and Khote to revise the policy since most R1 and several R2 Universities have them and, more importantly, to help guide faculty who want to cross-level a course.
   2. Senator Jeff Yunek, Music, noted that a cross-leveling policy was needed by his department since students take music ensembles at different times in their coursework. He was concerned that the revised policy still did not address some of the issues that music had. He noted that for these issues to be resolved, there would need to be a provision for a cross-leveling of lower-division and upper-division courses.
   3. Drs. Huang and Khote noted that while this was a general policy, individual departments could request exceptions. This would likely be a place where Music could have its concerns addressed.
   4. Dr. Rebecca Hill, ISD, thanked Drs. Huang and Khote for streamlining the previous proposal. She did note that the policy still did not seem to address certain courses that might be offered for only one semester (as opposed to permanent courses on the books). She gave an example of multiple sections of popular culture courses offered in any one given semester. Maybe only one of those sections of the same course might be need to cross-leveled, and that this might only be for one semester . Would a new permanent course have to be created?
   5. Drs. Huang and Khote noted that these types of courses could be addressed on an individual basis through the exceptions clause.
   6. A motion to extend the discussion on this item was made and then approved. Discussion was extended.
   7. Dr. Hill reiterated her concern that this policy could create difficulty for programs that currently cross-level and that would then seem to need approval from UPCC and GPCC with each exception.
   8. Dr. Michele Head noted that from a UPCC and GPCC prospective that a course can be approved to be cross-leveled, though the course does not always have to offered this way.
   9. Dr. Hill noted that it was helpful to know that a course could be approved for cross-leveling, though it did not have to always be taught that way. (Thus, this would avoid having to create a number of new courses that would then be taught rarely.)
   10. Senator Heather Pincock, Conflict Management, asked a clarifying question. She noted that while graduate courses should be correctly ordered to distinquish between masters and doctoral level courses, many of the older courses are not correctly numbered. This could present problems with cross-leveling.
   11. Senator Doug Moodie, Management, noted that one of the problems that KSU is having concerns numbering and especially renumbering of older courses. He noted that attempts are being made to streamline course numbering, but that older courses numbered incorrectly under the new system are still problematic.
   12. Dr. Pincock asked whether this would be a short-term problem.
   13. Dr. Moodie noted that courses will likely be renumbered before the policy goes into effect.
   14. Motion approved 29-3.
4. [Student evaluation motion](#_bookmark1) – Todd Harper
   1. Senator Harper, English, argued that faculty in his department had requested that the Senate approve a proposal to allow individual faculty to decide whether to submit Fall 2021 course reviews with ARDs. He noted that student evaluations would still be distributed. This was simply a proposal to allow faculty to choose whether to include them.
   2. Senator Bill Griffiths, Mathematics, asked whether the proposal could clarify what the “those” of “those courses” alluded to. For example, is it only courses that changed from one modality to the next.
   3. Dr. M. Todd Harper responded that it would be for all courses.
   4. Friendly amendment was proposed by Dr. Griffith for the last sentence to specify Fall 2020.
   5. Friendly amendment passed unanimously
   6. Senator Jeff Wagner asked for point of clarity if this is a blanket for all courses.
   7. Dr. Harper noted that it is a blanket for all courses. He noted that even if you were teaching in the modality originally meant to, there was a large learning curve.
   8. Dr. Harper noted that in FSEC Dr. Matson had noted that BOR policy requires course evaluations.
   9. Dr. Matson chimed in that this is in fact what he said. For those wondering about how we were able to abandon in Spring, he noted that this was a one-time exception caused by extraordinary circumstances.
   10. A suggestion was made to replace “PTR” with “Multi-level Review”
   11. Several senators noted that while they understood what Dr. Matson was stating about BOR policy, they noted that the Fall was as extraordinary in many ways as the Spring was. An exception, they noted, should also be made in this case.
   12. 80 in favor, 20 reject. Motion is approved.
   13. Important: Resolution was rejected by Academic Affairs based on a reading of BOR policy as outlined by Dr. Matson..

## Informational Items

1. [Committee on Academic Freedom (CAF)](http://catalog.kennesaw.edu/content.php?catoid=52&navoid=3801) – Needed five tenured members. The committee now has those members.
   1. Volunteers: Tim Hedeen, Rebecca Hill, Rebecca Petersen, Andy Pieper, and Hans Skott-Myre
2. Student evaluation motion – Darina Lepadatu
   1. Faculty Senate motion passed in February to extend the course evaluation period to almost 5 weeks starting this semester:

"For Fall and Spring terms, the evaluation period is available three weeks before classes end until 5 days after grades become available. For Summer terms, the evaluation period is available one week before classes end until 5 days after grades become available. Students will NOT be able to take the course evaluation after they have seen their grades. Faculty will receive the course evaluation results soon after the course evaluation survey is completed (6 days after grades are submitted). When checking for their final grades, students would be offered the option to complete course evaluations. They would be permitted to decline (i.e., no withholding) but they would have to actively do so by clicking an opt-out button."

**Post-Senate Informational Item:**

1. One senator asked if Provost Schwaig had said that the compressed salaries of Full Professors would be addressed first under the inversion/compression amendment. (Dr. Schwaig had spoken to this at the November meeting.)
2. Dr. Schwaig did in fact commit to working to address the compressed salaries of Full Professors first as long as there was money in the Spring to do so.

**KSU POLICY ON COURSE CROSS-LEVELING 2020**

Committee members:

* Dr. Kristina DuRocher
* Dr. Michelle Head
* Dr. Xiao Huang
* Dr. Nihal Khote
* Dr. Cherilyn McLester

Professor of History

Associate Professor of Chemistry, current UPCC Chair Professor of Economics

Assistant Professor of TESOL

Professor of Exercise Science, past GPCC Chair

# POLICY IN OTHER USG AND PEER INSTITUTIONS

* + Current cross-listing and cross-levelling practices bypass both UPCC and GPCC and these courses are not recorded in the KSU catalog.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| USG Institution | Cross-listed/-leveled policy? |
| Augusta Univ. | Yes |
| Georgia Tech | Yes |
| Univ. of Georgia | Yes |
| Georgia State | Yes |
| Georgia Southern | Yes |
| Valdosta State | No (but requires catalog documentation) |
| Univ. West Georgia | No |
| Kennesaw State | No  |

* + Therefore, in 2019, UPCC and GPCC requested a policy to guide their work.
  + The policy goal is to provide University guidelines on course cross-listing and cross- leveling and to maintain the integrity and quality of the curriculum offered at KSU.
  + The Committee reviewed policies from more than 20 institutions.



10/2019



11/2020

2/2020 – 3/2020

11/2019 – 1/2020



The Committee was formed.

# THE TIMELINE OF THE COMMITTEE’S WORK

Draft circulated to UPCC, GPCC, DC, CDA and FS to collect feedback.

Survey sent to all faculty for feedback.

Had f2f and virtual meetings and phone calls with several departments and colleges.

The Committee drafted the policy.

Voted down by FS.

**POLICY ON COURSE CROSS-LEVELING**

A cross-leveled course is a course that is offered by departments across numbers and/or level. The two courses that are cross-leveled are owned by the same department. It must have documentation with the Office of the Registrar and a proper description in the course catalog. (Requests for policy exceptions may be submitted to UPCC and/or GPCC.)

1. Cross-leveled courses are limited to the following two course pairs: 1) undergraduate upper division course/graduate course, and 2) graduate course/doctoral course. 9000 level special topics, directed study, theses, internships, practica, and dissertation courses may not be cross-leveled.
2. Cross-leveled courses must be supported by a rationale for combining students of different levels.
3. Cross-leveled courses must ensure there is a clear distinction between the requirements of undergraduate and graduate students or graduate and doctoral students, with more advanced course work for the higher- level degree program. This will be demonstrated in two different syllabi that include, but are not limited to, different objectives, assessments and/or outcomes.
4. Cross-leveled courses at the graduate level must be taught by faculty with graduate faculty status.
5. Sections of cross-leveled courses must share the same modality.

## KSU Policy on Course Cross-leveling

A cross-leveled course is a course that is offered by departments across numbers and/or levels. The two courses that are cross-leveled are owned by the same department. It must have documentation with the Office of the Registrar and a proper description in the course catalog.1

**Rationale**: Cross-leveling needs to be supported by compelling academic reasons. Once two courses from the same department are cross-leveled, students need to have access to this information. Hence it is important for a cross-leveled course to have a proper description in the course catalog.

* 1. Cross-leveled courses are limited to the following two course pairs: 1) undergraduate upper division course/graduate course, and 2) graduate course/doctoral course. 9000 level special topics, directed study, thesis, internships, practica, and dissertation courses may not be cross-leveled.

**Rationale**: The KSU catalog has the following classification of courses by level:

“Courses of instruction for degree credit in the curriculum of Kennesaw State University will be divided into four categories: lower division, upper division, graduate and doctorate. Lower division courses (typically regarded as freshman and sophomore level courses) are numbered 1000-2999; upper division courses (typically regarded as junior and senior level courses) are numbered 3000-4999; graduate courses are numbered 5000-7999; doctoral courses are numbered 8000-9999.” [http://catalog.kennesaw.edu/content.php?catoid=45&navoid=3297&hl=course+numbe](http://catalog.kennesaw.edu/content.php?catoid=45&navoid=3297&hl=course%2Bnumber&returnto=search) [r&returnto=search](http://catalog.kennesaw.edu/content.php?catoid=45&navoid=3297&hl=course%2Bnumber&returnto=search)

Cross-leveled courses should not jump more than one category, based on a KSU policy regarding academic credit that states “Graduate students must use graduate-level work to complete their degree requirements. Additionally, undergraduate coursework may not substitute or transfer more than one level; (i.e. 1000-level course may not be used for 3000-level courses and vice versa). Graduate-level work may be used in the undergraduate degree if an Accelerated Bachelor’s/Master’s policy is in place (maximum 12 credit hours).”

We do not want to create a cross listing policy that would not align with the other ways that we award credit. This quote is from a document submitted to SACSCOC regarding standard 3.4.4

Also, Augusta University which is in the USG and is SASCOC accredited has this number convention so that should be a note to us that there are likely good reasons for such a

1 Requests for policy exceptions may be submitted to UPCC and/or GPCC.

policy. [https://www.augusta.edu/compliance/policyinfo/policy/course-numbering-](https://www.augusta.edu/compliance/policyinfo/policy/course-numbering-cross-listing-cross-leveling-suffixes-policy.pdf) [cross-listing-cross-leveling-suffixes-policy.pdf](https://www.augusta.edu/compliance/policyinfo/policy/course-numbering-cross-listing-cross-leveling-suffixes-policy.pdf)

* 1. Cross-leveled courses must be supported by a rationale for combining students of different levels.

**Rationale**: The awarding of graduate-level credit is required by our accrediting body to demonstrate the following:

“graduate degree programs are progressively more advanced in academic content than undergraduate programs and are structured (a) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (b) to ensure engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training.” (SACSCOC Principle 9.6).

Thus, there must be a rationale or explanation as to why this course is appropriate for both undergraduate and graduate students and how these additional requirements will be met.

* 1. Cross-leveled courses must ensure there is a clear distinction between the requirements for undergraduate students and graduate students, with more advanced course work for the higher-level degree program. This will be demonstrated in two different syllabi that include, but are not limited to, different objectives, assessments and/or outcomes. **Rationale**: The SACSCOC Resource Manual expounds on the concept that “…graduate degree programs are progressively more advanced in academic content than undergraduate programs…” by stating, in part:

Graduate education builds upon the foundation of undergraduate education. Hence, there is an expectation that postgraduate professional degree programs and graduate programs demand more rigor and higher-order learning than undergraduate work on the same subject. Post-baccalaureate degree programs are progressively more complex than similar undergraduate programs. This expectation for graduate education also implies that requirements in courses not exclusively designed for graduate credit, but that allow both undergraduate and graduate enrollment, ensure that there is a clear distinction between the requirements of undergraduate students and graduate students.

* 1. Cross-leveled courses at the graduate level must be taught by faculty with graduate faculty status.

**Rationale**: Currently all graduate courses need to be taught by approved graduate faculty members where the faculty has a degree CIP code that aligns with the course CIP code. In cases where the CIP codes do not match a justification is provided by the faculty member and further reviewed. Permission to teach is also possible for those who cannot earn provisional or full graduate faculty status (e.g., no terminal degree, but noted expertise in an area). The GPCC Executive Committee currently reviews all graduate faculty status

applications. An approved application citing specific graduate courses to be taught remains on file with the graduate college.

* 1. Sections of cross-leveled courses must share the same modality.

**Rationale**: The goal of these courses are to have a shared experience with additional depth in the more advanced level. Thus these courses must share a modality, otherwise they are not cross-leveled but rather two separate courses being offered at the same time.

English Department Motion – Student Evaluations

*Whereas several fall 2020 classes shifted modalities at the last minute, creating additional work for faculty, and*

*Whereas several students who expected their classes to be F2F or Hybrid, but were disappointed that their classes suddenly shifted to an online or rotational model involving touch points, and*

*Whereas these shifting modalities could negatively affect student evaluations,*

*The Faculty Senate resolves that faculty should have the choice of whether to include those student evaluations within their annual reviews and/or PTR portfolios.*