



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 (Michael Van Dyke- proxy)	Y
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 Nasseri 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 Wolford. 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 so 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.

