

Faculty Senate Executive Committee Meeting: January 10th, 2022 (12- 1 PM)

Faculty Senate Meeting: January 24th, 2022 (12:30 PM – 1:45 PM)

**Faculty Senators in attendance**: Darina Lepadatu (Faculty Senate President, Sociology & Criminal Justice), Doug Moodie (Management & Entrepreneurship), Andrea Knowlton (Dance), Todd Harper (President Elect, English), Jim Davis (Theatre & Performance Studies), Austin Brown (Data Science & Analytics), Lantz Holtzhower (Construction Management), Ying Wang (Robotics and Mechatronics Engineering), Ann Mills (Library Resources), Jennifer Dickey (History & Philosophy), Susan Kirkpatrick Smith (Geography & Anthropology), Humayun Zafar (Information Systems & Security), Mary Beth Maguire (Nursing), Lin Li (Industrial & Systems Engineering), Rebecca Hill (Interdisciplinary Studies), Cameron Greensmith (Social Work & Human Services), Steve Collins (Political Science & International Affairs), Cristen Dutcher (School of Accountancy), Diana Gregory (School of Art & Design), Jillian Ford (Secondary & Middle Grades Education), Heather Pincock (Conflict Management, Peacebuilding, & Development), Michael Perry (Part-Time Faculty), Hassan Pournnaghsband (Software Engineering & Game Development), William Griffiths (Mathematics), James Gambrell (Inclusive Education), Kenneth Hoganson (Computer Science), Chris Sharpe (Public Services), Dabae Lee (School of Instructional Technology and Innovation), Noah McLaughlin (Foreign Languages), Giovanni Loreto (Architecture), Jeff Yunek (Parliamentarian, Music), Jennifer Dickey (History & Philosophy), David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis), Daniel Rogers (Psychological Science), Peter St. Pierre (Health & Physical Education), Nicholas Ellwanger (Honors College), Glen Meades (Chemistry & Biochemistry), Randy Stuart (Marketing and Professional Sales), James Gambrell (Inclusive Education), Paula Guerra (Elementary and Early Childhood Education), Sumit Chakravarty (Electrical & Computer Engineering), Mohammad Jonaidi (Civil and Environmental Engineering), Estella Chen (MCB),

**Ex-Officio Members:** LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey (ex-officio member, Assistant VP for Faculty Affairs), Kat Schwaig (ex-officio member, Interim President), Ivan Pulinkala (ex-officio member, Interim Provost).

**Guests**: Amy Buddie, Lesley Netter-Snowdon, Phaedra Corso, Christy Storey, Karen McDonnell, Thierry Leger, Tricia Chastain, Nwakaego Nkumeh Walker, Monique Logan, Akanmu Adabayo, Daniel Niederjohn, Pam Cole, James Taylor, Christina DuRocher, Ugena Whitlock, Robin Cheramie, Julie Ayers, Sumanth Yenduri, Geza Kogler, Sonia Toson, Alexander McGee, Ian Ferguson, Jeff Delaney, Randall Kennedy, Jamie Jamison, Estella Chen, Adrian Epps, Andrew Payne, Satish Gurupatham, Aaron Howell, Kelly Johnston

**Agenda**

# Opening Remarks

 Welcome – Darina Lepadatu

**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. 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 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.
4. Please get familiar with Robert’s Rules of Order: <https://assembly.cornell.edu/sites/default/files/roberts_rules_simplified.pdf>

**Meeting brought to order at 12:30**

**New Business**

1. Approval of Faculty Senate December 2021 Minutes. (James Gambrell 12:30) **Approved**
2. Presidential Search Update (Darina Lepadatu 12:35- 12:45)
	1. Deadline for Applications was January 21. Strong pool of candidates. Indicates great reputation of KSU nationally. “Airport Interview” by end of February with top 10 candidates. Committee will generate 3-5 finalist names from these interviews. Board of Regents committee will do their own interviews from these 3-5 finalists. Chancellor will appoint from data from both committees. BOR/USG have assured us that they will not appoint someone exterior to search. 3-5 finalists will be delivered to Regents in early March. Senator asks how large the pool is, but Dr. Lapadatu responds that they are not allowed to disclose neither the size of the pool nor the names of the 3-5 candidates.
	2. <https://www.kennesaw.edu/presidentialsearch> --Faculty encouraged to add suggested characteristics or needs for a university president.
3. Introducing the new University Ombudsmen: Dr. Akanmu Adebayo and Dr. Luc Guglielmi (12:45-12:50)
	1. Dr. Adebayo—Notes that we use the term “Ombuds” to be gender equitable. The ombuds are impartial, confidential, independent, and informal means of discussing issues at KSU. They have no formal responsibility and are not advocates. They work toward healthy campus resolutions. They work to enhance healthy discussion and collaboration to manage conflicts. There is a flyer in the appendences below to add further information.
4. Motion on Ranking of Candidates in Faculty and Faculty Administrators’ Hiring (Susan Smith & Heather Pincock 12:50-1:10)
	1. [Note that I leave the language of the motions below in the appendices to make the notes more clear to follow]
	2. Dr. Smith (Geography & Anthropology )—The motion is to allow search committees to continue to rank order candidates as well as to allow the committee to indicate that a finalist is unacceptable. Both of these policies are specifically mentioned in CHSS policies/guidelines. However, university administration has stated that these practices are not best practice because there are contradictions between hiring and rank order due to negotiations. While CHSS were not *mandated* to remove this language, they were told that the university administration may change university norms/policies around this and may require a change to college/department guidelines. University administration indicated that rank ordering is akin to the search committees making the final hiring decision. The creators of the motion disagree and feel that the search committee are *one* data point in the hiring of faculty (but the data point that has spent by far the most time with the candidates). Academic Affairs website includes the language of ranking candidates.
	3. Humayun Zafar (Information Systems & Security)—Does USG have any policies? Dr. Smith cited Academic Affairs policy, but do you know if the USG has policies? Dr. Smith—I do not. I did read as many college guidelines as were publicly available. Different colleges have different policies about rank ordering at KSU.
	4. Stephen Collins (Political Science & International Affairs)—Agrees with substance of the motion. Has a concern about the process. He believes that the administrators should *want* the rank ordering, and especially if the faculty search committee finds a candidate unacceptable. Worries that there may be liability if the committee sees something problematic/unacceptable and does not note that to the hiring administrator. States that faculty understand that the hiring administrator has the final say.
	5. Jeff Yunek (Music)—In favor of motion. Ranking provides better/more clear information for the hiring administrator. That clarity should *help* administrators make hiring decisions. Ranking does not force the administration to hire the top-ranked candidate.
	6. Heather Pincock (Conflict Management)—The push for committees to only discuss strengths/weaknesses makes faculty feedback unclear and ambiguous. This push to strengths/weaknesses is not a *future* policy change, but is *already* impacting many searches across campus.
	7. David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis)—Is this a percentage/points ranking? That may give better information to the hiring administrator. Dr. Smith—At least in our college, it is not numeric, but we provide strengths and weaknesses.
	8. Bill Griffiths (Mathematics)—Speaks in favor of motion. If the faculty and hiring administrator are repeatedly ranking/hiring differently, then it allows the faculty and administrators to collaborate on what kind of data they are needing in making hiring decisions. Reiterates that the search committee spends the most time with the candidates.
	9. **Motion Passes 42-1**
5. Motion on Make-up Work for Student Athletes (Daniel Niederjohn 1:10- 1:25)
	1. The biggest change is that dropping the lowest test/assessment grade does *not* qualify as appropriate attendance makeup for student athletes who miss class for sanctioned athletic events.
	2. Glen Meades (Chemistry & Biochemistry)—How do we distinguish between performance and missed performance?
	3. Rebecca Hill (Interdisciplinary Studies)—In her class, students have more assignments than are required for 100% (example 12 assignments, but 10 equals 100). Dr. Niederjohn—Sounds like you already have equity built into the course.
	4. Heather Pincock (conflict management)—Agrees with the general idea of the motion, but worries about the idea that being this prescriptive puts a burden on faculty and may overstep the bounds of academic freedom.
	5. David Bray (Economics, Finance, & Quantitative Analysis)—Agrees with the Dr. Pincock, but does feel we should be reasonable for athletes missing class due to university sanctioned activities.
	6. William Griffiths (mathematics)—Both understands the purpose of this change, but is also wary of overprescribing course content/assessment.
	7. I missed the name—Labs may be an area where this policy is impossible, for example.
	8. Jeff Yunek (Music)—Motions that we postpone to next meeting with further clarity on the scope to faculty load. **Tabling passes on voice vote**
6. Update from Policy Process Council (Randy Stuart 1:25-1:35)
	1. Outlines minor wording changes to various university policies. All of them are minor wording changes or changes to align with other updated policies.
7. Informational item: Updates from Deans’ Council (Doug Moodie)
	1. See notes below.
8. Informational Item: Notes from USG Faculty Council January 12 meeting with Interim Vice-Chancellor Rayfield (Doug Moodie)
	1. See notes below.
9. Update from Interim President Kat Schwaig (1:35-1:40)
	1. Governor Kemp announced that he will propose a $5,000 raise to all state employees and a cost-of-living adjustment for next year, pending legislative approval. The legislation is currently in session for 40 days. Budget for USG and all universities was positive (pending legislative approval). USG representative has never seen this big of a positive change in funding for higher education.
	2. Additional funds to offset fees that students pay (approximately $221 a semester for students).
	3. Presidential Task Force on Race. Policy recommendations are being reviewed and collaborated with Dr. Sonia Toson (Director of Diversity Relations). 37 recommendations have been collapsed into 30 as many are already being worked on. Dr. Toson is leading the shared governance to improve campus climate regarding race for students, staff, faculty, and administrators.
	4. BOR meets monthly and KSU was spotlighted at the January Board meeting.
	5. Todd Harper: There was a recent editorial in AJC that mentioned that the members of the Board of Regents wanted to sit in on university governing committees. Dr. Schwaig was unaware of the article and does not know of any Regents hoping to do this.
	6. Randy Stuart—Have we heard any updates from the USG on the search for a new Chancellor? Dr. Schwaig—I have not heard anything.
10. Update from Interim Provost Ivan Pulinkala (1:40-1:45)
	1. Thanks the Faculty Senate for the motion on ranking of candidates. We need to clarify our respective roles and responsibilities of shared governance. Wishes to align university, college, and department guidelines. The university administration looks forward to collaborating.
	2. Major concern: we will be hiring 85 new faculty this Fall. Office Space is already maxed out across campus. We will not have enough offices moving forward. We are requiring a systemic, systematic, and equitable solution for “Innovative Office Solutions.” Hopes to organize around sustainability, support, innovation. Wants to see what peer institutions are doing differently. Hopes that this will be an emergent collaborative strategy. Hopes to create both an ad hoc committee as well as seeking survey feedback from faculty. Hopes this will happen this Spring and pilot projects will be implemented in Fall, with policies being established by Fall, 2023.
	3. This morning, the university received the draft information about the new Post-Tenure Review guidelines from the USG. The 2 working groups will be convened and charged in the coming weeks. Working groups (and maybe surveys) will be asked to feedback to the new, 20-page document. Doug Moody indicated that the USG is seeking feedback even sooner than the completion of the 2 ad hoc working groupd to form the policies.

**Meeting adjourned at 1:47**

**Supplementary Documents:**

**3. KSU Office of the Ombuds**

About Us:

The Office of the Ombuds is serviced by **Dr. Akanmu G. Adebayo**, Professor of History in the Department of History and Philosophy; **Dr. Luc Guglielmi**, Coordinator of French Program and Professor of French in the Department of World Languages and Cultures; and **Dr. Hope Torkornoo**, Professor of Marketing and International Business in the Coles College of Business, as Kennesaw State University Ombuds.

What We Do:

Ombuds help you by:

* Listening carefully to your concerns
* Answering questions and helping you analyze your situation
* Reviewing and explaining relevant university policies or regulations
* Helping you explore options
* Facilitating discussions

Contact Us:

* *Phone*: **470-578-7773**. If you reach voicemail, please leave your phone number and when we might reach you; we seek to return calls within 24 hours.
* *Email*: ombuds@kennesaw.edu Please be mindful that email should not be considered confidential. Include only your contact information and availability to speak. We will call you.
* *In-person*: The Ombuds have a room on each campus for in-person consultations. Reach us first by phone or email and we’ll schedule an in-person meeting when necessary.
1. **Motion on Ranking of Candidates in Faculty and Faculty Administrators’ Hiring (Susan Smith & Heather Pincock)**

Whereas the document *Guidelines for Conducting Faculty Searches At Kennesaw State University (Including University and College Level Administrators)* states under section 11: Ranking of Candidates: ***Ranking of finalists****should correlate to values assigned during the interview process (examples: rubrics, prioritization of qualification components, and interaction with the search committee).* [emphasis added], We resolve that all faculty searches should be conducted according to the guidelines and provide a ranking of candidates. We further resolve that search committees be allowed to leave any finalist off the ranking list if they are deemed to be unacceptable for the position.

**5. Motion on Make-up Work for Student Athletes (Daniel Niederjohn)**

**Faculty Handbook – 2.10 - Student Attendance Policy (most relevant section highlighted in yellow)**

Attendance in classes, laboratories and lectures is important. All students are expected to attend these activities in accordance with their schedule of courses.  The instructor determines the attendance policy for each course.   All instructors will provide the students, at the beginning of each semester, a clear statement regarding their policies in handling absences.  Instructors will also be responsible for advising their students regarding the academic consequences of absences.

Students must not be absent from announced quizzes, laboratory periods or final examinations unless the reasons for the absences are acceptable to the instructors concerned.  Students should also understand that they are responsible for all material covered during their absences and that they are responsible for the academic consequences of the absences.  Students who are absent because of their participation in university-approved activities, such as field trips and extracurricular events, will be permitted to make up the work missed during their absences.

**Rationale for Potential Change:**

Many professors have course policies that allow for dropping a lowest quiz or exam score. For students who miss quizzes or exams for extracurricular activities, they are told that dropping of the grade for the absence will essentially provide the opportunity for a “make-up.” This practice does not allow students to have the opportunity to take and learn from an assessment, does not afford them the opportunity to drop their lowest performance grade, and is not a true “make-up” experience. Ultimately, students may be penalized for participating in university-approved activities.

**KSU Proposed language (addition in green)**

Attendance in classes, laboratories and lectures is important. All students are expected to attend these activities in accordance with their schedule of courses.  The instructor determines the attendance policy for each course.   All instructors will provide the students, at the beginning of each semester, a clear statement regarding their policies in handling absences.  Instructors will also be responsible for advising their students regarding the academic consequences of absences.

Students must not be absent from announced quizzes, laboratory periods or final examinations unless the reasons for the absences are acceptable to the instructors concerned.  Students should also understand that they are responsible for all material covered during their absences and that they are responsible for the academic consequences of the absences.  Students who are absent because of their participation in university-approved activities, such as field trips and extracurricular events, will be permitted to make up the work missed during their absences. Dropping a lowest quiz or test grade for an absence does not qualify as an equitable make-up.

**Examples of University-Approved Events**

**-**Athletic and scholastic competition

-Research or presentation in which the student is an integral member of the presenting team

-Musical or performing arts events

**Samples from other Universities’ Policies**

-University of North Florida

In the event of absences due to participation in a University-sponsored activity, instructors must allow students the opportunity to make up work due during such absences. **This applies even if the instructor's policy is to drop a low score.**

-University of North Carolina Chapel Hill

It is a University expectation that instructor be prudent, fair, and equitable when a student misses an assessment due to a University approved absence. **Course policies should avoid inequities, including discrepancies in preparation time for in-class versus make-up exams, missed opportunities to take and learn from an assessment, and policies that penalize students who must use their dropped grade option for a University approved absence.**

**Related Policies**

Provost’s Athletics Oversight Council (PAOC) – Policy 4

* 1. No athlete shall miss more than 20% of the scheduled class meetings for competition in any

one semester. Any number beyond that stated above must be approved by the ECAB.

4.9 The *KSU Faculty Handbook* and the *KSU Catalog* contain the policy regarding excused KSU student absences***.*** It is expected that faculty members will *not* penalize student athletes for missing classes due to conflicts with contractually scheduled athletic contests and related travel.

4.12 Student-athletes who believe that they have received a lack of reasonable accommodation of the provisions of this *missed class policy* by a coach should immediately contact the Athletics Director or the Faculty Athletics Representative.

7. **Informational Item: Doug Moodie.**

**ACADEMIC DEANS’ COUNCIL**

**Notes**

**Thursday, January 6, 2022**

1. Welcome Katie Kaukinen – new HSS Dean
2. Pam Cole leadership in AA
3. Assessment of Online Student Support and Engagement (AOSSE) – Anissa Vega
The Assessment of Online Student Support and Engagement (AOSSE) is a campus-wide assessment the CIA office is conducting in partnership with DLI and Student Services. The AOSSE will begin in late January and conclude within a few weeks. As a component of this campus-wide assessment, fully online students and Program Coordinators of those online degrees will receive an AOSSE survey.  AOSSE is an assessment of institutional capacity to serve fully online students and not a review of online program coordinator performance. We greatly appreciate timely, thoughtful, and honest responses to survey questions. Direct questions about the AOSSE to Dr. Kim Loomis, Interim Faculty Director of Digital Experience.
4. Failure to Submit Grades

Increased number of faculty failing to enter grades this term. Robin suggested it is mainly part-timers. Other faculty thought D2L automatically sent final grades to Owl Express. Some new faculty could not submit grades because they had not signed Buckley releases. Registration send out faculty grade missing list to Deans the day before and 4 hours before deadline. Department chairs can quickly find out anytime who has not submitted grades. Chairs should give repeat offenders letters. Copied to Deans, and note this in annual reviews.

1. Faculty Attendance at Commencement

This is poor. Department chairs and school directors must attend graduation to encourage and note faculty attendance. Ivan stated faculty should attend at least one graduation a year and that a RVSP system will be in use. As registrar needs all the space on floor for increased number of students, the faculty will sit on bleachers behind stage party. There will be 7 ceremonies in Spring, and no summer commencements. The aim is 500 to 600 students per ceremony, with maximum of 700.

1. Research Profiles,

Provost requires Deans to produce research profiles for their college. This is for external use (donors, accreditation, etc.) and internal (allocating space and equipment, hiring new faculty). They also need to note inter-college research priorities.

1. Annual Reviews

There have been problems with the system for student course evaluations, some of which is due to faculty not understanding system. USG will implement the new BoR changes with student success, etc. for next January 2023. However, KSU cannot start on their details until USG produces their policy. This is due next week from Stuart Rayfield (USG CAO).

1. Data Advisory Committee

There are 40,561 enrolled students for the spring. Normally 3% drop for non-payment. Graduate students are 9.9% of total and increased 8.5. Undergraduate students increased 4.7%.

1. Faculty Awards - Michele DiPietro

Michele presented PowerPoints on process. He emphasized that deans make recommendations for KSU awards, and then KSU make recommendations for USG awards. If deans delegate the process then he needs names of responsible officers.

1. Associate Deans’/Deans’ Retreat Topics

The retreat in February will include assistant and associate deans. The provost want suggestions for topics.

1. Covid Management

Omicron forecast to peak next week. The Provost is responsible for allowing modality changes, and reports them to USG monthly. Stuart (USG CAO) reports totals for USG upwards.

**8. Information Item: Notes from USG Faculty Council January 12 meeting with Interim Vice-Chancellor Rayfield (Doug Moodie)**

1. Stuart introduced herself to the USGFCEC. She has been an interim President in 3 different USG institutions. Her scholarship is in Leadership Development. Last USG job was leadership and institutional development for USG. Was a faculty member at Columbus State.
2. Her priority is student success.
3. She believes that there is a sweet spot between going all online and going back to Fall 2019 online/in person ratio.
4. USG institutions have lost resources but is hopeful they can get them back soon.
5. PTR - Hopefully, USG will put out draft handbook changes for review next week. Because time is short, feedback should happen quickly on an ad hoc basis directly to USG. Then USG can send out final approved version, so that institutions can work on their versions. It will allow flexibility in some areas and be a lot more detailed than the BoR resolution. She emphasized that PTR is meant as a developmental tool not a punitive tool.
6. USGFC pointed out that they represent the USG faculty not AAUP and the views of each body differ. Stuart stated that USG wants to answer AAUP publicity but understands that USGFC not AAUP represents the USG faculty.
7. She has no idea on if any upper-level course audits are happening.
8. She will find out what is happening on General Education. USG will either put proposed changes to bed or continue the disrupted process.
9. She knows nothing on what is happening on the Chancellor search.
10. The Governor has asked for a $5000 rise for all state employees (including USG employees).
11. A student fee committee is looking at the whole structure of fees and tuition. Students feel that USG is nickel and dimeing them with fees. However, there is a financial problem with money for bonds for non-academic buildings.
12. Hope the Hope scholarship will rise to 90% of tuition.
13. Covid testing varies across campuses. USG has plenty of tests available. The bottleneck is medical personal to apply such tests.
14. USGFCEC hope to have an in person USGFC meeting in late Spring, Covid willing. She will brief the acting chancellor on what happens at such meetings.