

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

Attendance:

Senators: Glen Meades, Kent Altom, Craig Brasco, Michael Carroll, Dale Vogelien, M. Harper, Albert Jimenez, Chandra Floyd, Paula Guerra, Judy Reardon, Jonathan Steppe, Dabae Lee, Noah McLaughlin, Daniel Ferreira, M.A. Karim, Lance Holtzhower, Daniel Rogers, Steve Collins, Randy Stuart, Peter St. Pierre, Darina Lepadatu, Tom Okie, Geza Kogler, Austin Brown, Minhao Dai, William Griffiths, Sheb True, Hether Pincock, James Davis, Susan Smith, James Stinchcomb, Sumit Chakravarty, Ken Hogansen, David Bray, Cameron Greensmith, Ann Mills, Jeff Wagner, Humayun Zafar, Nicholas Ellwanger, Jeffrey Yunek, Ying Xie, Doreen Wagner, McCree O’Kelley, Svetlana Peltsverger, Jillian Ford, Snehal Shirke, Hassan Pournaghshband, Doug Moodie, Rebecca Hill, Ying Wang, Lin Li, Philip Mayer, Shelby Meek,

Guests: Chris Cornelison, Juliet Langman, Ivan Pulinkala, Kat Schwaig, James Taylor, Amy Buddie, Nwakaego Nkumeh Walker, Phaedra Corso, LaJuan Simpson-Wilkey, Lori Lowder, Sumanth Yenduri, Lesley Netter-Snowden, Karen McDonnell, Sonia Toson, Alexander McGee, Neporcha Cone, Aaron Howell, Adrian Epps, Jesús Castro Baldi

**MoM**

# Opening Remarks

Welcome – M. Todd Harper

**Online Faculty Senate Meeting Expectations**

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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 December 22 Minutes. (Darina Lepadatu 12:30) Approved

**New Business**

1. Motion on revisions to change the Graduate Incomplete policy. (Juliet Langman 12:35-12:40)

In discussion with the registrar from Cand D to review and change the incomplete policy for graduate students and align it with BoR.

Undergrad had one full year for completing incomplete , but grad had 1 semester. This swas an issue if the next semester was summer. The specific wording to be changed is the “ grade of I must be changed within 1 year” rest mirrors undergraduate.

Humayun: Is it same with other institutions; Dean Langman: Yes

Heather Pincock: will request for waivers be honored for more than a year? Dean Langman: Significantly fewer justification must be there but Yes.

Heather Pincock:It would go into the next catalogue I assume so not until Fall 2023

Glen Meades: for undergraduate catalog, says its must be provided in the next enrolled semester.

Stephen Collins: The undergraduate policy is very confusion currently. Dean Langman: That said , the two pilocy are still not aligned.

Current catalog policy for undergrads:  "A grade of “I” must be removed by completing the course requirements within one calendar year from the end of the semester in which the “I” was originally assigned. In addition, should the student enroll in classes at KSU during the calendar year, the grade of “I” must be removed by the end of the first semester of enrollment during that calendar year."

Glen Meades:That means you have a calendar year within which to enroll. I suggest copying the language from the undergraduate catalog and paste it in the proposal.

Jeffrey Yunek: Motion to move it to next month.

Randy Stuart: Why don’t we just vote down the proposal and bring it back next month.

Jeffrey Yunek: Moving it to next month would be easier prosidurally. Technically, motion to postpone to a next time.

Voted for the motion: 95%support.

1. Motion on revisions to Intellectual Property Policy (Chris Cornelison 12:40-1:05):

IP property discussion. Federal law from Bayh-Dole Act, USG Policy 6.3.4.

No changes to faculty obligations. Creation of new assignment category focused on undergraduate inventors.

Addition of language to clarify point of confusion.

Revision on record keep. Under significant university resources, TA+GRA, software

Traditional academic works: Included textbooks as IP, educational software (removed)

Undergraduate assigned IP: optional pipeline for students to engage in KSURF by assigning IP to KSU.

Creation of academic products include: syllabi, lecture slides, reference materials (perpetual royalty free license).

Tom Okie: Is there any rule for undergraduates?

Chris Cornelison: unless if they are paid researcher, then they are obligated. Depending on weather they are customer or if they are employees.

Jeff Wagner: Developed video during covid for which reimbursement was not provided.

Chris Cornelison: If MOOC is created for revenue generation, then author will have royalty sharing. If the author does not agree, this may be settled in legal manner.

Chris Cornelison: In situation of disagreement, IP committee resolves it.

James Stinchcomb: Just want to get clarification does this also include part-time faculty?

Chris Cornelison:Yes

As its at predesignated time: Motion to approve: Jeff Yunek, second Bill Griffiths.

Voted for the motion: 75%support.

1. Recommendations of Provost’s Taskforce on Course Evaluations. Elected reps: Darina Lepadatu, Stuart Napshin, Stephen Barrett, Lantz Holtzhower (Darina Lepadatu 1:05-1:30)

The course repose rate is at 16%. Task force was created one year ago. Collecting feedback from FS now and will bring in for vote in March. Added a student success question. Primary goal is to measure teaching effectiveness.

Neporcha Cone: why course difficultly question?

Kent Altom: Why "difficult" instead of "challenging"?

Jeff Wagner:Diversity and Inclusiveness may not come into play for the courses I teach.

Glen Meades: I completely disagree with attaching any grade incentives to student responses. This is not a learning objective of any course. If you attach a raffle, students will give nonconstructive feedback just to enter the raffle.

Darina Lepedatu: SGA says some instructors never reply back.

Rebecca Hill (Guest):I think it is unreasonable to expect faculty to reply on the weekends - unless the assignment is due on a Sunday night, but we can choose to respond on weekends if we want to.

Noah McLaughlin:Darina Lepadatu I'll email this to you later, but two thoughts / questions:It seems like questions 5 and 8 have consider overlap. Why not just a single question about "Accessibility"?Why does the question about feedback include the adjective "timely" instead of "effective"? Effective feedback is timely, as well as clear and actionable.

David Bray:Students experience 'inclusion' by enrolling in my classes, paying tuition, and showing up on my roster.  'Diversity' is naturally occurring through the admissions office and the demographics of the region.  Faculty and admins who are not licensed psychologists should not pretend they are in charge of student's psychological well-being.  I will not support DEI in any of my courses and will educate students to the real meaning behind these highjacked words and the divisive agenda.

Glen Meades responded I that a psychology degree is not necessary to be aware of implicit bias and recognition that not every student in our classrooms has the same background, expectations, fears, or anxiety about us instructors, the course, their classmates, or their familiarity with higher education in general. Being willfully ignorant of these things is what DEI is trying to avoid, not change the way we teach our topic-specific course content.

Tom Okie:Lantz Holtzhower a comment from history department: "I’d suggest, for the question of “how difficult was this class” adding in questions like “because there was too much reading” or “because the assignments too very long to complete.” I realize this information may not be accurate but if it gives some students the ability to explain what they see an issue, that might be useful."

Daniel Rogers: Lantz & Darina:  I suggest any item about student perception of difficulty (#2) using a different rating scale and be separated from the instructor/course items using the same 4-point rating scale.

Dabae Lee: Timely feedback is important, but it may not be useful. I suggest changing it to "useful feedback in a timely manner".

Dabae Lee:An item we had at BCOE is how the course content is aligned with the course goals or syllabus. I think this is a critical question that should be included.

Dabae Lee:Another question is whether colleges can include some college-specific questions. At BCOE, using and modeling technology for learning is one of the standards we need to meet for accreditation, and we have an evaluation question: The instructor used technology to facilitate learning. I wonder if we can include the question or give individual colleges an option to add some other questions.

Shelby Meek: If we hold final grades until a student submits their course evals, as several other universities do, we will get 100% participation pretty quickly. This increased participation would also be a far better picture of true student perceptions than a 16% participation rate.

Noah McLaughlin: Research data on increasing course evaluation rates indicates that the most significant practice is to be open and communicative, telling students that these are important, and how you have concretely included feedback in the past.https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/PRR-03-2018-0008/full/htmlhttps://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1136018.pdf

Jillian Ford: Unsure about if we are trying to make it faster, why add these questions?

Michael Carroll: The scale’s order should be flipped.

1. Update on Buck Study (M. Todd Harper 1:30-1:35) No update given because of lack of time.
2. President’s Report (1:35-1:40): The enrolled might be up slightly but likely flat from last spring to this spring. Dual enrollment tis up by 36/% returning numbers are also up. Fall applications are also up We are in test optional and using common app.

Fundraising with advancement: Each of the Deans have a fund-raising target. We are at 75% ahead of pace. 8.7 to 30 million. 75% student need scholarships only 4% have scholarship, buildings, centers, endowment chairs etc.

1. Provost’s Report (1:40-1:45): Three initiatives and request your engagement and support.

1. Updating the P and T guidelines: collaboratively develop to support the BoR PTR and Annual Review guidelines.

2. Implementation phase: Todd, Lori, Sheb true.

3. ARD/FPA: 78 faculty have not submitted. Have asked the chairs/ deans that reach out and

Asked the chairs and directors work collaboratively with faculty on this. Faculty may not hit forward at the submission.

Todd harper: Will send out the MoM.

Motion to adjourn: Approved 1:47 PM.