

Kentucky State University
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601
Faculty Senate

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 8, 2016

TO: Faculty
Faculty Senators
Ex Officio Members of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Kimberly Sipes, President
Faculty Senate

RE: Notice of Faculty Senate Meeting

The second meeting of the Faculty Senate will take place Monday, September 12, 2016 at 3:10 p.m. in Hathaway Hall 123. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

- and Chandel [5-minute time limit]
5. President Thompson [5-minute time limit]
6. VPAA Dr. Jackson [10-minute time limit]
7. Mr. Daryl Lowe, Associate Dean for Student Affairs for Student Conduct and Title IX [10-minute time limit]
8. Report of the Academic Policies Committee, Joe Moffett [10-minute time limit]
9. Report of the Budget and Academic Support Committee, Reba Ryd [10-minute time limit]
10. Report of the Curriculum Committee, Ken Andries [10-minute time limit]
11. Report of the Professional Concerns Committee, Cindy Glass [10-minute time limit]
12. Faculty Regret Report [10-minute time limit]
13. Other Business
14. Adjourn

Kimberly A. Sipes
Assistant Professor
Faculty Senate President 2016-17
School of Business
Kentucky State University
102 Bradford Hall
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 597-5808 (office)
kimberly.sipes@kysu.edu

**Minutes of Faculty Senate, 8/22/16 Meeting
123 Hathaway Hall**

Senators

Abdullah Alhurani (Nursing) A
Ibukun Amusan (Math & Sci)
Ken Andries (AFE)
Nancy Capriles (BSS)
Gary Elliott (WYS) E
Maheteme Gebremedhin (AFE) A
Cindy Glass (BSS)
William Graham (EDU) A
Robert Griffin (FIAR)
Buddhi Gywali (AFE)
Dantrea Hampton (Library)
Jens Hannemann (Comp Sci) E
Robert Hebble (Math & Sci)
Ashok Kumar (at large)
Vikas Kumar (AQU)
Li Lu (Math & Sci)
Joe Moffett (LLP)
Narayanan Rajendran (at large)
Reba Rye (at large)

Peter Smith (LLP)
Kimberly Sipes (at-large)
Steve Ulrich (PUA, CJ, SW)
Changzheng Wang (at large) A

Ex Officio Members and Guests

Aaron Thompson (President)
Candice Love Jackson (Acting VPAA)
Deneia Thomas (Assoc. VP)
Elgie McFayden (Faculty Regent)
Kirk Pomper (Interim Dir. Land Grant)
John Sedlacek (AFE)
Cynthia Shelton (WYS)
Bekele Tegegne (Library)
Bruce Griffis (Math & Sci)
Fariba Bigdeli-Jahed (Math & Sci)
LeChrista Finn (AFE)
John Poole (Pearson)
Michlene Healy (Pearson)

1. Call to Order

Faculty Senate President Sipes called the meeting to order at 3:12pm. A show of hands was requested to indicate number of senators present. Twelve people raised their hands.

2. Approval of Agenda

President Sipes asked for approval of the agenda. A senator made the motion and another seconded it.

3. Introduction of Senators and Non-Senators

President Sipes asked for senators to introduce themselves. After all had done so, President Sipes thanked everyone for service. Non-Senators, Ex-officio members, and guests also introduced themselves.

4. Overview of forthcoming issues

President Sipes noted that Senate has much work to do this year. She announced that APC and PCC would work together on several issues, including updating the Faculty Handbook and reviewing processes for Tenure and Promotion, program review, Post-Tenure Review, and

scheduling of classes. She noted that CC would examine the recommendations made by The Registry about the university's general education requirements, as well as changes to the Whitney Young program. BASC will work on the strategic plan.

5. President Thompson

University President Thompson introduced himself and noted that he attended the meeting because he wanted to address senate directly. He stressed the importance of shared governance and that faculty should be a part of that process. He promised transparency. Through working with CPE he was intimately familiar with KSU's challenges before coming to campus. He apologized that faculty could not be more intimately involved with the planning to switch over to e-textbooks, but the situation required swift action.

President Thompson evoked a number of the recent challenges faced by the university—organizational confusion, low enrollment, student success, negative media coverage—and emphasized that he hoped to generate positive press and called on the faculty to help. Citing the balanced budget, he noted that the university is at a sustainable place to grow and its small size offers it the ability to be cutting edge. While the university did not get all it had asked for from CPE (i.e., tuition stabilization funds), it did benefit from not having its budget cut like the other public universities, and it had land grant funds matched. The Board has charged the president with getting things done that have not been achieved in the past few years, but he did not specify what those items were.

One senator asked the President about low ACT subscores among first year students. The Senator noted he had some students with a subscore of 10 in English 101. He also noted concern about the exceeding of caps in English 101 courses from 20 to 25. The President responded that a sophisticated metric was deployed to determine students who would likely succeed at the university. He noted this is a triangulation approach that considers not only ACT scores, but also high school grades and other evidence of student motivation (such as leadership roles). He stressed that by itself, the ACT is not sufficient for predicting student success. Nevertheless, students who may be at risk will be closely monitored through intr

transfers. At present the university may be a little short on those numbers, but that possibility was anticipated in the final budget.

6. VPAA Dr. Jackson

Vice President Jackson reiterated the work for faculty senate this year (working on the faculty handbook, reviewing tenure and promotion processes, etc.). She emphasized that the Board has agreed to allow the return of tenure, but promotion will remain suspended. Those who are eligible for tenure review will be notified. One senator asked about the possibility of early tenure and the VP responded that she would want to be sure someone is not going up too early, but that early tenure could be considered on a case-by-case basis. If anyone had submitted a dossier and had not yet been considered due to the moratorium on tenure, he or she could retrieve the dossier and add items. Faculty who have gone through Post-Tenure Review should be sure to retrieve their dossiers. President Thompson affirmed the value of having tenure and promotion as separate processes.

The Board has approved the re-organization of the university starting in fall 2017. The Faculty Regent asked if there would still be dialogue on these changes. The VP affirmed there would be.

VP Jackson noted the importance of grant seeking and that we have a subscription to a database that allows searching for grants. She mentioned that general education review needed to be undertaken and reminded everyone that we are working on our SACSCOC reaffirmation for 2019.

VP Jackson reminded faculty about the upcoming Convocation. She also noted that she would like to see more interaction between departments and their students. The EAB Student Success Collaborative software will be essential to tracking student / faculty interaction, especially for the 2+2 program. The university is also looking at a centralized advising model; students need to be well prepared for professional and graduate school.

The VP reminded President Sipes that the faculty senate website needs to be updated. President Sipes indicated it was underway.

The university catalogue is up; the VP asked for emails if there are problems with the catalogue. Students are required to follow catalogue of entry. Discussion ensued where a senator noted that in the past students could change to a newer catalogue, but the VP reiterated students need to stick with their catalogue at the time of matriculation so that they would not be slowed on progress toward graduation. A senator asked if the catalogue stated an attendance policy and the VP confirmed that it does.

A senator asked about the status of CC items passed through senate in the spring. The VP indicated she would work with appropriate parties to trace where items are in the review process.

7. Michlene Healy, Pearson Higher Education

President Sipes introduced Michlene Healy and John Poole from Pearson who attended the meeting so they could answer questions. Healy reiterated that Pearson is available to help and that this should be viewed more as a partnership than a typical vendor / customer relationship. She noted that there are plans for discipline-specific reps to come on campus.

If Pearson could not supply a digital copy of one its books, complementary print copies were ordered and could be picked up in the Bookstore. Desk copies for faculty needed to be obtained through the appropriate sales rep.

A guest expressed concern that books might be out of date for his discipline since it was rapidly changing. Ms. Healy noted that faculty could change books each term and the new books were being digitized on an ongoing basis. She pointed to Smarthinking to help students who are challenged by etexts.

President Thompson noted that Pearson has been great to work with, and he reiterated that he has appreciated the faculty getting on board with the adoption of etexts.

President Sipes said she was still working through all emails regarding etexts and asked for patience.

8. Faculty Regent Report

Faculty Regent McFayden offered a brief overview of the last Board meeting. He noted changes that were approved in the organization of the university. He indicated he is the chair of external relations and noted that KSU's investment portfolio had recently picked up \$2.5 million; he made a request to President Thompson to draw down \$1 million for a one-time salary stipend to faculty.

Regent McFayden registered his concern about Post-Tenure Review. He noted that faculty put a good deal of energy into it when notified and that this forces them to put other important work on hold. He argued that faculty already go through an annual review.

The Faculty Regent expressed a desire to see the development of an enrollment management plan, but he praised the current administration as the best he has worked with. He noted their hard work, going so far as to clean dorm rooms in anticipation of the arrival of students.

Two senators expressed concern that the Faculty Regent had recently accepted a departmental chair position. It was noted that one is not supposed to hold an appointed position while serving in an elected capacity. The Regent responded by noting he was in compliance with KRS and that he had fulfilled part of his yearly teaching duties in the summer. He also argued that similar dual positions had been held by faculty in recent years. President Sipes promised that the situation would be addressed in committee.

9. Break-out into individual committees for election of Chairs, Vice-Chairs, and Secretaries.

Senate committees will be constituted as follows:

Academic Policies Committee – Hathaway Hall 314

Joe Moffett (LLP), Chair

Ashok Kumar (at large), Vice Chair

Ibukun Amusan (Math & Sci), Secretary (fall term)

Maheteme Gebremedhin (AFE), Secretary (spring term)

Nancy Capriles (BSS)

Nkechi Amadife (Library -- non-Senator)

Budget and Academic Support Committee – Shauntee Hall 100

Reba Rye (at Large), Chair

Peter Smith (LLP), Vice Chair

LeChrista Finn (AFE -- non-Senator), Secretary

Vikas Kumar (AQU)

William Graham (EDU)

Li Lu (Math & Sci)

Sunday Obi (EDU -- non-Senator)

Rene Desborde (BUA -- non-Senator)

Mike Unuakhalu (Comp Sci -- non-Senator)

Curriculum Committee – Library 2nd Floor Conference Room 219

Academic Policies Committee Meeting (August 29, 2016)

Members Present: Joe Mott (Chair), Ashok Kumar (Vice Chair), Ibukun Akin (Secretary), Nancy Capriello, Mahele Gebremedhin, Nkechi Andie

The meeting was called to order at 3:13pm in HH 314.

Members in attendance:

The agenda was approved after other business was added.

An overview of work for the year was discussed as follows:

Admission policy will be revisited. Some faculty have expressed concern about some freshmen having very low ACT scores. It was noted that there are also some students that have very high scores.

The Registrar has reported that in spring 2016, they would put the academic policies in place. APC members have been concerned that they are being overruled. It is noted that there is a need for change. It is suggested that the Registrar people are still in the process.

Sen. president would like to see work by APC. It is likely that PCC will be working on faculty handbook. The handbook was previously worked on a few years ago by a committee but there was no feedback from the handbook committee. APC will be working on it.

- x The ability to complete virtual courses successfully of first semester on student level by at a distance should be assessed before the semester begins. The assessment should be an online reading tool or research methods approved by the administrator of the program. VPAA is to make the final approval for student in which be required standard.
- x Evaluation of online courses should be done annually by faculty centered in the department (s) in the Faculty Matters. "

The changes were discussed. It was noted that the outside committee is to be very helpful per course. APC members are to read the proposal before the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

The role of the Registry and their recommendations was discussed to determine the impact on reorganization and its potential cost/impact for the University. We discussed the feasibility and rationale for bringing back the dean structure and its impact on the budget. Chair Ryewill ask Dr. Candice Jackson for her slide on reorganization from Faculty Staff Institute. The question was raised how the University can make the case to bring back the dean positions if we can't afford raises? case

PCC Meeting Notes
August 29 2016

Attendees

PCC members	Ex Officio/Guest
Cindy Glass- President	
Stephen Ulrich –Vice President	Kim Sipes
Buddhi Gyawali- Secretary	
Jens Hannemann	
Mara Merlino	
Fariba Bigdeli-Jahed	
Robert Hebble (absent – excused)	
Abdullah Alhurani (absent)	

Meeting called to order at 3:15

PCC president Cindy Glass distributed Registry's recommendation for the revision of Faculty handbook and Tenure & Promotion for review. Motion to review was passed. A member suggested to review a copy of the Faculty handbook which was previously submitted to the University by Todd Davis. That was the unapproved handbook Davis' committee worked and submitted for revision two years ago. That document might have addressed some of the issues Registry has recommended. College of Agriculture criteria were also included in the previous revised (unapproved) handbook by Todd Davis. F/S president Kim Sipes will contact Tierra Freeman about the document and try to access it.

A discussion was held about automatic tenure given to some administrators in the past. According to the current T&P policy, only V/P/Provost and Deans are qualified for it but others were also given.

A discussion was held about evaluation of dean chairs, Chairs were evaluated in some divisions but deans' evaluations never happened. Registry recommends to look at T&P criteria of other universities which have less than 2000 students. It was suggested that divisions can tailor their criteria.

Registry's recommendation of using the Boyer model to document Scholarly Activities is good that represents faculty who do not have teaching load and have other non-teaching responsibilities, such as faculty in College of Agriculture. Registry's recommendation provided general framework for scholarship which help redefine scholarship at unit level.

An inquiry was made about having third year tenure evaluation as suggested by President Thompson. It was suggested to look at institutions' model of assigning mentors and conducting evaluation in three years after original hire.

It was noted that a new calendar for tenure review and faculty who are eligible to apply will be notified soon.

A discussion was held about the faculty who applied for T&P in 2014 right before a moratorium was put in place. Their dossiers have already been evaluated by Unit and College, and University T&P Committees and a recommendation was submitted to the VPAA. Their dossiers are in the VPAA's Office and VPAA and the president need to review and make their decisions. It was discussed that the minutes of F/S's last meeting and VPA Jackson's suggestion to pick up or update their dossiers during the recent meeting, were confusing and may need to request her to clarify. It was discussed that updating dossiers may not be appropriate since all dossiers were evaluated using the T&P criteria in 2014. It was discussed that their dossiers need to move forward for further decision, these faculty do not need to reapply. VPAA Jackson needs to evaluate their dossiers and submit to the president.

PCC's view on post tenure provisions were shared. It was suggested that a post tenure evaluation is important and we need it if there is a problem with the faculty member's performance that needs to be monitored. A member raised an issue about post-tenure evaluation procedure, relating that a chair in one division told faculty they were NEVER to evaluate themselves as "Exceeds Expectations". That Chair (in the past) told them it was inappropriate, but then when that Chair left and a new one came in, the new Chair then asked the PUA Faculty why no one was "exceeding expectations". Therefore our current evaluation method is subjective and is not applied evenly across all units.

It was suggested Distribution of Effort Agreement (DEA) is the one that needs to be referenced for faculty's annual evaluation. It was discussed that if somebody reaches a certain level and not evaluated it may not be a good practice. A member pointed that post-tenure policy was put in place to acknowledge faculty achievements. Minor performance needs to be acknowledged and rewarded in a timely manner.

PCC was informed that there is a sabbatical policy in place but we don't know how decisions are made at administration level and mostly the decisions are made at random without following any criteria.

The Chair asked if we have other agenda for discussion.

It was suggested to have a discussion on current hiring policy. It was discussed that there is no standard procedure for screening of applicants. There is no consistency in where the applications come, who keeps them, who acknowledges to the applicants, it's not clear.

A member explained a recent case of mishandled applications. One applicant was screened

Brief discussion ensued whether we should consider the idea of having both tenure track and non-tenure track positions within a department. Some other Universities do this, and it can provide more flexibility and not lock KSU in during a period of financial turmoil. Others mentioned that it would probably be difficult to recruit faculty into these non-tenure track positions.

The PCC Chair suggested to read the Registry's report and prepare for the discussion in the next meeting.

There were no action items tabled or passed.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42 PM. PCC will meet in three weeks.

Notes prepared by
Buddhi Gyawali, Secretary PCC.