

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:

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of agenda [5-minute time limit]
3. Approval of minutes [5-minute time limit]
4. Introduction of new members and Chandee [5-minute time limit]
5. President Thompson [15-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 Rye [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 Regent Report [10-minute time limit]
13. Other Business
14. Adjourn

Kimberly A. Sipes
Assistant Professor
Faculty Senate President 2016-2017
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 intrusive advising and they will be coached on a “learning path” that ensures their progress is charted.

The Faculty Senate Parliamentarian indicated time was up and a motion was passed to extend time for ten minutes.

The President stressed that this year would serve as baseline data for the 2+2 program. A senator asked for clarification on the program and the President noted that students admitted under these auspices would earn a “milestone” degree and then, the university hopes, move on to a four year program. The development of milestone certificates, in addition to the associate's degree, will be considered.

Time was again extended through a motion. A senator asked about the previous administration's plan to build the budget around a projection of 600 new students. The President said that he did not feel this number was realistic and that he budgeted for 350 new first year students and 150

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

Ken Andries (AFE), Chair
Changzheng Wang (at large), Vice Chair
Dantrea Hampton (Library), Secretary
Gary Elliott (WYS)
Robert Griffin (FIAR)
Narayanan Rajendran (at large)
Donavan Ramon (WYS -- non-Senator)

Professional Concerns Committee – Hathaway Hall 224

Cindy Glass (BSS), Chair
Steve Ulrich (PUA, CJ, SW), Vice Chair
Buddhi Gywali (AFE), Secretary
Robert Hebble (Math & Sci)
Abdullah Alhurani (Nursing)
Jens Hannemann (Comp Sci)
Fariba Bigdeli-Jahed (Math Sci -- non-Senator)
Mara Merlino (BSS -- non-Senator)

10. Adjourn

A motion to adjourn the meeting passed at 4:40pm.

Respectfully submitted, Joe Moffett, Faculty Senate Secretary

Academic Policies Committee Meeting (August 29, 2016)

Members Present: Joe Moffett (Chair), Ashok Kumar (Vice Chair), Ibukun Amusan (Secretary), Nancy Capriles, Maheteme Gebremedhin, Nkechi Amadife

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

Members introduced themselves.

The agenda was approved after 'Other Business' was added.

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

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

The Registry group that came during spring 2016 said they would put the academic policies in one place. APC members now have the document and they are to go over it to see if there is anything that should be changed. It is not clear if the Registry people are still around.

Senate president would like committees to work together. APC will likely be paired with PCC to work on faculty handbook. The handbook was previously worked on a few years ago by a committee but there was no feedback from the then administration. APC will try to get what was done before and work on it.

KSU is preparing for another 5 years SACS accreditation. Administration may bring something for APC to work on. Last spring, Mark Shale advised it was good to have a statement about programs accreditation.

APC will work on 2018/2019 academic calendar. The 2016/2017 calendar online looks like the one proposed. During summer 2016, VPAA wanted the dates when midterm grades are due to be changed for 2016/2017 calendar. The changes were made by the executive committee. It was mentioned during the meeting that some schools have their fall break the week of Thanksgiving, and maybe this is something that can be considered for KSU, but it would mean not having any break for a long time after Labor Day.

Online program proposal for freshmen: Last academic year, administration did not want freshmen to take online classes. Some concerns that were expressed by faculty included the following – there may be some freshmen that are high achieving students, some may have previously taken online classes successfully, and online classes may benefit athletes that travel a lot.

There was some discussion about online course and face-to-face course merits.

The online program proposal that was passed through senate last spring was sent back with some changes and suggestions made by VPAA and/or Jennifer Miles. Some of the changes are the following:

- The number of face-to-face meetings for Hybrid (also known as Blended) courses should be 3 sessions if the course meets once per week, 6 sessions if course meets twice weekly and 9 sessions if course meets thrice weekly.
- The policies should apply to dual credit courses offered online or as hybrid.
- The degree and certifications of an appointed director of online programs should comply with national standards.

- The ability to complete virtual courses successfully, of first-semester online students exclusively at a distance, should be assessed before the semester begins. The assessment should be an online readiness tool or any other methods approved by instructor, advisor or director of online programs. VPAA is to make the final approval for students not meeting the required standard.
- Evaluation of online courses should be done annually by faculty-centered consultant(s) from outside the university, e.g. Quality Matters.

The changes were discussed. It was mentioned that the outside consultant fees can be very high per course. APC members are to read the proposal again before the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

Budget & Academic Support Committee Minutes (Approved)

August 29, 2016- (Shauntee Hall, Room 100)

Members in attendance: Reba Rye (Senator-At-Large), Chair; Peter Smith (LLP), Vice Chair; LeChrista Finn (AFE - non-Senator), Secretary; Vikas Kumar (AQU); Li Lu (Math & Science); Rene Desborde (BUA – non-Senator); Mike Unuakhalu (CS)

Chair Rye began the meeting at 3:18 PM; a motion was made by Vice Chair Smith, 2nd by Desborde and voted on by the committee to approve the agenda. Introductions were made by each member of the committee.

Discussion of BASC responsibilities

Chair Rye pointed out in the Faculty Senate KSU Constitution (Appendix A) where it states the Senate exists, *“to advise the President on the planning for physical facilities and staff when these may affect the attainment of educational objectives.”* This was a talking point to suggest BASC keep this in mind while undertaking tasks for the academic year. A brief discussion was held to share the responsibilities of the committee as referenced in the faculty handbook. These responsibilities are to:

1. Recommend faculty priorities and work with the administration in developing the annual budget and the biennial budget report.
2. Analyze the finance and resource allocations of the University on a continuing basis so that it may advise the Faculty Senate, and through it the President of the University, on the relationship between the allocation of funds and the established missions of the University.
3. Make recommendations regarding the administrative services which the University provides for its faculty.
4. Make recommendations regarding academic support services such as the library, bookstore, duplication, and any other support units affecting the academic programs of the University.

Prioritize focus and issues for review

A lengthy discussion led to the decision that Chair Rye would draft a formal email request from the BASC prioritizing information needed to address concerns for this year. The BASC believes the administration will be transparent and inclusive in budget hearings and conversations to provide input and recommendations when appropriate.

BASC agreed it is important the administration takes the responsibility and is held accountable for assuring pay equity across the board while also working to recruit minority faculty. This also includes a) looking at the number of administrators and their salaries, b) assessing the ratio of administrators compared to student enrollment and c) addressing how overall operating expenses for KSU relates to instruction.

Acquisition of KSU Line Item FY1617 Budget

Chair Rye made a request of the President a few weeks ago for a copy of the itemized budget for this academic year. She will make a formal request from BASC for review.

Reorganization plan approved by Board of Regents effective fall 2017 and impact on budget.

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 Rye will 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? It was agreed that BASC should be proactive and place issues on the radar of the President.

There is some concern about overlap of the work the consultants are doing versus the role of staff. BASC wants to identify the role of consultants, their work assignments, cost and source of funding to determine impact on the overall budget and potential duplication.

Strategic plan as relates to budget

Chair Rye provided a copy of the strategic plan for the committee to review and discuss at the next meeting.

Action items:

Chair Rye will draft an email to formally request from President Thompson an 1) itemized budget, 2) data on all consultants and/or other expenditures from the Foundation fund and 3) a full copy of the Registry's recommendations. BASC members will provide feedback electronically to facilitate moving this item forward.

Secretary Finn will forward minutes to Chair Rye to submit to Senate for upcoming meetings; approvals will be done electronically by the committee.

Vice Chair Smith made a motion; Unuakhalu 2nd and it was voted on by the committee to adjourn at 4:08 PM.

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 latest 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 VPAA/Provost and Deans are qualified for it but others were also given.

A discussion was held about evaluation of deans and chairs, Chairs were evaluated in some divisions but deans’ evaluations never happened. Registry recommends to look for 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 full teaching load and have other non-teaching responsibilities, such as faculty in College of Agriculture. Registry’s recommendation provided general framework for scholarship which helps to 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 other institutions’ model of assigning mentors and conducting evaluation in three years after original hire.

It was noted that a new calendar for tenure is coming 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 been already 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 VPAA Jackson's suggestion to pick up or update their dossiers during the recent F/S 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 considered. 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 prior 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 opined that post-tenure policy was put in place to acknowledge faculty achievements. Meritorious 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 applications. There is no consistency in where the applications come, who keeps them, who acknowledges to the applications, it's not clear.

A member explained a recent case of mishandling of applications. One applicant was screened out because that applicant did not meet one of the demographic attributes. A member said we cannot practice illegal discriminatory screening of applications. We need to follow procedures properly for screening and hiring of candidates.

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.