

The 12th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate (FS) Meeting occurred on April 16th, 2020 via WebEX.

Attachments for this meeting were/are available under Meeting Documents on the MSU Faculty Senate Blackboard (BB) shell.

- Minutes from FS Meeting March 5, 2020
- Update on Distinguished Awards
- Update on Distinguished Service Award
- Resolution re Online Teaching – 1st Reading
- (supporting document) Statement on shift to online education
- Resolution to Explore Efficiencies – 2nd Reading
- Committee appointments
- Student Life – 1st Reading

Call to Order (3:45pm)

The following announcement was made by Chair Lennex:

Update on Distinguished Teacher, Distinguished Staff and Faculty, and Distinguished Researcher Awards for Fall 2020.

Distinguished Teacher Award for 19-20 update:

At the March 13, 2020 meeting, the present members of the Excellence in Teaching committee decided to postpone the selection of Distinguished Teacher until the early part of the fall 2020 semester. The 2019-2020 committee membership would make the selection for the 2019-2020 academic year only considering those individuals who have delivered a portfolio for the Spring 2020 selection. The Distinguished Teacher 2019-2020 will be awarded according to Provost recommendation for either Winter Commencement or Spring Convocation. The 2020-2021 selection will continue as usual with the 2020-2021 committee.

Distinguished Researcher and Creative Production for 19-20 update:

The Research and Creative Productions committee will award Distinguished Researcher award at the Fall commencement. There were no entries for Creative Productions.

Distinguished Service, Staff and Faculty, for 19-20 update:

The Service committee will award Distinguished Service, staff and faculty, at Fall commencement.

President's Report President Morgan

No report; president Morgan was not available for this meeting.

Provost's Report-Provost Albert

The following was sent by Provost Albert in lieu of an oral report as he was unavailable for this meeting.

1. *Program Review Process:* Given the inability to hold the Gray Associates program

workshops as scheduled due to COVID-19, we have had a few conversations with the Gray consultants and with Melissa Bell at the CPE. We have come to an agreement to hold the program workshops in August – hopefully in a live setting, but if not, this will give Gray more time to further develop a more robust online alternative. Melissa Bell has agreed that we can submit our standard program reviews to CPE at the end of the fall term.

2. *Fall Course Delivery Considerations:* Have been developing a process involving select faculty representatives and AA administrators to develop contingency plans for the fall term, given the lingering uncertainties related to COVID-19. Would like to discuss this in detail with the FS Executive Committee on Friday.

Senator Sharp asked if anyone knew when in August the Gary Associates meeting would occur? Lennex replied: According to Laurie Couch, August is a tentative date.

Senator Schack requested clarification regarding whether senate would discuss point #2 of the Provost report (Fall Course Delivery Considerations) more when we look at resolution a bit later in the meeting?” Chair Lennex stated that yes, the topic of fall course delivery is something that would be further discussed during the Faculty Welfare and Concerns report later.

Faculty Regent's Report-Regent Adams

Regent Adams congratulated Dirk Grupe, Anthony Dotson, and Vijay Subramaniam, FS members on their BOR approval of Promotion with Tenure.

Regent Adams provided the following report via email as a summary of her report:

The BOR held its quarterly meeting via WebEx on 4/16/20.

The Audit Committee met at 9:45 a.m. to reappoint the auditing firm (Dean Dorton Allen Ford PLLC) and approve the scope of the annual audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2020. (Note: KRS 164A.570 requires universities like MSU to have an annual audit). The fee for this fiscal year shall not exceed \$94,700.

The full BOR meeting began at 10:00 a.m. All of the work that was done (i.e., everything that was approved) was part of the consent agenda:

Following the recommendations of the Audit Committee, the full BOR approved the annual scope of the audit and the auditing firm. It ratified the compiled list of personnel actions from 12/5/19 through 4/9/20 (which included hires, leaves of absences, FLSA changes, promotions, renewals, reassignments, separations, and salary supplements).

It approved 4 policies: PG-11 Leave of Absence (military service) and PG-24: Time off for Death in Family and Funeral included with minor revisions for clarification, PAC-17: Sabbaticals and PAC-28: Educational Leave of Absence were just reapproved.

Of most import to faculty, the BOR approved the promotion of 3 associate professors to full and the tenure (and promotion to associate) of 6 assistant professors, and accepted the amendment to the mandatory fee schedule for graduate classes to allow students to take 600-level graduate classes in Education at a reduced rate (\$374 a credit hour, vs. our usual \$570). It also approved the modified pass/fail policy for the 2020 Spring semester and accepted the second quarter financial statements that “provides an overview of the University’s financial activities for the six months that ended on December 31, 2019” (April 16, 2020 Agenda, p. 132).

Of most interest to faculty:

Budget: Students will be getting refunds for housing and meal plans, the prorated amount from March 28th-May 8th. Figures are still being determined. Although this returned money will not be our only revenue loss this term, it will be a significant amount (probably \$2m+).

We have applied for the stimulus funds (in the CARES act) as of today. Half of the money (listed as \$6,016,440 in the searchable database in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and the pdf made available by *Inside Higher Ed*) is earmarked for students, the other half for institutional needs. Dr. Morgan favors keeping this money (which we haven’t received yet) separate from current budget lines and considerations (such as refunds for meal plans and housing). When we do receive these funds, they will be placed in designated accounts for future use.

I inquired who would be overseeing/tracking these funds once they were received, and I was told that that has not been fully determined yet. (Quick primer on why that is even a question: restricted governmental funds, such as money for building or M&O [maintenance and operation], are normally overseen by the chief financial officer, but CARES offers the stimulus as grants, and grants are overseen by the senior grants and contracts accountant.)

Hiring and Human Capital: The President relayed to the Board what he has noted in recent campus wide communications: we’re being very, very cautious in terms of hiring and not automatically filling lines that become open (through retirement and separation). He also noted that “we” (presumably the upper admin) would be looking at employee credentials to see where people could be put to best use. We (as in faculty) ought to consider this in light of the President’s April 13th campus-wide communication, which included this statement:

As we curtail new hiring across campus, we will likely have a need to make sure we have an adequate amount of faculty and staff to cover courses this fall and other core areas. Our goal will be to try to utilize full-time employees that we currently have to cover courses this fall before we go off-campus for new ones. This will be one of several ways that we maintain operational funds, preserve jobs, and also allow us to operate with some caution under the circumstances. We will be able to assess our course coverage needs somewhat better after Advance Registration is completed in the next week or so. Additionally, we will know SOAR numbers for incoming new students later in June.

Senate has already been addressing the issue of fractionalization, and attendant issues with teaching observations, in relation to FYS. These recent communications suggest that there are possible plans to expand fractionalization, which could exacerbate existing problems.

Governance relating to technology: The BOR also approved the “University Technology Plan 2020-2024.” The first initiative, “Technology Governance,” calls for the creation of a Technology Advisory Council (TAC) that includes both a faculty and a staff representative. The other membership slots are administrators or general areas (like Student Life). A reconstituted Technology Review Board (TRB), which is supposed to work in consultation with TAC, includes representation from Student Government as well as “College technology representatives,” or the staff and hybrid positions developed to oversee technological needs in each college.

I voted to approve the plan, with the governance structure outlined therein, because it was presented as an “evolving” document that could and would change in relation to needs. As I have already conveyed to President Morgan and CIO Howes, the first initiative is a welcome move (in so far as faculty are given a voice at the table) that should evolve in order to produce better results. The institution already has three existing constitutive bodies (Faculty Senate, Staff Congress, and Student Government) capable of facilitating much of the communication and outreach needed. Instead of creating another governance structure wherein mid and upper level administrators, who often do not even have to use the technological tools under consideration (because they have ADs and support staff to do things like data entry), are given disproportionate sway, the institution can and should open stable lines of multidirectional communication between end users and the tech experts so that end users can identify recurrent technological problems and desired outcomes and tech experts can provide solutions within the frame of the possible. We all know much of our software does not communicate across campus, and that’s a direct consequence of previous institutional choices to isolate end users from tech experts. We have a chance to change this pattern, and produce better outcomes with less unwarranted enmity on campus, if we use the governance structures already in place to address our technological needs.

I would strongly encourage you all to read the technology plan, which is available on the April 16, 2020 Board Agenda, and to contact CIO Howes with your thoughts as to how faculty can facilitate IT’s important work.

Staff Congress Report-Chair Savard-Hogge

Piggy backed off of a lot of Adams report—April report in SC talked about the many committees meeting across campus:

March 4 Employee Benefits-Discuss new coverage, waiting for the budget office to release information. Dr. Kessinger, requested info from Human resources and SC is in midst of assigning people to the committee.

March 10-Ad hoc Supervisor Committee creating supervisor evaluation tool for staff; similar to what the Evaluation committee has done for Dean evaluations. This was an initial

organizational meeting. Savard-Hogge indicated that initial information demonstrated that within the supervisor evaluations as they currently exist included some levels of unfairness. Concerns regarding evaluation issues brought to light by staff would be addressed by going back through the supervisor ladder which could result in retaliation, or further unfairness. Savard-Hogge encouraged the continuation of the ad hoc committees particularly when fractionized workloads become more likely.

General Education Revision Implementation Report— Regent Adams

Regent Adams provided the following summary of her report Via email:

The committee met on 4/13/20 via WebEx. Rubrics for ALL 10 SLOs, which have been vetted by faculty who teach in each area, have been finalized, and the general assessment plan from the original revision (LUX) was approved. The committee also outlined the information it would like the Associate Provost to make available on a clean, forward-facing website that faculty can easily access for all their general education needs.

Faculty members of the committee are updating the assessment schedule to account for the new implementation date (Fall 2021) and SLO distribution. The schedule and a simple, one-page verification form, for faculty to denote the assignments that will be used for assessment purposes in each course (i.e., which assignments will be evaluated with the standard rubric for assessment purposes), should be approved at the next meeting (Wednesday, April 22nd).

The committee will also begin discussing the work already completed by Faculty Senate (the creation of the new GEC and FYS subcommittee) and aiding in the necessary revision of FYS.

General Education Report- Chair Grupe

No report, but he wished to announce the following:

The QEP committee met on Tuesday. Grupe announced that a budget for the QEP had been requested in the amount of \$175,000. Regent Adams noted that she understands the proposal had a grant portion, so had any grants been written? Grupe stated that he not heard that the committee has written any grants for the implementation of the QEP, but the QEP has internal money that faculty and staff can write grants for.

FS Committee Reports

Academic Issues – Chair Grupe

Chair Grupe presented a Resolution regrading Online Teaching as a response to the social distancing mandate to online conversion. The resolution was brought for a 1st Reading. The resolution draft is available on the FS BB. President Lennex noted that the FS EC would be meeting with the President tomorrow (Friday April 17th) and we will be talking with President Morgan about online teaching. This was a 1st reading, so we will have the opportunity to talk about this at the next meeting (2nd reading).

Senator Schack requested clarification on pages 22-24. What is the committee asking for? Chair Grupe responded that this is in reference to providing help for faculty who had never taught online classes before. The intent was for administration to know that we want instruction *from* faculty *to* faculty. Adams clarified that in UAR 136.002, at no point does it discuss SLO's. Also it doesn't reflect what happens when the University needs to move quickly to a new instructional necessity. There are three questions of interest: 1. What are the digital tools all instructors need? 2. What are courses that could be converted to more of an online scenario? 3. What are courses or experiences that CANNOT be online? The UAR was not clear, faculty need to be in charge of what tools and/or resources are needed in order to move online. Adams remarked that this was a distance learning move, not a move to online classes. Senator Schack requested that lines 22-24 be made clearer. She will send Friendly Amendments (FA's) to the committee.

Senator Sharp stated that she fully supported the resolution, but would like to also consider unforeseen or unintended outcomes of moving online. She asked: At what point will this UAR make brick and mortar become obsolete? Regent Adams noted that there is a digital divide. While students say they want online courses, this situation has shown us that students do not all have the capabilities needed for the digital delivery.

Significant discussion about the differences between Distance Learning and Online teaching ensued until Cahir Lennex noted that we had used the allotted time for discussion on this topic.

Senator Schack raised the question of who is responsible for paying for internet access for faculty. At that point Chair Grupe asked for FA's sent to him by next Wednesday.

The supporting document: *Statement on shift to online education* is available on FS BB.

Evaluation- Chair Long

Chair Long noted that he did not have a lot to add at this meeting because reporting regarding the evaluation of hybrid teaching will come in next meeting.

Faculty Welfare & Concerns- Chair Sharp

Chair Sharp brought forth the Resolution to Explore Efficiencies. This was a 2nd Reading. The document is available on FS BB. Grupe asked if we need another ad hoc committee that deals with looking at what platform we want to recommend for faculty online portfolios. There was not a lot of support for adding yet another committee, but it will be evaluated.

Motion to accept resolution was made; resolution was passed. Chair Lennex will send the resolution to Provost Albert.

Governance- Chair Graves

Chair Graves reported that the Governance Committee was bringing forth the slate of appointees for the Standing Committee appointments. Chair Lennex noted that the committee received a rate of return of about 40-45% which is usual.

Motion to accept the slate of nominations passed.

Graves presented to *Student Life Committee* description revision for a 1st Reading. The document is available on the FS BB. Russ Mast had some recommendations which the committee will evaluate. Any further FA's were to be sent to Graves by next Wednesday, the committee is meeting on Thursday.

Issues-Chair Rashad
No report.

New Business

Chair Lennex announced that Faculty Senate will hold a Summer I meeting, on June 25th. The time and location are TBA. The purpose of this meeting is to present the 2nd reading of TEC committee description (1st reading will be on April 30th) and 1st/2nd reading of policies for BOR approval in August.

Jamie Hornbuckle is collecting videos for use in recruiting. Grupe encouraged faculty to consider doing online video tours for their programs.

Next meeting – Thursday, April 30, at 3:45pm online through WebEx

Submitted by:

Jenny Dearden, 2019-2020 Faculty Senate Communications Officer