

Faculty senate minutes April 4, 2018

1. President Rigsby called meeting to order at 3:15.

Members present: Malcolm Rigsby, Aneeq Ahmad (for Emilie Beltzer), Rebecca Langley, Kristen Benjamin, Janice O'Donnell, Matt Gross, Dever Norman (for James Duke), Connie Phelps, Shelly Austin, Michael Watters, Shannon Clardy, Vincent Dunlap, Paul Glover, Richard Miller, Judi Jenkins (for Pat Weaver), Peggy Woodall, Carolyn Eoff, Beth Maxfield, Christy McDowell, Michael Loos (for Rochelle Moss), Fred Worth, Lewis Kanyiba, Catherine Leach

Members absent: Troy Bray, David Stoddard, Natalie Scrimshire, Holly Morado, Andrew Kreckman, Christine McDowell, Tommy Finley

Guests: Steve Adkison-Provost, Elaine Kneebone-General Counsel, Brandie Benton-Associate Provost

2. Ms. Kneebone spoke regarding the universities' policies regarding free speech and facilities usage. Talked about the recent demonstrations at several schools around the country and protection of free speech but the need for some regulations regarding that expression to time, place, and manner restrictions for use of the campus.

3. Dr. Benton discussed her departments' report of enrollment over the last few years, how there was no enrollment data following student from application to enrollment until she took her position. Data management is done within her office and expressed some concerns about the accuracy of the past "point in time" data. We are reported to be up about a thousand application from this time last year but predictions cannot be made regarding fall enrollment based on these numbers. Budgets must be made according to the data available nonetheless. Discussion followed regarding of the numbers of applicants versus number of students actually enrolling and the system "noise" of students applying due to the lack of application fee at HSU and differences between national data populations and the population we serve. Discussion of impacts of contact methods (texting) helping with increasing new admit and Heart Start numbers.

4. Dr. Adkison discussed budget concerns about the academic budget compared with the administrative budget. Instructional vs. non instructional areas in qualitative and quantitative data are not equal in their information available. Discussed need for 2.1 million reduction in budget regarding academics and he assured us that we will not lose any positions within the faculty or other essential positions for student services or academic programs. There will be a very few number of staff positions eliminated. Some administrative offices will be consolidated and there will be further consolidations made across campus. Discussion of concerns about keeping classes open that are being taught by adjuncts and costs related to enrollment compared to cost of instruction. Deans will meet next Tuesday with Adkison, Powell, and Lecia Franklin to talk about budget concerns. If enrollment meets better than expectations, then the money off the top will go to the strategic priorities in compensation increases for faculty and staff.

5. Approval of minutes from March 2018. Minutes approved by the senate.

6. President's report: See Appendix A

7. Reports of committees

A. Executive committee: Completed agenda for today's meeting

B. Academics Committee: see Appendix B: Discussion of SI and addition of language explaining what it means, and talk of low enrollment course cancellation proposal for guidelines and possible exceptions.

C. Buildings and Grounds Committee: Met with facilities proposal evaluation committee right before senate meeting so report will be forthcoming after review of proposals for new contracts for services.

D. Finance committee: Handout regarding adjunct pay at Arkansas institutions and recommendations for increasing ours, as it is very low compared to similar institutions. Recommendations will be held for future submission in regards to the budget shortfall being dealt with at this time.

E. Operations and Handbook Committee: Progress was made and Board approval is coming presumably at their meeting this month.

F. Procedures committee: Elections for positions being sent out

F. Shared Governance Committee: See Appendix C: speech and expression covered by Kneebone, and motion to approve the policy with reservations regarding the policy as written possible being used to terminate arbitrarily considered inappropriate behaviors on campus. Motion passed senate vote. Use of campus facilities policy rejection as it is written and motion was carried to reject the policy.

6. Old business: none

7. New business: Candidates for VP of Student Services position on campus for interviews and presentations this week—Senators encouraged to attend the forums.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:19 by President Rigsby.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rebecca Langley

Appendix A: President's Report

President's Report to the Faculty Senate, April 4, 2018

Meeting with Dr. Glen Jones, University President, March 29, 2018

International Students: As discussed earlier there have been two trips to China over the past few months and there will no doubt be a few more. We are now in dialog five Chinese institutions (up from the past President's Report of three). I expressed to President Jones that two concerns have been conveyed to me from multiple members of the HSU community. These are: **1.** The cost associated with the building of these relationships, what is our goal in regards to our financial bottom line especially given the current fiscal budget, and what are our financial expectations four to five years out, and **2.** What are we doing to assure that students who come from Chinese Institutions will remain enrolled at our campus and graduate from HSU.

In regards to Cost: Previous trips to China have been paid for with *private revenue sources*. No state funds have been used at this point. There will most likely be a few more trips that will similarly be covered by private sources. However, at some point university funding will be used to build the program. This commitment is in regards to the strategic goal; *recruitment*. We are confident in expecting revenues to exceed expenses once the initiative is established. We are not simply looking to fund the program but provide a net profit. In this regard this is an investment and therefore is similar to any other investment in infrastructure or resources. The return in investment in an international student presence on campus depends on developing a strong trust between the home universities, the students, and their parents who will expect us to assist students in adapting to and succeeding at HSU. We are pursuing this aim seeking a measureable goal in terms of student success. This is the same model we seek for all students, which is graduation.

In regards to Student Success and Retention: President Jones answered in two parts. The first deals with the qualities of HSU and the goals of the home institutions in China. He has been advised by officials in negotiation that they are seeking universities such as HSU in communities such as Arkadelphia because they believe the qualities of HSU reflect their expectations and goals for their students. The second part of his answer addressed retention. We are addressing retention through three measures: **1.** Building mutual and trusting relationships to assure that our state, local community, and our campus community are a good fit for their young people and that we will receive them and take care of them. **2.** Utilizing Memorandums of Understanding between HSU and the home institutions built around 2+2 and 1+2+1 programs, thereby creating commitment with the home institutions. **3.** Learning from past mistakes. We are not entering an informal recruitment effort that results in us knowing little about the students before they arrive. Rather, we are building upon the MOUs securing intermediaries that assist in negotiating the student agreement and hold students accountable for their enrollment at HSU. *For example*: American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASSCU) has been involved in negotiating the MOU. Further accountability relates to how students are selected with the goal graduating here and returning to China (2+2 programs), or in the 1+2+1 program returning to China to graduate at the home institution. In each case financial support and expenses related to students are shared by their families and/or the home institutions which thereby create financial accountability in attending HSU. We hope to start receiving students in Fall 2019.

Marketing: I mentioned concerns have been expressed for the last two years that we have failed to have a visible advertisement in the annual Arkansas Democrat Gazette circular on Arkansas Higher Education Institutions. I asked if he might elaborate on the reasoning for HSU not placing an advertisement in the circular for the past two years. President Jones explained that the failure to place the ad was an oversight in the transition that has taken place in marketing. He said he was already aware of it and that ‘there is no excuse.’ The new director is on top of it and is busily evaluating past and present endeavors and working to maximize advertising. President Jones did ask that if possible please to ask Tina Hall to our May faculty senate meeting so she might give a progress report and answer questions. He advised that she is wanting to seek faculty input, focus on programs we offer and revise our “text-heavy” website so that it is more conducive to point and click platforms.

Meeting with Dr. Steve Adkison, Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, March 29, 2018

Budget Instructional Prioritization Plan: I asked Dr. Adkison to meet with Senate in April and provide us detail on the Prioritization Plan as it affects the Instructional Side of the process. This arises from a statement made at the President’s Conversation held last Tuesday, March 27 where it was stated that the Budget Prioritization Recommendations will have to be to the Planning and Budget Committee by the end of March. I asked that in Senate perhaps he could clarify for the Senators the distinctions between the non-instructional and the instructional sides of the process and that each side will focus on two different budget years (2018/19; and 2019/20), that at this time the focus is on the non-instructional units and for 2019/20 the focus will be on the Instructional units. I also asked for clarification of the “recommendations” referenced in the above statement and when will the “workgroup” be meeting so timely recommendations may be made.

IRB: Further concerns were addressed regarding the slow process of gaining IRB approval for students in Bachelor Capstone classes (awaiting graduation) and for students in graduate degree programs. It was reiterated that even “expedited” review is taking longer than usual. That we are down to the last five-six weeks of the semester before graduation and some students still have not been approved to start administering instruments and others have only now received their authorization letters. That during the past week students had received Authorization Letters with Condition but conditions not stated. He advised that a member who is familiar with the process has been assigned to take the role of IRB Director next fall and that a formal process will be established for qualifying a dedicated person to fill that role as soon as possible thereafter.

Upcoming Events – Active Shooter: Dr. Adkison wants to give us all heads up that we will begin a new phase of our Emergency Response Plan “active shooter situations”. In April President Jones will be presenting to the President’s Executive Council and the Council will conduct a table top activity to help shape the content of training and when training will be organized.

Meeting with Dr. Brett Powell, Vice President for Finance and Administration, March 29, 2018

Chinese Student Program: I asked Dr. Powell about the expenses and related costs of travel to China to negotiate the 2+2 and 1+2+1 programs. Dr. Powell assured that private funds were used for these trips. He elaborated on our return on this investment as follows. Conservatively, we should expect 10 students in the first year and 20 in the second year. This will allow us to gauge our ability to provide for the students. If all infrastructure is in place at that time he

expects the annual number to be between 50-100 students served. These students will stay in university housing. This plan is structured with net profit as the goal. We are not just seeking to cover costs. To assure continuity and manage attrition we are taking our time in structuring the programs and we are involving third parties including the home universities. This will also serve to provide responsibility of students to attend and complete the program of study. CCIEE the Chinese Center for International Educational Exchange is working with us and with the home universities to structure the requirements of the program. This is a plus since the historical process for students coming to the US has been through “paid recruiters” who simply enroll the student and place no requirements on the student to comply. Here both the home university and the others providing funding are involved. Last, China tests student before college and sets their degree program of study. They all enroll in similar classes the first two years, then particular studies (including our current proposal) will require their study here). Thus they are locked in to their study before they even begin university. This enhances commitment on the behalf of the student. Three potential HSU plans are outlined.

2+2 = just like a 2+2 here, students complete 2 years in China and 2 years at HSU. Each university grants a degree. China grants an associate and we grant a Bachelor

1+2+1 = the first year in at the home institution in China then 2 years at HSU and then the final year in China at the home institution.

Study Abroad = is also an option. This will include faculty as well.

ERP Implementation and Prioritization Plan: I asked Dr. Powell what is next in line on the ERP Implementation timeline. I noted that the slide for the Timeline which was discussed at the President’s Conversation the past Tuesday was so small I did not think many could read it. I asked if he would supply us a copy of the slide. A copy is attached herewith.

Dr. Powell noted that our next phase of the non-instructional prioritization plan includes moving us into a 4 year cycle of review which will support and help us decide how we best use our funds. He has also supplied a copy the slide that depicts our budget process and the 4 year review cycle. Without too much detail the non-instructional process now moves forward from the recently completed evaluations of the non-instructional units. Members of the Budget committee were teamed to evaluate the PEP Priority Proposals submitted by non-instructional units across campus. These proposals were rated from established criteria. Those meeting a threshold were considered eligible to move to the Operational Planning stage of the 4 year Cycle. Those failing to meet the threshold will reevaluate their proposals. If Senators wish I will ask Dr. Powell to attend the May Senate meeting and elaborate on this slide and the 4 year cycle of evaluation.

Other Updates

Shared Governance Committee (SGC):

March 16, 2018 the SGC met to consider two proposed policies entitled Facilities Use Policy and Policy on Speech and Expression. These policies are attached. They have been reviewed by the SGRC and will be reported on at the April 4, 2018 Faculty Senate. Please read over these.

March 30, 2018 the SGC met to consider the report on these policies entitled Salary Savings, Cell Phones, and Electronics Devices. The March Faculty Senate Shared Governance Review Committee (SGRC) submitted their report on the review of three Proposed Administrative Policies at the March Faculty Senate. After the report of the SGRC and deliberation we followed the suggestions of the SGRC and rejected the three policies. Attached is a copy of the SGC summary of all campus reviews of the three policies. At the meeting, Chair Dr. Megan Hickerson submitted and we discussed the summary. It was decided to accept the Salary

Savings Proposal with changes. This proposal with the changes appears at the end of this summary. The Cell Phone Proposal was deliberated and determined that several concerns needed to be clarified and addressed. The revision has not been made available at this time. The SGC rejected the Electronic Devices proposal in its current form. The following statement summarizes the concerns of the SGC. "While we can see this proposal applying in some form to certain offices on the HSU campus (in which the majority of work is completed in office, for example), we do not support its application to the university as a whole. In particular, we see this proposal as running counter to the university's prioritization of its educational goals, which include the advancement of online course provision and in some cases entire programs (for which the president has articulated support). We also find that the policy as proposed overly limits the ability of department and program heads to make decisions best suited to personnel and program goals within their specific areas of expertise and supervision.

We believe that there is too much concern with aspects of this proposal (as written) to enable the SGC to revise it to a comprehensive purpose."

Appendix B: Academics Committee

Academics Committee Minutes
Thursday, March 29, 2018
11:30 Evans Hall

Members Present: Vincent Dunlap, Christy McDowell, Holly Morado
Members Absent: Andrew Kreckmann

1. Call to Order
2. New Business
 - a. Course Cancellation Policy (General Dean's Council Proposal):
Vince spoke with Dr. Hardee and Dr. Boswell about the proposal and intent behind the proposal. A discussion ensued about the likelihood of the proposal successfully navigating through the Shared Governance process. The committee found the proposal as written to be satisfactory but decided to look into producing a minimum enrollment number for courses in both Fall/Spring and the Summer that would be feasible. Vince agreed to look into these numbers and report those back to Christy, who agreed to write the policy up as a formal proposal to present to the Senate for the April meeting.
 1. Old Business
 - a. Service Intensive course on transcript:
Vince consulted with Dr. Shannon Clardy about her experience with conducting a service-intensive course and she graciously provided the committee with materials. Based on Dr. Clardy's input, Holly presented a set of guidelines to the committee (attached) to send forward to the full Senate. The committee was in agreement about the guidelines and their wording. Dr. Clardy also voiced approval of the guidelines as written.
 - b. Printing of catalog:
Holly has agreed to look into the cost of printing limited numbers of hard copy catalog.
3. UAC Update:
Vince shared his minutes from the UAC meeting. The en route Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degrees discussed at UAC will no longer be pursued.
5. Adjourn

Appendix B-1

From December 2017:

The Proposal passed with the “friendly” addition in italics

Proposal: Service Intensive (SI) on Transcript

The Faculty Academics committee proposes the following change to courses that are Service Intensive. The abbreviation of (SI) should be placed in front of these courses. The faculty that teach these courses will need to follow the appropriate steps to have SI added to the course title.

Service Intensive course guidelines should be created with the cooperation of the Provost and faculty members.

For April 2018 Faculty Senate:

Proposal: Guidelines from the Academics committee for (SI) on Transcript

The Faculty Academics committee proposes the *Proposal for Service-Intensive Course Designation Approval* form to be implemented to determine if a course qualifies as Service Intensive (SI).

Appendix B-2

From December 2017:

The Proposal passed with the “friendly” addition in italics

Proposal: Service Intensive (SI) on Transcript

The Faculty Academics committee proposes the following change to courses that are Service Intensive. The abbreviation of (SI) should be placed in front of these courses. The faculty that teach these courses will need to follow the appropriate steps to have SI added to the course title.

Service Intensive course guidelines should be created with the cooperation of the Provost and faculty members.

For April 2018 Faculty Senate:

Proposal: Guidelines from the Academics committee for (SI) on Transcript

The Faculty Academics committee recommends the following *Proposal for Service-Intensive Course Designation Approval* form to be implemented to determine if a course qualifies as Service Intensive (SI).

Appendix B-3

Course Cancellation Proposal

I.Date: 3/29/18

II.Sponsoring Constituent: Academics Committee

III.Statement of the Issue: (This should be in a format for submission to the HSU campus community)

In the request from Faculty Senate to examine a policy for low-enrollment cancellation, the Academics Committee recommends the following proposal:

In implementing low-enrollment cancellation policies, colleges, departments, and programs must ensure that these policies do not hinder students' timely progression to graduation nor violate students' guarantee to full-time enrollment. Colleges, departments, and programs must also ensure that these policies do not threaten the reputation of HSU as a desired workplace for faculty, instructors/adjuncts, and teaching assistants. Careful planning, informed by enrollment histories, is necessary. Efforts in this regard include the following:

- In the fall and spring semesters, undergraduate courses with fewer than seven students and graduate courses with fewer than five students are considered low-enrollment courses.
- In the summer semesters, undergraduate courses with fewer than five students and graduate courses with fewer than three students are considered low-enrollment courses.
- Departments should look at the enrollment histories of courses required for graduation. If these courses are low-enrollment courses, then required courses should be offered once a year rather than every semester.
- If a low-enrollment course is required for graduation, obtaining a minor, obtaining a certificate and the affected students are nearing graduation and cannot be accommodated in the class the following semester without disrupting their path to degree completion, then either off the low-enrollment course or accept alternative courses that fit the affected students' schedule.
- Electives that have not been taught in at least one year may be offered even though they may be low-enrollment courses.
- Departments will:
 - Use a reasonable time frame (i.e., no less than two weeks before the first day of classes) to determine when to cancel a class.
 - Notify affected students and college/department academic advising staff as soon as the action is taken.
 - Work with the affected students to ensure that they find acceptable alternatives.
 - If cancelled courses are required for graduation and the affected students are nearing graduation but are not in their last semester before graduation, departments will ensure that the students can be accommodated in the course the following semester.
 - All affected students should be accommodated, but colleges and departments must pay special attention to seniors preparing to graduate, international students, students on financial aid, students who need special accommodations for disabilities and might have chosen a class on this basis, and students who require full-time enrollment or who have specific minimum credit hour requirements (e.g. Homeland Security laws require international students to be enrolled full time).
 - Note that there will inevitably be exceptions to cancelling classes with low enrollment, such as independent studies and practica, and colleges should work

with departments to identify these, taking into account the college and department teaching load/compensation policies.

Colleges and departments must also take into effect of low-enrollment cancellations on faculty, instructors, and teaching assistants. Especially for new or specialized elective courses, or courses that have historically low enrollment, departments should have backup plans for changing assignments, and such plans should be made known in advance to instructors, faculty, and teaching assistants who might be affected.

For tenure track and tenured faculty members, accommodations in cases of cancelled courses may include strategies such as:

- Reassignment to a required course that is in high demand
- Opening another section of existing courses
- Expansion of enrollment in another course that the instructor is teaching
- An uncompensated overload in a subsequent semester
- Assignment to administrative, research, or other duties that are normally compensated with course release in the unit

There may be instances in which canceling a class because of insufficient enrollment is the most sensible course of action. Following these guidelines should help minimize the impact to everyone affected.

Appendix C: Shared Governance Committee

Shared Governance Minutes
Wednesday, March 28, 2018
2:00 Evans Hall

Members Present: Dever Norman, Beth Maxfield and Holly Morado

Members Absent: none

The following are the committee's findings per Shared Governance policy.

- I. Policy on Speech and Expression
The committee discussed the reason and understanding behind the need for the policy. The committee agreed there is a necessity for the policy.
There was also discussion about the definition of disrupt in (d), and (e). The concern is who will make the decision on what classifies as a disruption. Also, on (o) the concern was raised that this will eliminate the ability to have a peaceful sit in.
The committee decided to approve the policy with reservations. Also, we want a record of our concerns.
- II. Policy on Facilities Use
The committee discussed the reason and understanding behind the need for the policy. The committee had concerns that the process is already confusing and time

consuming. The policy seems to make things more difficult. Such as, number of forms, insurance, time for prep and approval through President or Vice President of Finance and Administration. The committee feels the process will slow down and filter out activities that are beneficial for campus life.

The restriction on Food Service stating that ALL food served on campus must be provided by Sodexo was concerning to the committee. Dr. Powell stated that food purchased by Henderson money should be purchased through Sodexo, however, if you purchase a pizza (out of your own money) for a campus club then you can use any Pizza provider. However, "Henderson money" needs to be defined. Because alumni events are catered through outside caterers.

The committee also discussed how confusing and embarrassing the formatting of the policy.

Policy on Speech and Expression

The Shared Governance Policy Review Committee proposes with strong reservation, that the policy on Speech and Expression be approved. The need and reason behind the policy is understandable. However, without clarification on what constitutes a disruption, the administration has the ability to arbitrarily terminate any demonstration.

Policy on Facilities Use

The Shared Governance Policy Review Committee proposes the policy on Facilities Use not be approved. The policy presents a process that will slow down and filter out activities that are beneficial for campus life due to (a) inefficiencies resulting from increasing points of contact for applying coordinators, (b) increased financial barriers from the required insurance policy, and no suggested mitigating financial support, and (c) potentially unmanageable workload placed on top administrators. In scheduling conflicts the policy may not prioritize academic events as heavily as is appropriate for an academic institution. The policy also puts a restriction on Food Service, forcing Sodexo to be used for all food served. The policy is not formatted grammatically, syntactically, nor organizationally in a manner that best represents an educational institution.