

Faculty Senate Minutes
1 October 2014

Senators Present: Lea Ann Alexander, Ajay Aggarwal, Steven Becraft, James Duke, Carolyn Eoff, Dan Fitzroy, Greg Gibson, John Greene, Megan Hickerson, Frank Hudspeth (for Richard Schmid), Jana Jones, Travis Langley, Patricia Loy, Richard Miller, Holly Morado, Janice O'Donnell, Malcolm Rigsby, Ingo Schranz, Brett Serviss, R. C. Smith, Suzanne Tartamella, Patrick Wempe, Penny Whelchel, Fred Worth

Senators Absent: Kristen Benjamin, Emily Gerhold, Lonnie McDonald, Richard Schmid, Peggy Woodall

Others Present: Steve Adkison, Johnny Campbell, Jacob Mills

1. Call to Order: President Fred Worth 3:15
2. Discussion with Chief of University Police, Mr. Johnny Campbell
 - a. Chief Campbell mentioned that he had been chief for eight years and on campus for twenty years.
 - b. Mr. Campbell provided some statistics (courtesy of the university's FBI liaison) regarding campus crime and active shooter incidents; that information is available via the following link: <http://www.fbi.gov/news/stories/2014/september/fbi-releases-study-on-active-shooter-incidents/fbi-releases-study-on-active-shooter-incidents>.
 - c. Mr. Campbell also noted that he routinely attends public safety conferences and speaks with vendors to find products and services—such as the blue light phones and the alarm siren—that would benefit our campus.
 - d. Mr. Campbell mentioned several upcoming projects designed to increase campus safety.
 - i. He is working with AlertUs, a vendor who would install a box (on each floor of each building) that would display an LED message in the event of an emergency; the system would also shut down desktop computers and display messages there in the event of an emergency.
 - ii. Indoor, wall-mounted trauma kits will soon be installed in campus buildings (starting with the academic buildings); training for the kits will be announced soon also.
 - iii. Emergency guidebooks will soon arrive; administrative assistants will have these at their desks as quick reference tools.
 - e. Dr. Adkison mentioned that even though we are a sovereign entity, one incident could cost a significant amount of money, and thus we are increasing our efforts to create a safer campus and also manage risk.
 - f. Dr. Adkison also thanked Mr. Campbell for his work on various campus safety initiatives; he particularly praised the Chief's use of his network of personal contacts to procure several of these programs “at cost.”

- g. Dr. Adkison noted that the test scenarios run in the past had worked as far as they went, but results were limited; he mentioned that President Jones had asked about how we notify faculty members in the classrooms.
- h. Mr. Campbell noted that several safety videos (e.g. “Run, Hide, Fight”) are available on the university’s website; he emphasized the importance of a plan and suggested that various departments/units should consider coming up with individual plans; Dr. Adkison added that this initiative would roll down from the deans and the chairs.
- i. A senator expressed concerns about his/her safety in the classroom, specifically how faculty should defend themselves. The senator asked if he or she should ask the chair about this issue.
 - i. Dr. Adkison emphasized the need to meet as departments to discuss these issues.
 - ii. The senator noted that he/she has personal experience with violence in the classroom.
 - iii. Mr. Campbell recommended mace or pepper spray; he also mentioned the use of various office items as defensive weapons.
 - iv. Dr. Adkison reiterated the importance of the videos (cf. g, above).
- j. Another senator mentioned that he/she would like to see a change so that doors lock from the outside, not the inside.
- k. Another senator mentioned the Virginia Tech shooting and asked about developing a profile for “troubled students” or faculty’s submitting names to a database.
 - i. Another senator mentioned that we already have this in place via the Person of Concern (POC) program.
 - ii. Johnny Campbell noted that he also receives the e-mails that are reported through that system.
 - iii. Another senator asked if the list of students reported under that program was protected by Freedom of Information Act (FOIA).
 - 1. Dr. Adkison noted that only personally identifiable information is protected.
 - 2. Johnny Campbell responded that information reported via the POC program is confidential.
- l. A senator asked about a timeline vis-à-vis the implementation of the aforementioned safety initiatives.
 - i. Mr. Campbell responded that the emergency guidebooks are ready for publication and the trauma kits are ready to order.
- m. A senator expressed concern about the lighting on campus, especially for those students and faculty who have night classes.
 - i. Mr. Campbell noted that campus walkabouts happen regularly; if a faculty member does see a lighting issue, he or she should e-mail him.
 - ii. Dr. Adkison mentioned that lighting problems are generally solved quickly.

- n. President Worth noted that incidents such as those under discussion are relatively rare on college campuses.
- o. Johnny Campbell noted that the “AlertUs” program is much larger and the implementation thus longer; an on-site visit from the company will be necessary; funding may also dictate progress, although academic buildings will be first priority; additionally, the Shortel phone will prove useful in this project.
- p. Dr. Adkison asked about the legal size of pepper spray; Mr. Campbell responded that Wal-Mart sells the legal size and encouraged faculty members to carry it.
- q. President Worth noted the service provided by Reddie Rides for those faculty and students teaching or taking night classes.
- r. A senator raised a question about the movement of the Student Technology Center (previously in Foster, now in Garrison): was the previous location not safer?
 - i. Dr. Adkison responded that the needs of Disability Services dictated the move as its former location was a greater safety concern (only an elevator was available to reach the upper floors); he added that the current discussion calls for moving all student services into the former Caddo Cafeteria; Dr. Adkison also noted that student computer usage in the Foster facility had dropped prior to the move.
- s. Mr. Campbell mentioned the addition of a university police substation in the Garrison Center; he also hopes (budget permitting) to hire another officer.
- t. Dr. Adkison noted that the offices of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) have been temporarily moved into the Garrison Center; he said that this creates a conflict of interest.
- u. President Worth asked if any other senators had safety issues/concerns that they wished to bring forward. He also mentioned that senators could e-mail those concerns to Mr. Campbell.
- v. Steve Adkison asked the senator (cf. g, above) about specific safety concerns.
 - i. The senator responded that he/she had experienced problems, such as thrown chairs, in the classroom. He/she was concerned because there had been no follow up after a report was submitted via POC.
 - ii. Steve Adkison noted that we do not—but should—have a clear academic policy regarding behavior in the classroom.
 - iii. The senator noted his/her concern about students who had been removed from classes returning to campus (if not the classroom).
 - iv. Dr. Adkison noted that he would follow up with the senator regarding this issue.
- w. Mr. Campbell noted that the messages broadcast over the alert system (alarm siren) are prerecorded and will always identify the type of incident.
- x. A senator commended Johnny Campbell and his department for their continued quick responses to various incidents on campus.
- y. President Worth thanked those who had come to the “Meet the Provost” event.

3. Discussion with Provost/VPAA, Dr. Steve Adkison

- a. Dr. Adkison apologized for not following through with some of the commitments he had made to several academic committees—he had simply been overwhelmed with other items.
- b. He noted that he hoped that these academic concerns would come through the shared governance process and remarked that the target date for the implementation of that system is January 21.
- c. Dr. Adkison mentioned that the “biggest thing to work on” is the fact that we have conflated academic concerns and complaints (an informal process) with the student code of conduct; there is no academic grievance committee.
- d. Dr. Adkison mentioned that the provost should ensure that the academic grievance committee is the one to decide academic matters.
- e. He noted that as it now stands, “persons of concern” are handled via student affairs and there is no clear distinction between academic affairs and student affairs; moreover, the academic grievance process is too informal.
 - i. A senator noted that an academic grievance policy was developed but subsequently “lost in the shuffle.”
 - ii. Dr. Adkison asked the senator to send him a copy of the policy.
 - iii. President Worth noted that the previous academic grievance policy was an example of the Senate’s need for a “perfect” policy—one that was picked apart and subsequently lost momentum.
- f. Dr. Adkison asked for questions from the senators.
 - i. A senator asked about the difference between aggressive behavior and plagiarism.
 - 1. Dr. Adkison replied that the POC is not FERPA protected; certainly the faculty member who was the victim in any incident should know of the process’ outcome; he emphasized that we have a zero tolerance for aggressive behavior in the classroom.
 - 2. President Worth noted that a concerned faculty member can always e-mail Chad Fielding.
 - 3. Dr. Adkison noted that Student Affairs is charged with student life; thus, they cannot handle academic issues.

4. Approval of May 2014 Minutes by Acclamation

5. President’s Report

- a. Report of Meeting with Dr. Glen Jones, President (26 September 2014)
 - i. We discussed a miscommunication regarding the Fringe Benefits committee and addressing salary gaps. The compensation task force and then the budget committee will deal with those issues.
 - 1. A senator asked if the salary issue could be sold in such a way that we do not have to broach the topic again (perhaps that the salary would be built into the budget).
 - a. President Worth noted that this has been tried before and can hopefully be tried again; he also mentioned that the shared

- governance taskforce will result in the reorganization and recharging of the Fringe Benefits committee.
2. A senator asked about the idea (mentioned in last month’s meeting) about an independent audit of the budget.
 - a. President Worth responded that he had spoken with President Jones about the idea; the President was not enthusiastic about/not interested in the idea.
 - b. The senator responded that the current process has not worked well in the past.
 - ii. Shared governance will require committees to act promptly and communicate clearly, taking ownership of the process. This will be a change in mindset.
 1. A senator expressed concern about the timeline—will there be enough time to get things done after something has come from the shared governance taskforce?
 - a. President Worth responded that committees will have to “do their job[s]”; the committees will have to make time to get the work done.
 - b. Another senator noted that what will be put into place is a set of procedures and guidelines that can be modified as the process evolves.
 2. A senator mentioned using technology to improve the ways in which committees work.
 3. President Worth noted that he is really excited about the new shared governance opportunity.
 4. A senator voiced a concern about the number of faculty representatives on the compensation committee as well as a concern about Bobby Jones’ objectivity as chair of the compensation committee.
 5. President Worth responded that three of the eight members of the committee are faculty members.
 6. Another senator noted that Bobby Jones has always been “great” about working with faculty on the Buildings and Grounds committee.
 7. President Worth mentioned that the committee regarding the outsourcing of the physical plant did not come up during his meeting with President Jones; a senator and member of that committee noted that he/she is the *only* faculty representative on that committee and would appreciate input from the faculty at large about this issue.
- b. Report of Meeting with Dr. Steve Adkison, Provost/VPAA (24 September 2014)
- i. Logos
 1. We discussed various uses of the “Reddies” and centurium logos.
 - a. The “Reddies” logo is only for athletics; that logo will be changing soon.

ii. Evaluations

1. HSU uses CourseEval software for its evaluations. It allows for a variety of options on the part of administrators, departments and/or faculty.
2. Faculty or departments can add questions.
3. Various data can be extracted from the results.
4. We'll need to participate in dialog with faculty and SGA in order to increase student participation.
5. We should *not* give extra credit or prizes for participation.
6. We need a response rate $\geq 35\%$ for any data from evaluations to be of any value.
7. E-mail reminders to students can improve response rates.
8. CourseEval has developed a cell phone app students can download to do the evaluations.
9. Questions to consider
 - a. How do departments use them?
 - b. How should departments use them?
 - c. How can we adjust the evaluation instrument to accomplish our purposes?
10. We need to set up evaluations so we can determine if comments are from different students or the same student
11. Clear and timely student communications will help us drive response rates up, and CourseEval will help with that as well.
 - a. A senator noted that comments from the students who do fill out the evaluations are rare.
 - b. Another senator mentioned the frustration about the inability to link comments with specific questions.
 - c. Another senator suggested delaying the opening of course evaluations until a bit later in the term.
 - d. A senator asked about the roadblock members of his/her department had encountered in both requesting and then obtaining the results of their paper evaluations.
 - e. President Worth noted that he had never had a problem with his evaluations.
 - f. The senator (cf. d, above) reiterated the question about the roadblocks associated with paper evaluations.
 - g. Another senator suggested blocking access to grades until the students had completed the evaluations.
 - h. A senator observed that when evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure, evaluations tell us nothing.
 - i. President Worth noted that Dr. Adkison is very interested in "reinvigorating" the course evaluation process.
 - j. Several senators questioned whether or not evaluations are being used for promotion and tenure purposes.
 - k. A senator remarked that this is a huge issue—evaluations can really impact people's academic lives.

- 1. President Worth reiterated Dr. Adkison’s commitment to reevaluating the evaluation process.
 - m. A senator noted that the evaluation instrument was looked at years ago; we need to revisit what is included in the evaluation.
 - n. President Worth said that he would speak to President Jones about the issue.
 - o. A senator suggested a student focus group to look at the evaluation process.
 - iii. Online classes
 - 1. The university needs to give resources and guidance to faculty offering online classes
 - 2. Departments and faculty have the responsibility to ensure academic integrity of online courses, just the same as with traditional courses.
 - a. A senator stated that he/she wanted to ensure that online courses are equivalent to what is offered in the standard classroom.
 - iv. Ad hoc committee on academics
 - 1. Ginger Otwell can provide us with data for many of our purposes on this committee.
 - 2. The grade forgiveness policy may need to be analyzed to see if it has any financial aid implications.
 - 3. The provost will work with the ad hoc committee to best serve the purposes of the committee, senate and university.
- c. Report of meeting with Mr. Bobby Jones, Vice-President for Finance (28 August 2014)
 - i. A few more cutouts will be installed in curbs around campus to make handicapped access better.

6. Reports of Committees

- a. Executive Committee – No Report
- b. Academics Committee – No Report
- c. Buildings and Grounds Committee – No Formal Report
 - i. Faculty parking spaces in Arkansas Hall Parking lot are not clearly marked and have been used by students; these slots are still faculty parking and will be restriped.
 - ii. Students have complained that faculty parking is not clearly marked and are upset when they are ticketed; they may appeal those tickets.
 - iii. A senator asked what constitutes faculty parking—paint or a sign?
 - 1. The legal designation is a sign; however, our signs have disappeared.
 - 2. A senator asked about the faculty slots between Smith and Russell Fine Arts; they are still faculty slots.
 - 3. A senator mentioned observing the faculty parking at Pulaski Technical College; the spaces were clearly marked—why not use this system as a model?

- d. Finance Committee – No Report
- e. Operations Committee – No Report
 - i. Workman’s Compensation: still working on the report
- f. Procedures Committee
 - i. Proposed Changes Regarding the Faculty Senate Constitution (see addendum)
 - ii. Each issue (1, 2, and 3) was put to a vote; all passed with a two-thirds majority and will now be sent to the faculty at large.
- g. Ad Hoc Committee on Academics – No Formal Report
 - i. The committee has been meeting actively.
 - ii. The committee was given the charge to research various items related to academics.

7. Old Business

- a. Online Course Policies and Guidelines
 - i. No formal report from Academics Committee.
 - ii. The committee will have something prepared for November meeting.
- b. Guidelines for Electronic Committee Meetings
 - i. A skeletal outline was provided as a starting point (see addendum).
 - ii. These are complex issues and should be referred to the Procedures Committee since these actions will constitute a change in the bylaws
 - iii. There was no discussion amongst the senate at large
- c. Minutes for Meetings of Faculty Senate Committees
 - i. Minutes—however minimal—need to be kept for each senate committee and submitted to the Senate secretary.

8. New Business

- a. Information Update on New Website
 - i. The original rollout date was beginning of the term.
 - ii. A team was created to implement the roll out.
 - iii. The website needed significant work.
 - iv. The initial templates have been created; non-academic material has been ported over from the old site.
 - v. Population of the new pages should take approximately three weeks.
 - vi. President Worth emphasized that in order for the website to be done correctly, the committee (and the rollout) will take as much time as is necessary.

9. Adjourn 4:52

Respectfully Submitted,
P. Gregory Gibson
Faculty Senate Secretary

Addendum I

Proposed Constitutional Amendments Composed by the Procedures Committee in September, 2014

Issue #1

The current wording of the Faculty Senate Constitution does not technically grant representation to the School of Business faculty since they are no longer organized by department. The Procedures Committee reworded Article VI Section 4 to ensure all areas are represented.

Current:

Article VI. Membership Section 4

4. The Faculty Senate shall consist of: one member from each academic department, one from the library and eight members who will be elected at-large with equal representation according to the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. One half of the departmental representatives and one of the at-large members from each of the ranks shall be elected anew each year.

Proposed:

Article VI. Membership Section 4

4. The Faculty Senate shall consist of: one member from each academic department, **one from Aviation, one from the rest of the School of Business**, one from the library and eight members who will be elected at-large with equal representation according to the ranks of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor. One half of the departmental representatives and one of the at-large members from each of the ranks shall be elected anew each year.

Issue #2

The Secretary of the Faculty Senate is no longer part of the Procedures Committee, so the designation of the Secretary acting as the Chair of the Procedures Committee needs to change. The Procedures Committee believes that designating a Chair of this committee and creating a stable transition from one year to the next could help ensure the timely completion of all elections. Since both Webmaster-Elect and Webmaster are currently assigned to the Procedures Committee, the committee felt designating the Webmaster as the Chair would be the simplest way to ensure a smooth transition.

Current:

Article VII. Officers and Their Election Section 3

3. The President-Elect shall be chairman of the Executive Committee and the Secretary shall be chairman of the Procedures committee.

Proposed:

Article VII. Officers and Their Election Section 3

3. The President-Elect shall be **Chair** of the Executive Committee and the **Webmaster** shall be **Chair** of the Procedures Committee.

Issue #3

Membership of the Executive Committee has in practice been expanded to include the Webmaster and Webmaster-Elect; however, the Constitution needs to be updated in a couple of sections to reflect that change in practice. The Procedures Committee included both Webmaster and Webmaster-Elect in the Executive Committee in the proposed wording below. If that change passes, the quorum definition for the Executive Committee needs to be updated, since three members could be a quorum but not a majority of the committee.

Current:

Article VIII. Committees – Standing and Temporary Section 2

2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the President, and the President-Elect, the Secretary, the elected Representative to the Board of Trustees, and the Parliamentarian, if one has been appointed. The Executive Committee shall be charged with the formulation and review of agenda and the preparation and presentation of a report concerning the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate – with its recommendation – during the final meeting of the official year of the Faculty Senate.

Proposed:

Article VIII. Committees – Standing and Temporary Section 2

2. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate shall consist of the President, and the President-Elect, the Secretary, the elected Representative to the Board of Trustees, **the Webmaster, the Webmaster-Elect,** and the Parliamentarian, if one has been appointed. The Executive Committee shall be charged with the formulation and review of agenda and the preparation and presentation of a report concerning the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate – with its recommendation – during the final meeting of the official year of the Faculty Senate.

If the above proposed amendment passes, the following will need to be addressed:

Current:

Article X. Quorums

1. One half of the members of the Faculty Senate shall constitute a quorum of that body.
2. In meetings of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, three members shall constitute a quorum.
3. In meetings of the standing committees and special or appointed committee, half the members shall constitute a quorum provided not fewer than two members are present.
4. In meetings of the appointed committees, one half of the members shall constitute a quorum provided not fewer than two members are present.
5. Whenever the Faculty Senate declares itself the committee of the whole, a quorum shall consist of those present.

Proposed:

Article X. Quorums

1. One half of the members of the Faculty Senate shall constitute a quorum of that body.

~~2. In meetings of the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate, three members shall constitute a quorum.~~

2. In meetings of the standing committees and special or appointed committee, half the members shall constitute a quorum provided not fewer than two members are present.

3. In meetings of the appointed committees, one half of the members shall constitute a quorum provided not fewer than two members are present.

4. Whenever the Faculty Senate declares itself the committee of the whole, a quorum shall consist of those present.

Respectfully submitted,
The Faculty Senate Procedure Committee

Addendum II

Conducting Committee Meetings by Email

The 11th edition of *Robert's Rules of Order*, Newly Revised (2011) sets the minimum standard for an electronic meeting as an audio-conference; no provision is made for conducting meetings via email. *RONR* states that "committees that are expressly established by the bylaws can hold a valid electronic meeting only if authorized in the by-laws to do so" with "additional rules pertaining to their conduct." *Robert's* calls for rules relating to:

- provision of an adequate description of how to participate in an electronic meeting;
- methods of determining a quorum; and
- methods for taking and verifying votes.

This is a complex issue and should be referred to the Procedures Committee since it involves a change in the by-laws

While Senate committees should make every effort to meet in person or simultaneously via audio- or video-conferencing, those committees meeting via email should, at a minimum, follow the steps below:

1. The Committee Chair should notify all members of the issue being discussed.
2. For an e-mail message to be part of a meeting, it must be sent to all committee members via "Reply All." Other messages may be sent for caucusing or other off-line discussion, but these are not officially part of the meeting.
3. To conduct an e-mail vote, a ballot should be sent to the voting membership. It should state exactly what is to be voted on and contain a clearly designated place for the member to mark a vote. The subject line (or equivalent) should contain the term "ballot."

Minutes should include actions taken by the committee and should be emailed to the full committee.