

Faculty Senate minutes

April 5, 2017

3:15 pm, Cabe Room

Senators Present: David Bateman, Don Benton, Troy Bray, Carolyn Eoff, Brian George (for Natalie Scrimshire), TaLisha Givan, Megan Hickerson, Eric Jett (for Rochelle Moss), Wray Jones (for Lisa Massey), Lewis Kanyiba, Catherine Leach, Christy McDowell, Richard Miller, Holly Morado, Dever Norman, Janice O'Donnell, Malcolm Rigsby, Ingo Schranz, Laura Storm, Bill Sutley, Michael Taylor, Tammie Townsend, Mike Watters, Penny Whelchel (for Connie Phelps)

Senators Absent: Emilie Beltzer, Tommy Finley, Greg Gibson, Kasten Searles

Guests: Dr Clint Atchley, Dr Allison Vetter (Title IX Officer), ORACLE reporter.

1. Call to order by President Megan Hickerson at 3:18 p.m.

2. Approval of minutes - Minutes from the March 1, 2017 meeting were approved.

3. President's Report—President's Report can be found as **Addendum I**.

Regarding report of her meeting with Dr Adkison (Provost/VPAA):

- A. President Hickerson additionally reported that Dr Adkison has informed her that the summer school enrollment policy will be that of summer 2015, according which classes with any enrollment will be allowed to run.
- B. During discussion, Dr Adkison stated that he has a meeting set the two associate provosts regarding acceptance of credits from Straighterline.com. He was asked by a senator whether policy regarding credit acceptance should operate through UAC, as these credits are not mandated or universally accepted. Senators continued to express concern regarding these credits, and Dr Adkison promised to report back on the matter.

4. SGC Update: The president's report includes Dr Powell's responses to senate questions regarding the Salary Savings and Strategic Position Review Proposals. Revised proposals are **Addendums II and III**.

A. Strategic Position Review:

- President Hickerson reported that with regard to the VPs' role in Strategic Position Review, Dr Powell described to her a process by which principal discussion of positions in question is between the person submitting the position request and the relevant VP; committee of VPs operate to "keep each other accountable."
- Senator asked about the timeline envisioned between submission and decision; Dr Adkison stated 2-3 days.

B. Salary Savings:

- Senator pointed out that changed language in the Salary Savings proposal (Scenario 3) makes the altered sentence ungrammatical.

C. The Senate will vote on these proposals by email ballot.

5. Reports of committees

A. Executive Committee

- i. Some faculty have raised concerns about the stated policy of dropping students who have not completed Title IX training from classes in which they have enrolled.
 - Dr Adkison stated that this is a federal compliance issue; students must have the training and we are legally required to demonstrate compliance.
 - He stated that dropping students at this point is untenable, as currently 81% of our students have not begun the training (3, 126 students).
 - Senator pointed out potential effect of dropping students on performance funding.
 - Senators suggested possible means of drawing students into training: pop ups on My Henderson and registration; Heart Start; Henderson Seminar.
 - Title IX Officer is concerned with “catching up” on students beyond freshman year
 - Senator noted that preventing registration before training completion is a strategy used at other institutions
 - Senator pointed out that registration holds are used for other reasons and could be used for this.
 - Dr Adkison suggested potential policy similar to immunization requirement.
 - Senator suggested using student organizations to compel compliance, similar to with athletics.
 - Title IX Officer stated that coaches are required by the NCAA to compel and demonstrate compliance.

B. Academics Committee: Report is **Addendum IV**

i. Online Course Policy

- Senator asked about proctoring component: how and where is assessment proctored?

- Committee chair noted the request for a testing center to resolve that problem.
- Senator asked if using a testing center should be required in online courses for the purpose of ensuring a common standard of academic integrity.
- Dr Adkison suggested that such a proposal would go too far in compromising faculty autonomy.
- President referred to pilot of Examity and ProctorU proctoring agencies that she and Ms Massey conducted last year with cooperation of Department of Instructional Technology; result was recommendation of neither service and renewed request for a testing center. She also noted the growing online presence of sites dedicated to teaching students how to cheat such proctoring services; she stated that the library has space that could be used to the purpose.
- Senator, while not opposing proposal, requested deeper discussion moving forward.
- No action was taken at this time.

ii. Course Repetition

- Senator expressed concern that students could go to JUCO and take Liberal Arts Core courses if we limit their ability to repeat them at HSU.
- Senator stated that some students take courses multiple times for financial gain (grants, loans).
- Senator stated that we beg students to fail by our policy of academic forgiveness, hurting four-year graduation rates.
- Senator noted that limited retakes should help with retention and graduation rates.
- Much discussion followed.
- President encouraged highlighting academic forgiveness issue more clearly into policy proposal—related to but not the same as course repetition policy.
- Academics Committee will return to work on the proposal and Senate will revisit it.

C. Buildings and Grounds Committee

- Chair reported on correspondence with Dr Shepherd, Vice President of Student and External Affairs regarding parking concerns (handicapped parking and parking citations). Dr Shepherd's letter of March 20, 2017 was submitted to the Senate (**Addendum V**).

D. Finance Committee

Co-Chair reported that the committee is creating an informal survey to distribute to faculty for feedback regarding satisfaction with salary, benefits, and other matters. Committee is working with Human Resources director to establish and distribute survey with consent of the Faculty Senate.

E. Operations/ Handbook Committee

i. Faculty Handbook

- Promotion and Tenure process (**Addendum VI**).
 - Proposal passed.
- Distinguished Professor candidacy.
 - Proposal withdrawn for further consideration.

ii. Sabbatical Process (Timing of Approvals): Committee will propose language ensuring faculty's ability to delay taking up sabbaticals for a year, facilitating opportunities for grant applications.

iii. Anonymity in Online Class Evaluations (**Addendum VII**).

- Proposal Passed.

iv. Software Purchases

- Chair met with Director of Instructional Technology who suggested that special purchases (for Ellis College needs) should go through ECPAC.

v. Adjunct Pay/Overload Pay

- This has not been looked at since 2005.
- Committee will take up this issue.

F. Procedures Committee—No Report.

6. Unfinished Business—No Business

7. New Business

A. Straighterline.com: Concern that entire LAC is available at this website.

- Senator suggested that this is a cheap and easy way for students to avoid academic rigor.
- Senator would like to know how we came to accept these credits: whose decision was it and how was it made?
- Senator would like to see a report of usage: who is using this online service for achieving credit at this university?
- Senator asked if this was principally used by student athletes.

- Discussion ensued.
 - Dr Adkison stated that he will gather more information for the next meeting of the Faculty Senate.
- B. SGC Proposal: Budget Policy
- President will conduct an online vote on this proposal.
- C. Handbook: Faculty Excellence Awards
- i. Discussion of Process/ production of application packet as too burdensome.
 - ii. President passed chair to President-Elect: President requested that Operations/Handbook Committee consider changing award designation from “Liberal Arts” to “Social Sciences and Humanities.”
 - Senator noted that three award categories within Ellis College derive from history of the university and expressed concern that new designation will clash with other language in the Faculty Handbook.
 - Motion to change passed; Handbook Committee will submit language at next meeting.
 - iii. President asked if it is appropriate to maintain rule preventing any one faculty member from receiving more than one award.
 - Discussion did not support alteration. President withdrew motion.
- D. President moved to Table other New Business.
- Motion Seconded and Passed.

8. Senate adjourned, 5:24pm.

Addendum I: Report from the President to the Faculty Senate, 5 April 2017

Meeting with Dr Glen Jones, University President, March 30, 2017

Dr Jones opened with an update from the Arkansas State Legislative Session. on March 22nd, Governor Hutchinson signed HB1249 into law as Act 562, allowing conceal carry on public university, college, and community college campuses. Those who wish to carry on public campuses will be required to complete a training course (approved by the Director of the Department of Arkansas State Police) in addition to that required for regular carry, of up to eight hours (this training will not have to be renewed).

As of the morning of March 30th, the Arkansas House was preparing to vote on SB 724, which would both allow schools to continue to prohibit concealed weapons in college athletic venues and provide exemptions for the State Hospital, UAMS, and daycare facilities.

(Subsequent to our conversation, SB 724 has passed both House and Senate and is on its way to the governor's desk.)

Dr Jones also reported that the Arkansas legislature was considering a bill (SB140) to impose a tax on internet sellers (e.g., Amazon) in Arkansas. While some advocates intended to direct substantial amounts of collected revenues into improving Arkansas highways, there was also some hope that this would be capped in a manner allowing for remaining revenues to move into the state's general fund for, among other things, higher education. (However, since our conversation, on March 3rd the bill was defeated in the House.)

We completed our meeting and were then joined by Chanda Hooten (President of the Staff Senate) and Jennifer Boyett (VP for Institutional Advancement) to discuss "Conversation Café (subtitle to be determined)," a campus dialogue series on topics of current interest to be co-sponsored by the President's Office, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Senate, and the Office of Institutional Advancement. With a first session in late April, each dialogue event (as presently conceived) will open with a "learning session" featuring a speaker or video, and then become a venue for discussion by all attending, with groups of people at separate tables (with designated "hosts") engaging in free and respectful discussion of the issue; those attending will then be asked if they wish to share any outcomes of their discussions, but this will in no way be required. We are considering beginning (at our first event) with the topic of "Fake News" (and how to spot it), which open with an informative video presentation (likely a combination from 60 Minutes and a TED Talk). We are tentatively planning on repeating this session during Freshman Welcome Week in order to provide a good segue into the Fall series (hopefully we will offer one each month).

Meeting with Dr Steve Adkison, Vice President for Academic Affairs/Provost, March 31, 2017

Dr Adkison reported that he would have the policy on low enrollments to the Senate in time for the meeting of April 5, 2017.

He also reported that the policy regarding early college credits (for high school students) is still under revision.

In response to direction by the Executive Committee, I asked Dr Adkison about our acceptance of credits from Straighterline (.com, an online course website). He looked at our website regarding credit transfer, and noted that Straighterline is identified as part of the ACE (American Council on Education) network. He was unsure as to the implications of this regarding either the university's need to accept credits from Straighterline or the desirability of doing so, and will further investigate.

During the meeting, I told Dr Adkison about concerns I have regarding a transfer student in one of my classes, which has led me to wonder about admission standards for such students; the student transferred from a community college, but is still classified as a freshman, and has ACT scores of 10 and 11, including a 10 in reading. In discussion, Dr Adkison and I considered that transfer policy (regarding students who have not achieved Associates Degrees) could be a matter for Senate deliberation. In light of this, Dr Adkison and I also talked about approaches to the problem of plagiarism among our students, and wondered at the possibility of integrating a mandatory workshop into Welcome Week for HSU's freshman classes. This could also be a matter for Senate deliberation, perhaps involving consultation with the university Writing Center.

Meeting with Dr Brett Powell, Vice President for Finance and Administration, March 31, 2017

Dr Powell reported that all divisions have returned their questionnaires/assessment documents towards the non-Instructional Reprioritization Review Process. The non-Instructional Reprioritization workgroup will complete review of these documents by April 17th, at which point they will be sent back to the divisions. Communication of the next steps in the process will come after these steps are complete.

Dr Powell and I talked about discussion that took place during the Budget and Planning meeting of March 29, 2017, at which Dr Powell reported that present plans for increased spending during the 2017-18 year—including towards both the Compensation Plan and the increased cost of Health Insurance premiums—require more funds than will be available with expected (flat) enrollment. Dr Powell, reiterating the approach to this problem considered at the Budget and Planning meeting, informed me that the university's different divisions are now examining their spending to find potential savings; this will be followed up at the next meeting of the committee, April 19, 2017. He said that we should expect that the Compensation Plan step planned for 2017-18—as previously communicated to the Faculty Senate—will be completed.

SGC Proposal: Strategic Position Review

Faculty Senate Questions: *Senators would like to see more explanation of this policy, its purpose and its proposed duration. How does this policy as proposed fit into the timeline for the reprioritization process?; is it a “stop gap” measure? In addition, senators would like to see an explanation of the composition of the strategic review committee (as such). Why are these particular people in position to make decisions regarding all staffing positions at the university? If there is going to be such a group, must it be comprised solely of (and of ALL) university vice presidents? What is the rationale for that particular (and dramatically top-down) approach?*

Dr Powell responded: Budget prioritization is an on-going process to ensure that we are always making strategic resource allocation decisions. Because strategic priorities will change periodically, it will be important to continue the process of reviewing where resources are investing. The position review is part of that process.

Rather than top-down, this is very much a bottom-up approach. The review process begins with the unit in which there is a staff vacancy. The SPR questionnaire encourages the unit/department head to critically review the vacancy to determine whether the position is the most effective use of resources given current university priorities. Once completed, the questionnaire and position request are forwarded to HR for review, then to the vice president responsible for the unit/department. After that VP has reviewed and is satisfied that the position requested is appropriate, the remaining 3 VPs are asked to review it. This last step is a form of accountability. It gives us the opportunity to ask each other if we are thinking critically about where to invest resources. So, the process begins with the hiring department and works its way up.

SGC Proposal: Salary Savings

Faculty Senate Question: *First, senators would like the opportunity to put the policy to the Senate Finance Committee for study regarding the numbers/percentages indicated in the policy. Importantly, with such study a given, senators also advocate revision of the second sentence in Scenario Three: “In these cases, when approved by the chairs of the affected departments and the deans of the affected college or colleges, the position and salary may be re-allocated to another department or program at the same salary level or at a reduced level.”*

Dr Powell responded: This was addressed in the revised language sent back to Lea Ann last week (Senators: this revision is Document 2b). **Has the study been completed?** (my highlight: I will revisit this with Dr Powell after the April meeting of the Faculty Senate.)

Faculty Senate Question: *In addition, senators would like clarification of the language in Scenario Four (case and outcomes): while based on savings from Strategic Position Review, outcomes indicate re-allocation to “remaining” faculty or staff positions, etc., based on a budget*

proposal. Senators would like confirmation that this does not affect the limited scope (to staff positions) of Strategic Position Review.

Dr Powell responded: This policy does not change the Strategic Position Review policy, which explicitly states that it applies only to staff positions. The statement clarifies that if a department or unit determines that it can eliminate a vacant position, it can use the savings in a number of ways, including salary increases for the faculty and staff in that department. "Remaining" simply refers to the faculty and staff in the department.

Addendum II: SGC Proposal, Strategic Position Review (revised)



Strategic Position Review

Subject to Review and Approval

In connection with the Budget Prioritization process, all decisions to fill vacant staff positions must be strategically examined. The Strategic Position Review policy is required for determining whether to release vacant positions at all levels. Through this process, all vacant staff positions will be reviewed for centrality to university mission and relationship to strategic priorities.

The following are the steps in the process:

1. Respond to all questions on the attached questionnaire.
2. Attach a current position description for the proposed position.
3. Forward the questionnaire and position description to HR for review of position classification and pay level.
4. HR will forward the questionnaire and position description for strategic review by the Provost, Vice President for Finance & Administration, Vice President for Student & External Affairs and Vice President for University Advancement. A consensus is required for approval. *The Vice President over the requesting department or unit will have reviewed the request for strategic importance before discussing with the remaining Vice Presidents.*
5. Positions recommended to be filled will be forwarded to the President for final approval
6. HR will officially notify the requestor when the position has been approved or disapproved.

**Strategic Position Review Questionnaire
For Staff Positions**

1.	What duties and responsibilities of the position must be performed in order for the department and/or division to operate?
2.	Why can't the duties and responsibilities of the position be absorbed into an existing position?
3.	Provide justification for why the position cannot be eliminated.
4.	List any positions on campus that perform similar duties.
5.	Has the position been revised to include new or different duties? Is a reclassification (upward or downward) warranted? If so, explain.
6.	Has the position description been revised to include new duties and responsibilities? Describe those duties.
7.	What strategic priorities can be met by filling this position?
8.	Explain why the position is relevant to the department and the University at this time.
9.	What salary is budgeted for this position? What is the funding source?

Director/Dean: _____ Date: _____

Vice President: _____ Date: _____

A copy of the position description must be attached to the Questionnaire

Strategic Position Review

Approval Form

Position Title: _____

Position Verification		
Budgeted Salary	Budgeted Benefits Cost	Total Compensation (Salary + Benefits)
Proposed Compensation Savings		Proposed Compensation Cost

Proposed use of compensation savings or proposed funding of compensation cost:

Additional comments:

Position Number	Date Vacated	Last Incumbent

Comments:

Director of Human Resources

Date

_____ Approved to Fill	_____ Not Approved to Fill
-------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Vice President

Date

Addendum III: SGC Proposal, Salary Savings (revised)



Salary Savings Policy

Subject to Review and Approval

This policy statement clarifies the sources and acceptable uses of savings from a budgeted faculty or staff position. Salary savings are generated through one of four potential sources.

Scenario One

Course/time release is sometimes provided through external grant funding. When an external grant includes funding for a portion of a faculty or staff member's salary, the operating budget, or original salary funding source, is relieved of those costs.

Scenario Two

Unfilled vacancies which occur during the fiscal year. In some instances, though a position is funded in the operating budget, the university is unsuccessful in filling the position or the position is vacated during the year without being filled. In these instances, salary expenditures will be less than budgeted.

Scenario Three

Position re-allocation decisions, *which occur through approved university processes and* which reduce the number of positions in a department or program, thus reducing the salary budget in that department or program accordingly. In these cases, the position and salary may be re-allocated to another department or program at the same salary level or at a reduced level.

Scenario Four

A department or program may, through the strategic position review process (separate policy document), determine that efficiencies can be gained by eliminating a position. Such cases typically occur following the retirement or resignation of an incumbent staff member during the fiscal year.

In each of the four scenarios described above, operating savings are generated either for the current fiscal year only or for an extended period. The nature of the savings will determine the allocation and use of generated salary savings, thus the policy will vary based on the nature and duration of the savings.

Scenario One

Salary savings generally extend the period of the external grant, then budget salaries return to pre-grant levels.

- In these instances, salary savings for each fiscal year of the external grant will be allocated 25% to the originating department or program and 75% to the central budget.

Scenario Two

Salary savings only occur during the vacancy period, then budget salaries return to pre-vacancy levels.

- In these instances, salary savings for the period during which the budgeted position is vacant will be allocated 25% to the originating department or program and 75% to the central budget.

Scenario Three

Salary savings are generated in one department or program and are transferred to a second department or program.

- In these instances, no allocation of salary savings can occur.

Scenario Four

When positions are eliminated, salary savings extend indefinitely.

- In these instances, a budget proposal will be requested from the department to re-allocate up to 50% of the salary savings to salary increases of remaining faculty or staff or to operating budgets. The remaining, unused salary savings are returned to the central budget. *(Salary increases for classified staff are subject to OPM compensation guidelines)*

Addendum IV: Academics Committee Report

Online Course Policy—Constituents and Administration expressed the need for an online course policy for designing and monitoring online courses.

In the request from Faculty Senate to examine a policy for online courses, the Academics Committee endorses the need for a uniform policy. The AC support uniformly using the current rubric (Chico) that is provided. However, the AC recognizes that further support is needed from administration, such as instructional designers, support and testing center.

Policy that limits the number of times a student may retake a course—The AC discussed the following:

In the request from Faculty Senate to examine a policy for designating a limit for the number of times a student can retake a course, the Academics Committee recommends that students be allowed to take a course a maximum of three times. If, after the third attempt, a student wishes to retake a course, the students must submit an appeal before the college of their major, including the College Dean, Department Chair, and an organized committee (for example, the TEC), unless a program has a specified policy in place.

Adding +/- to the current grading scheme

The committee reviewed this and saw no need to change the grading scheme at this time.

Addendum V: Buildings and Grounds, Letter from VP Student and External Affairs

March 20, 2017

Dr. Dever Norman, Chair
Faculty Senate Buildings and Grounds Committee
Henderson State University
Arkadelphia, AR 19999-0001

Dear Dr. Norman and Committee,

Thank you for your recent communication regarding accessibility for drivers with disabilities. After your letter I began to look at parking as a whole in regards to the accessible spaces allotted for drivers and passengers with disabilities.

Currently there are 99 parking spaces reserved for individuals who need to be near any facility which they are visiting. Based on the recommendations of the ADA, there should be 1 reserved parking space (disability accessible) for every 1-25 spaces in a designated area. Based upon this recommendation, we have adequate reserved parking spaces, but they may not all be in the right areas.

The University Police Department has written approximately 50 citations for parking in a reserved spot without the proper permit so far this semester. I have asked Chief Johnny Campbell if he will instruct our officers to increase their patrol to deter violators.

Also, we have several ground posts with the reserved designation on them that are missing. They have been ordered and this will be corrected as soon as the signage arrives. Len Nicosia, campus facilities manager, and I talked about the parking issue and he wants to revisit the design for the entire campus this summer.

While you did not specifically ask for all of the information in this response, I felt that providing it will give some context to the situation and provide information on the long range plans for addressing the issue. If you need additional information, have comments, or suggestions, please feel free to let me know. Again, thanks for bringing this to my attention.

Thanks,

Lewis

Addendum VI: Operations/Handbook Committee Proposal, Tenure and Promotion

Handbook and Operations Committee Senate Proposal 1, April 5, 2017

From the March 2017 Senate Minutes:

Promotion and Tenure – Constituents expressed concern for the clarification of the procedure for informing tenured faculty members of their responsibility to write letters for promotion and tenure applicants. The Committee will update and clarify language to be included in the Faculty Handbook and report back to the Senate at the next meeting.

This is the **current language** [boldface added for emphasis] in promotion and tenure sections:

III.L.3. Procedures for Tenure and Promotion

(Third paragraph). **The tenured members of the department shall review each application for tenure/promotion. The tenured members, who may submit individual recommendations or a group recommendation, shall forward their recommendation(s) to the school/college tenure/promotion committee.** The school/college tenure/promotion committee shall consider the tenured faculty recommendation(s). **Only tenured faculty shall make a recommendation. In the event there are no tenured faculty within the department of the candidate for tenure or promotion, the Tenure and Promotions Committee of that department's college or school shall appoint a tenured faculty member from another college or school within the university to interview the candidate's departmental faculty and, based upon those interviews, to write a letter of recommendation reflecting the view of the departmental faculty regarding the candidate's qualifications and worthiness for the award of tenure or promotion which shall be forwarded to the school/college tenure and promotion committee.**

III.G. Award of Tenure

Tenure is granted by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the President. No other person shall have any authority to make any representation concerning tenure appointment. Recommendations for tenure of eligible faculty should originate from the department in which the faculty member is assigned, and **should always include appropriate participation in the recommendation by tenured faculty in the department.** As tenure is reserved for those faculty members who have attained a high level of achievement in their academic disciplines, recommendations for tenure will not normally be made for faculty who have not earned the doctorate or other appropriate terminal degree. Applicants for tenure will be notified of approval or disapproval within one week of the Board's decision.

Discussion and proposal: While existing language makes it clear that candidates for tenure and promotion should be considered by every tenured faculty member of the department, the committee suggests the addition of one new line (highlighted in yellow) in the section on chairperson duties to help insure compliance with existing policy:

III.L.3 (Second Paragraph).

The department chairperson shall receive each application for tenure/promotion. Upon receipt, the department chairperson shall inform each tenured member of the department of the application and make it available for review by tenured faculty. Following an independent review of each application, the chairperson shall make a positive or negative recommendation in writing with explicit reasons stated especially for negative recommendation.

Addendum VII: Anonymity in Online Evaluations

Handbook and Operations Committee Senate Proposal 3, April 5, 2017

From the March 2017 Senate Minutes:

Online Course Evaluation Anonymity- The committee is continuing to work on the suggestions of addressing online course evaluation anonymity for courses with fewer than five students in the current evaluation process.

In the long term, the committee would like to solicit ideas for restructuring the evaluation process, including allowing faculty the option of returning to paper evaluations. In the short term, to address the specific issue of anonymity in online evaluations, the committee proposes this resolution:

The Faculty Senate resolves that no electronic evaluations be solicited or collected from classes with fewer than five enrolled students unless specifically requested by the faculty member. Faculty who prefer to receive evaluations in low enrollment classes for planning purposes should advise students that their participation may not be anonymous.