

Faculty Senate Agenda  
Wed., December 7, 3:15p.m., via Zoom

Senators Present: Shannon Wittig, Janna Lock, Catherine Leach, James Martin, Maryjane Dunn, Don Kelly, Chris Todd, Dever Norman, Edward Akoto, Carrie Flora, Shari Valentine, Steve Adkison, Amanda Jones, and Ruth Eyres

Alternate attending as senator for absent senators place: Linda Evans, Christy McDowell (serving in the place of Beth Wyatt)

Senators Absent:

Guests: Trudi Sabaj, Travis Langley, Kristina Shelton, and Beth Maxfield

1. Call to Order
  - a. Dr. Norman called the meeting to order at 3:19 pm
2. Approval of minutes: November minutes
  - a. Moved/seconded and approved the November minutes
3. President's Report
  - a. See Addendum 1 (all in addendum)
4. Report of committees
  - a. Executive Committee
    - i. Met and built the agenda
  - b. Special Committee
    - i. See Addendum 2
      1. In response to Special Committee report, a member from Arts & Humanities (outside of HESS) mentioned that limiting a learning community to 50% of total Faculty Senate membership maybe challenging – and may not be warranted (or needed)
      2. Faculty are invited and encouraged to provide feedback on this report to the Special Committee before January 19<sup>th</sup>, as they will be crafting final proposals for petitioning amendments to the Senate Constitution
  - c. Academic Committee
    - i. No report
  - d. Finance Committee
    - i. No report
  - e. Operations and Handbook Committee
    - i. See Addendum 3

1. Academic Directors (Current Structure) are equivalent to previous Department Chairs, but recommendation is that amendments not allow Academic Directors to serve on Faculty Senate
  2. Coordinators are below the level of Department Chair
  3. Recommendations are ultimately folded into amendments constructed by Special Committee, so suggestions or dissenting opinions should be provided to Special Committee along with 4 b) i) 2
- f. Procedures Committee
  - i. No report
    1. Meeting in Spring
- g. Representative to the Board of Trustees
  - i. No report
    1. Next Board meeting is Friday, December 9
5. Unfinished Business
  - a. None
6. New business
  - a. First meeting of the Spring semester will be Feb 1
  - b. Motion/Pass to allow Faculty Senate to be held for the remainder of the academic year via zoom (22-23).
7. Adjournment
  - a. Motion and seconded to adjourned. Meeting adjourned at 4:55 PM.

---

## Questions from faculty to the Chancellor

### **Questions about University operation and overall budget:**

- 1. When will our hsu.edu website accurately reflect the new structure of the university? Currently it has a significant amount of old information about programs and committee structures.**

Connie Testa has updated and emailed the organizational chart for the university. The revised org chart will then be posted on the hsu.edu website.

Learning community information has been added to the academic section of the website and will continue to be expanded. We are currently working on marketing videos and content to create landing pages for future degree programs.

Because we still have students in teach-out areas, information about Ellis College, School of Business, and Teachers College will be retained online as an archive for the next year. Registrar information about degree programs will continue to be available online throughout the teach-out process.

- 2. To what extent was a consulting firm used to help with banner and class scheduling, and what was their fee?**

The Huron Consulting Firm was instrumental in developing the academic portfolio used in the exigency process. The total cost of Huron work was \$406,000 which was paid by the ASU System, utilizing \$350,000 allocated to the System by the Governor.

The Ferrilli Consulting Firm is helping in the Banner Implementation process across six campuses in ASU System. Class schedules and other academic campus-specific functions and decisions come from the Academic Leadership Team (program directors and the Dean of the Faculty). As of today, approximately \$3.2K has been paid to the Ferrilli Consulting Firm.

- 3. How much does HSU owe of the \$6M loaned by the state of Arkansas?**

In 2021, HSU paid \$250,000 on the \$6M advance.

- 4. Of the money saved from the loss of salaries in program eliminations, approximately what fraction of that will be countered by the need for new hires to cover courses for gen-ed?**

The total impact of the \$12M of annualized reductions resulting from furloughs, resignations, and position eliminations went directly towards eliminating existing cash deficits or level setting the amount of institutional spending with existing revenues. All additions to our current level of spending are balanced against the amount of savings produced and current revenues generated. The Program

Directors have the ability to allocate instruction in consultation with financial services to meet the criteria set through the development of the Academic Portfolio.

**5. In the interest of student success, is it possible to extend the library hours so they will have more access to study spaces, materials, and computers? Is it possible to use the HSU/OBU cooperative agreement to extend them?**

Library hours were adjusted to align with staffing capacity. Student usage patterns were taken into consideration before determining current opening and closing times. Students are welcome to email [refdesk@hsu.edu](mailto:refdesk@hsu.edu) or stop by the library to offer suggestions for consideration.

**Questions about faculty careers:**

**6. To whom should faculty submit their applications for Tenure and Promotion? The framework for the prior review procedure doesn't exist.**

Faculty members in terminal contracts are eligible to apply for promotion; however, the nature of promotion will not change the terminal nature of that faculty member's existing employment.

The Tenure and Promotion application process is outlined in the Faculty Handbook; however, until an updated handbook has been approved, we are planning to publish a temporary campus operating procedure that provides a pathway to the following: The applicant will prepare the application, ensuring that all relevant materials are included, and submit to the Academic Program Director (which for all intents and purposes serves as the Departmental Level outlined in the handbook). From there, after the Director completes a thorough evaluation of the documentation, a positive or negative recommendation in writing with explicit reasons for recommendation will be submitted to the Tenure/Promotion committee in each learning community. The committee will then make its recommendation to the Dean of the Faculty who will submit the recommendation on to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs.

**7. Regarding the administration's desire to at some point repair and improve the wage and benefit structure for faculty, in what order does the administration plan to repair/improve the following items?**

- Restoration of promotion raise
- Restoration from 3% pay cut enacted in 2019
- Restoration from 4% benefits cut (retirement contribution, also 2019)
- Restoration from overload pay reduction from \$2500 to \$1850
- Restoration from summer school pay reduction down to 5%
- Cost of living/inflation adjustment to wages

The FY 2022-23 fiscal year [or Year Zero] is meant to restore fiscal Integrity and to operate to the modified cash budget. This ensures that the University meets its financial obligations through this current fiscal year. The second priority will focus on adjustment to our wage and benefit structure to offset the costs of inflation and increase the living wage for our lowest salaried individuals. Following these two priorities - all other repairs and improvements to our wage and benefit structure will be determined by our collective ability to improve our institutional net revenue, increase the number of students who are enrolled [at a responsible level of institutional aid], and most importantly, how we can work to increase the persistence and completion rates of our students.

**8. Are all faculty who are teaching overloads receiving overload compensation?**

The faculty handbook allows overload pay for those teaching overloads. It is believed that all faculty members who are teaching overloads are receiving overload payment. If a faculty member believes they meet the criteria for receiving an overload, but one was not granted, they should speak to their director and/or the Dean of the Faculty.

**9. What are the criteria for determining which faculty will receive overload pay?**

According to the Handbook,

"The workload of each faculty member, as to nature and distribution, is arrived at in consultation with the department chairperson, the Dean, and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. A normal teaching load is considered to be 12 hours (or 12-15 hours for non-tenure track instructor) of undergraduate teaching or equivalent service. Adjustments may be allowed on several bases including, but not limited to, class size, class preparation, honors courses, research, teaching of

graduate classes, University assignments, etc. and must be consistent throughout the University."

Institutional funds allocated for overload payments remained consistent with payments of \$1600 and \$1850 per 3-hour course. However, some teach-out areas and other disciplines (i.e., Business, Innovation and Entrepreneurship) subsidized overload payments through endowments from the foundation. Any other inconsistencies in how payments were received should be addressed with the Dean of Faculty and Human Resources.

**10. Are the criteria from question (9) applied equivalently to all learning communities?**

See response to question 9

**11. Will the criteria from question (9) continue to be used moving forward?**

The same process for determining overloads for the fall will be used for the remainder of the academic year.

**12. Has the ASU Legal Department made any statements about whether overload should be paid to HSU faculty, or to the system faculty as a whole?**

Yes. The ASU legal department has consulted campus administration on a number of issues including overload pay. ASU legal has not made any pronouncements applied to the system faculty as a whole.

## Addendum 2: Operations Committee

### Faculty Senate Operations Committee

#### Minutes

Monday 10/31/2022

10:00 am

**Committee Members:** Chair, Don Kelly, Marck Beggs, Marty Campbell, Ruth Eyres, Darrell Farmer, Martin James, Amanda Jones, Scott McKinnon, Richard Miller, Mark Mosser, Christopher Todd, David Warren, Patrick Wempe, Beth Wyatt.

#### **1. Call to Order:**

Members present, Chair, Don Kelly, Marck Beggs, Ruth Eyres, Martin James, Amanda Jones, Scott McKinnon, Mark Mosser, Christopher Todd, David Warren, Patrick Wempe.

#### **2. Approval of minutes:**

No prior meeting minutes as this was the first meeting.

#### **3. Unfinished Business:**

Confirm Committee Chair: Dr. Don R. Kelly was confirmed the committee chair by unanimous vote.

#### **4. New Business**

Define definitions of terms for membership, titles, and responsibilities.

All members indicated they would conduct additional more research in preparation for the next meeting in two weeks.

#### **5. Adjournment**

## Addendum 3: Special Committee

10/24/2022	Working Group: Dr. E. Akoto, Dr. D. Kelly, Dr. S. Wittig, Dr. T. Sabaj; all present	
Item	Discussion	Deliverables/Next Steps
<b>Urgency</b>	The process of revising the faculty senate constitution and bylaws cannot begin until a direction has been established for how senate will operate.	Urgency noted; group to meet again in 4 days on 10/28/22
<b>Decide who will chair committee</b>	Dr. Trudi Sabaj has volunteered to serve as Chair and Members have approved	Chair has been identified
<b>Establish communication mechanisms this Special Committee shall have with key stakeholders</b>	Faculty Senate President, Dr. Dever Norman, has communicated that this committee may contact Dr. Talisha Givan Chief Learning Officer, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, directly for any questions.  Dr. Norman will make himself available to assist in any way he can.	Communication process with Faculty Senate and with Academic Administration identified
<b>Ability to quickly access Faculty Senate documents that may be needed to answer questions and inform recommendations</b>	Dr. Wittig has access to the versions of these documents that contain notes and questions which executive committee has raised to pinpoint some obvious issues.	Dr. Wittig will access and distribute documents as needed.
<b>Establish a mechanism to express ideas, answer questions, archive process</b>	Dr. Wittig created a folder in Google Drive so that we can easily share information with each other. She has granted everyone editor status to add, change, or edit any document in the folder.	First document in the folder is entitled "Questions to be asked"--If you think of any please place them there.
<p>Resources: Existing Structure</p> <p>Resources: Re-envisioned structures and models</p>	<p>Constitution of Henderson State University Faculty Senate</p> <p>? Have other schools implemented innovative shared governance structures that we might want to consider?</p> <p>? Is there any precedent established or revised structures from other ASU colleges?</p> <p>Current structure consists of an Executive Committee and 4 standing committees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exec</li> <li>• Procedures</li> <li>• Academics</li> <li>• Finance</li> </ul> <p>Discussion of past efficacy of committee structure</p>	<p>Share any findings in shared folder</p> <p>Does our charge involve recommendations for re-envisioning the entire structure, committees and representation, or would that fall under a Constitution-updating group and we need to focus on simple structure for representation for January?</p>
<p><b>Identify possible structures and move toward recommendation(s)</b></p> <p><b>Recommended first goal per current Faculty Senate President:</b></p>	<p>There have been many suggestions, including ideas such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a senate of the whole</li> <li>• adjusted representation of learning communities and ranks</li> <li>• merging faculty senate with staff senate.</li> </ul> <p>How many members? How will representation occur?</p>	<p>Complete restructuring and re-inventing may be beyond the scope of this group.</p> <p>Dr. Kelly has a draft for how adjusting current structure</p>



<p>Determine how many members should be in/on The Faculty Senate/or the body to be named, and whom they shall represent</p>	<p>Dr. Dever Norman, Faculty Senate President, has indicated we are projected to have 62 full-time faculty members next fall. Prior Fac census was around 172.</p> <p>Determining how many members will provide a vote-worthy beginning which may possibly be carried into next year <b>so that we can begin on the details of how to make it happen.</b></p>	<p>could work to move the process along, get elections done and have that group oversee the redesign. We will also clarify expectations of the Special Committee in terms of deliverables.</p>
<p><b>Purpose and Goal(s) of this working group:</b></p> <p>“special committee for determining how faculty senate will comprise its members in the future”</p> <p>The overall goal itself will be large and multi-step, so executive committee believes it's probably prudent to</p> <p><b>strategically alter the current structure until</b></p> <p><b><i>it fits the needs which your committee determines senate to have now.</i></b></p>	<p>This will be the first step to envisioning how faculty will exist in this new structure</p> <p>This is an opportunity to instill improved shared governance and communication; be <b>creative and open-minded about how to find a suitable design.</b></p> <p>Similar issues being faced at universities throughout the USA.</p> <p>Dr. Sabaj noted that a brief search of the current literature suggests HSU is not alone in the re-envisioning process.</p> <p>Suggested a review of purpose(s) of faculty shared governances and what kind of structures best support those purposes. Noted key points (forbes.com)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Faculty are) “incredible intellectual assets of a university in visioning as well as strategic decision making”</li> <li>• Current financial challenges in keeping higher education alive suggests “the perfect time for a reaffirmation of shared governance, a reactivation of this unique and powerful model for accessing intellectual resources, and a reframing of shared commitments to institutional progress and sustainability.”</li> </ul> <p>“Faculty shared governance was originally intended to vest in the faculty oversight and responsibility for all academic matters, making clear that administrations, government, or even the Church could not unreasonably interfere with or otherwise influence academic matters such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curricula</li> <li>• Degree programs</li> <li>• Instructional policies</li> <li>• Academic calendar</li> <li>• Conferring of degrees</li> <li>• Decision-making role in faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure”</li> </ul> <p>What structure would best serve those intentions? Has the prior structure been effective in strategic decision-making and leveraging intellectual assets for shared decision-making? If yes, will it continue to work given new Learning Communities structure?</p> <p>If not, in what ways might the structure better facilitate faculty shared governance and the leveraging of intellectual assets for shared decision-making that will lead the university to a new place of intellectual rigor, accessible and learner-centered education, and financial sustainability?</p>	<p>Working group of four faculty members has been identified</p> <p><a href="#">Shared Governance At America's Universities: Reaffirming Higher Education's Cornerstone In The Post-Pandemic Era (forbes.com)</a></p> <p>Are these the kinds of committees that are needed?</p> <p>Continue discussion of options at next meeting</p> <p>Consult Dr. Norman and Dr. Givan for clarity</p>

	<p>Discussion that the <i>purpose(s)</i> of the Faculty Shared Governance body should dictate <b><i>the structure necessary to fulfill the purpose(s)</i></b></p> <p>We have a range of options to consider, from “blowing it up” and innovating a completely new approach, to keeping the structure basically the same with adaptations to match the flattened academic reporting and community structures, to anything in between</p>	

10/28/2022	Working Group: Dr. E. Akoto, Dr. D. Kelly, Dr. S. Wittig, Dr. T. Sabaj; all present	
Item	Discussion	Deliverables/Next Steps
<b>Old Business</b>		
<p><b>Purpose and Goal(s) of this working group:</b></p> <p>“special committee for determining how faculty senate will comprise its members in the future”</p> <p>The overall goal itself will be large and multi-step, so executive committee believes it's probably prudent to strategically alter the current structure until it fits the needs which your committee determines senate to have now.</p>	<p>Continued discussions on types of re-visioning including logistical challenges with various options</p> <p>Dr. Travis Langley has volunteered to join this committee and all approved</p>	<p>Everyone bring a model to next meeting for discussion</p> <p>Practical “get ‘er done” models as well as futuristic models are welcome</p> <p>Next meeting Friday 11/11/22 at 1 pm via Zoom</p>