Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, March 4
President’s Room, Lumpkin Center, 2nd Floor
3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Members Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLS (9)</th>
<th>COA (5)</th>
<th>COBCS (4)</th>
<th>COEHP (5)</th>
<th>Library (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Abegaz (20)</td>
<td>Joseph Girard (21)</td>
<td>Phillip Bryant (21)</td>
<td>Sherika Derico (19)</td>
<td>Paul Luft (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajeev Dabke (19)</td>
<td>Natalie Higgins (20)</td>
<td>Rania Hodhod (21)</td>
<td>Vanessa Hicks (21)</td>
<td>Alternate Senator: Allison Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Lynch (21)</td>
<td>Chris McCollough (19)</td>
<td>Tesa Leonce (19)</td>
<td>Saoussan Maarouf (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Riser (19)</td>
<td>Stephanie Patterson (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heather McKeen (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternate Senator:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternate Senator:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugen Ionascu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alicia Bryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ex Officio Members Present: Dr. Bordelon
Members Absent with notice: Dr. Markwood; Jennifer Newbrey (20); Rosa Williams (20); Alternate Senator: Nicholas McMillan; Andrew Puckett (19); David Owings (21)
Members Absent without notice: Richard Stephens (21); Alternate Senator: Lydia Ray

I. Call to order 3pm

II. President’s comments and announcements - Chris Markwood absent

III. Provost’s comments and announcements – Deborah Bordelon 00:03:23: COA dean search; interviewing; will review search committee material. AVP faculty affairs and innovation, open and faculty forums still occurring. CIEO failed search; review position description and see if revision needed. Sallie McMullin introduction; greeting; invited questions. Update about request to engage in outside activity form; working on revisions of the form;

IV. Executive Officer’s comments and announcements – Chris McCollough 00:11:40

A. Committee Bylaws - Update and What Lies Ahead: spending month of March to review bylaws; dividing up the review labor.

B. Keep an eye out for April Location: planning on RiverPark, Dillingham or Frank Brown

C. Names and affiliation please - Adapting to Skype: Identify yourself for the benefit of the records and for the viewers in Zoom.

D. Presenters, come on up. Come up when you give your presentation or report.
E. RE: Distance Engagement From Senators: Senators need to be physically present at meetings until we get policy and procedure.

V. Approval of Faculty Senate February Meeting Minutes - Eliot Rendleman Ryan and Tesa motion 1 and motion 2; vote 19-0-2

VI. Staff Council Report – Lashica Thomas: 00:19:30: Sent dean’s request for staff nominations for council; developing staff development; reminder about USG initiative about well being; nutrition month;

VII. Student Government Association Report – Winston Black (Christopher Oswald, VP): working on constitutional amendments for student government; educator of the year nominations; how can we help downtown; working on tornado relief; missing senators for college of the arts and grad school; election apps for student government close today, March 4.

VIII. Standing Committee Reports*: 00:23:00
   A. National Scholarship - Sarah Bowman & Ben Blair: written report that may not have been distributed
   B. Admissions Policy - Laurence Marsh: nothing to report
   C. Readmissions Appeal - Steve Graver - Written
   D. Information Technology Advisory - Ryan Todt
   E. Honors Education - Andrea Frazier/Natalia Temesgen: investigated through interviews of 15 students and found underrepresentation in the honors college; cost is a problem; concern the members are too homogenous; Ogburn asked about how many students were interviewed; Ryan Lynch asked about interviews of those in the program; Ogburn asked about student perceptions of the amount of work;

IX. Action Item(s) for the Senate: 00:30:00
   A. Teaching Evaluation Update - Dr. Megan Hallisey, COEHP:
      1. The committee likes the idea of developing a video (or powerpoint) to educate students about the importance of student evaluations; the evaluation instrument has been reviewed; Ellen Roberts brought forward the problems of not allowing a separate evaluation instrument for online learning; Ellen Martin brings up objections to the Not Applicable answer option; Ryan Lynch takes issue with #8 about advocating respect; Hallisey reminds everyone about how the document has been reviewed,
and this is the document the committee puts forth; Stephanie Patterson asked if there is a student rep to give feedback; Hallisey shared how student feedback was and was not incorporated; Rajeev Dabke asked about open ended questions; Phil Bryant, asked why we are changing the old evaluation; Lynch, celebrated what he and his constituents support, esp. Open ended questions, asked how long they've worked on this; Ellen Martin clarified it is the scale to which she objects; Diana Riser shares a comment from Tim Howard who is joining remoted—wants to emphasize how the instrument can get information from students to improve courses; Hallisey reminded senators that faculty can create their own addition questions; Vanessa Hicks, asked how concerns were brought to the committee; Hallisey reports from faculty or students; Rania Hodhod, how is mean score value calculated with using Not Applicable; Hallisey explains Not Applicable simply does not count in calculations; Alicia Bryan, question for point of clarification: what role or part are we playing in the procedure for approval or endorsement; is the provost's office allowed to make changes or do they have to bring it back to senate; Lynch, asked provost to comment on this discussion and procedure; Bordelon, agrees with open ended questions and allows for meaningful feedback; nothing jumps out as objectionable; even if there are concerns, we can still pilot it to receive results for further revision; Lynch elaborates his concern is about how long to run the pilot; Lynch elaborates concerns about how the few words will have such a big impact; XO explains what our options are to move forward; Hallisey, recommends we pilot for one semester, shared what students think about evaluation, the importance is not being conveyed to students; Ellen Martin asked about the pilot. Megan indicated students seemed to not understand the process or use of student evaluations and I said that was different from the content of the evaluation. I did ask if there were any questions the students didn't understand. Megan said yes and I asked for an example which Megan responded the "conducive to learning" question.; Brian Schwartz, reminds us that it's up to faculty to promote and discuss importance of evaluations, and the promote with administering the evaluation; Phil Bryant, move to
thank the committee for their hard work and continue going forward with the evaluation we currently have, and Hodhod seconded the motion; Tesa Leonce, proposes a description before the evaluation or introduction; 1-20-1. Larry Dooley isn't this a motion from the committee? Lynch, no; Friendly amendment proposed by Lynch to change advocate to promotes; Ellen Martin moved to remove Not applicable. Vote to change advocate to promote 15-3-3; 4-14-5 move fails to remove Not Applicable. Vote to support video, 15-0-2. Motions to recommending adoption of proposed evaluations with amendment, 17-4-2. Passes.

2. Request for clarification of usage of evaluation from provost; practices is inconsistent across colleges; Lynch celebrates committees request for how evals are used; Provost supports the idea of using evals as one element of overall teaching and not the sole metric; Ellen Martin, the problem isn't with the promotion and tenure document as written (meaning University), the problem is in the Standards of Excellence; Ellen Roberts asks for clarification of where the problem is, says the work needs to be done at the college and department level; Motions to call for provost's office to review standards of excellence from colleges to departments 20-0-2, motion passes.

B. Sabbatical Policy Change - Faculty Development Committee - Roberts/Nixon 01:29:00: explains current policy, and policy to allow non-tenured track faculty to be eligible; motion in support of item called, Lynch and Martin 20-0-1.

X. Updates and New Items for Discussion

A. Policy RE: CougarVIEW & Online Teaching - Ellen Roberts: proposed changes in training for faculty in f2f or online instruction as they relate to CougarVIEW; highlights that f2f or online faculty are required to do specific things in CougarVIEW; feels that many of the proposed training may not need senate approval on any of the items because the items relate to BOR business continuity; requesting motion to require online faculty to take best practices in instructional media, 1 hour training; Riser asked questions of clarification for what accessibility training is (SIP, DIP), for what an "experienced" instructor is (Roberts, self-identify); Luft from library, questions practice of self-identification of accessibility training, Rajeev Dabke, asked about GradeBook requirements;
Higgins, Marsh motions for the training, 15-0-3. Knotts, explains developments in more online faculty development for online teaching;

B. Meet our AVP for Enrollment Management - Sallie McMullin (Completed during Provost's comments.)

XI. 01:55:00 Provost: Green Zone training; Please attend. Ogburn asked for

A. Motion to adjourn.

*Senate Committees are asked to present a report on a schedule each month. Unless noted as a presentation to Senate, each chair has submitted a report for advanced review, and will be in attendance for questions from the Senate and others in attendance. All reports and materials will be submitted 3 business days prior to meeting to allow for substantive review.