Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Date: 3/21/24

Roster									
Guests: Allison Bailey, visiting incoming senators for next year: Ashanti Jones, Kim Ensminger, Siva Murru									
	CAES		**CBSS**		**CHS**		**COP**		**Library**
☒	Anderson, Jeff*	☒	Ashworth, Burton*	☐	Davis, Lacy -Resigned	☒	Comeau, Jill	☐	Deuber, Melissa
☐	Ji, Jane	☒	Bruce, Paul Robert	☒	Glaze, Donna	☒	Jackson, Keith		
☐	Koers, Gregory	☒	David, Blair	☐	Richardson, Amanda	☒	Tice, Hilary*		
☒	McGuire, Pat	☐	Harris, Courtney	☐	Showers, Jo Ellen -Excused				
☒	Rowley, Brendan	☒	Johnson, Mark	☒	Traxler, Karen				
☒	Tresner, Clifford	☒	McDaniel, Janelle*						
		☒	Tolleson, Josh						
		☒	Wiedemeier, Paul						

X=Present; *Indicates member at large

Agenda

- General updates
- Reports of Committees
    - Academic Standards
    - Constitution and By-Laws
    - Elections
    - Faculty Welfare
    - Fiscal Affairs
    - Ad Hoc Committees
        - Faculty Handbook
        - Emeritus Faculty
- Review of Policy (posted in the Moodle section)
- Membership requirement discussion - Do we need to be more specific in the constitution as to who can serve on Faculty Senate?

Business Type	Item Description	Action	Follow Up Plan
Call to order	Time: 1230 Presiding: Dr. Jeffrey Anderson Recording: Hilary Tice		
Announcements	Introduction of guests	Allison Bailey shared that she is attending the meeting to get ideas on how to improve communication with faculty. She mentioned that she met with Chance Eppinette, IT Director, to try to increase lines of communication between IT & Faculty. She informed senators that there is an academic technology committee composed of faculty and staff members to help provide input on the matter. Dr. Bailey then opened up the floor asking the senators for input on how IT & PLC can improve support and communication with faculty. Comments made included the following: -Dr. Bailey could share in an email a list of who is on the academic technology committee, in which Dr. Bailey made senators aware that there is an Academic Affairs website listing committees and members, which includes the composition of the academic technology committee; -a concern was voiced about having courses in CANVAS populated by CRN in the nursing program with Dr. Bailey indicating that Banner would need to be changed for it to change in CANVAS and that there is an area in CANVAS commons on how to create master courses that can combine CRNs; Dr. Bailey informed senators that there are budget and time limits to the number of permissions that can be addressed for changes to be implemented; Dr. Bailey shared that the DPT program has been beta testing CANVAS and several improvements have been made based on this beta testing with Dr. Jones praising the work done in addressing issues during the beta test; -timeline of course shells being population in CANVAS was questioned and Dr. Bailey informed senators that late summer shells in CANVAS have been migrated at the time of the meeting, fall classes should start populating in mid-April and spring '24 courses should migrate after end of	

		semester and will not replace S23 courses already migrated; a senator inquired about the status of rectification of migration of moodle quiz banks with Dr. Bailey stating this has been resolved and training is available for faculty to use to learn how to address this. Dr. Bailey mentioned she can reset non-live courses if needed and strongly supported individuals reaching out to her at abailey@ulm.edu or the canvas email canvas@ulm.edu with issues, noting that the canvas email gets sent to 6 individuals all at once and has been set up to allow faculty to interact directly with individuals affiliated with CANVAS. Individuals contacted with the canvas email are Dr. Bailey, Stephanie, & 4 people from IT (Brea included). Visiting incoming senators for next year: Drs. Ashanti Jones, Kim Ensminger, Siva Murru	
Approval of Minutes	2/15/24 minutes review	Allison Bailey suggested that senate minutes could be put in teams to allow real time comments on posted documents. Motion to approve minutes as written by Senator McGuire; Seconded by Senator Comeau; minutes approved unanimously with one abstention	Senator Anderson or Tice will send approved minutes to Robert Glaze to post on the ULM Senate website. Senator Anderson to bring copies of minutes to future in-person meetings.
New Business			
	Reports of Committees -Academic Standards (AS) -Constitution and By-Laws (CBL) -Elections (E) -Faculty Welfare (FW) -Fiscal Affairs (FA) -Ad Hoc Committees: Faculty Handbook (FH); Emeritus Faculty (EF)	**-AS:** update provided by Senator Comeau. Committee has discussed creating a faculty survey capturing information about AI; will work with Megan the Director of advocacy and accountability then develop a policy based on internal and external information; will try to determine how to track and check AI and inform students of consequences of using AI. **-CBL:** update provided by Senator Tice. Met on 3/12 w/o a quorum of members; items discussed included 1) lowering faculty to senator ratios-suggestions included changing from 20:1 to either 10:1 or 15:1; Elections committee is addressing vacancies; 2) potential for a two-house version	Senator Tice asked to have CBL committee look at how faculty is defined for membership in the senate.

| | | of the senate (tenured professors serve in upper house)-decision deferred; 3) Tenured senators attend executive committee meetings w/ Provost-suggestion made was to have interested senators attend and 4) fixing inconsistencies in CBL-items discussed mainly dealt with secretary issues (maintenance of a general faculty roster; bylaws article VII.4 "secretary shall send to members of the general faculty a summary report of the business transacted" and it was noted that minutes are posted to the Faculty Senate ULM website and Dr. Anderson sends out undertakings of the FS, so should this be updated?); Questions/discussion by others in attendance included:
 -concerns were voiced about ability to balance representation of different schools/colleges if a two-house version was implemented;
 -a comment was made that duplication of effort would increase as well as increasing problems with logistical interactions between various entities;
 -a question was asked about how a 2-house version would run, like legislative senate and house, and how would voting be handled? Would there be a chair for each house that would speak for the group and then this position could be a full professor?
 -A comment was made that voices should be equally heard and weighed regardless of tenure or promotion status.
 -A suggestion was made that the structure and criteria for chairs of committees could be adjusted to better address this.
 -Senators discussed past & current mix of tenured vs non-tenured senators; currently out of those attending, tenured = 8 with the remainder being non-tenured; concern was voiced regarding the potential workload of tenured individuals with any adjustments made to the senate structure;
 -Another discussion point affirmed that minutes do not need to be sent in a separate email by the secretary, since faculty could be reminded through other means that minutes are posted to the Faculty senate website. | |

		-E: update provided by Senator McGuire. Reviewed section VII of the CBL; committee was able to fill all vacancies; 8 senators were reinstated with 3 new senators added; an updated senate roster was posted to the Moodle page. Unusual issues that arose filling the vacancies were discussed. Construction management was left open with plans to fill in the fall. Members at large were adjusted. Available seats changed in a few programs. **-FW:** update provided by Senator Rowley. Met 2 weeks ago; finalized a faculty survey assigning weight to service, research, scholarship and citizenship obligations; faculty should see this survey next week; committee is attempting to develop a workload policy based on a credit system (0-5) and have it added to the faculty handbook. The workload can be adjusted with supervisor during annual evaluations based on this credit system. Since teaching obligations are significantly different between programs, the credit system will not incorporate this aspect but it will be worked out with each program. **-FA:** update provided by Senator David. Budget is on the ULM website & the committee reviewed budget line-by-line. Committee set up a meeting with Dr. Graves and Kristi Davis to address questions generated about the budget and all questions were answered transparently. In addition to assigned committee members, Jay Lewis was used as a resource. Senator David proposed that senators assigned to the FA committee and the Q&A from the budget meeting with Dr. Graves & Ms. Davis should be shared with faculty during program meetings. Availability of the budget online should also be shared. Senator David explained the reason for budget freezes and it is tied with the state legislation schedule. Senator Rowley supplemented the discussion by sharing news from the Staff Senate meeting he attended, stating that the budget is down ~$400,000, mainly from lower pharmacy enrollment, while 10 faculty and 6 classified staff have retired and their positions have been closed.	

		-FH: update provided by Senator Anderson. Committee a bit over 1/3 done with the review. **-EF:** update provided by Senator Anderson. Work has been completed.	
	Policy Review -Instructor promotion policy	Policy was posted to moodle for senate review; comments were submitted before the meeting, so a newer version with comments was posted close to the start of the meeting; senator Anderson mentioned delays in rolling out the policy are related to attempts to tie it to staff promotions but the staff and instructor promotions were eventually separated out to move the policy forward; senator Anderson opened the floor for comments/discussion and the following were made: -rolling contracts were removed and it only has general not specific raises so there is no reward for instructors to apply for higher positions; -the phrase "as funding permits" raised concern, as well as the removal of specific percentage raises suggested by an ad hoc committee. Senator Anderson added a comment that there need to be specific percentage levels stated in the policy and as worded, the promotion does not necessarily guarantee a raise & raises should be guaranteed with the promotion; -projected initial implementation strategy was discussed & the roll out would be immediate with instruction being provided to instructors on creating a portfolio; -a question was asked if instructors could apply for ranks commensurate with their experience and senator Anderson stated that initial discussion indicates that ranks could be skipped (not to include distinguished positions) to allow for promotion to a level in-line with experience; -Section V under the paragraph starting with job description, the last sentence was questioned as the language is a bit vague and whether the provost would have the final say in promotion?; -in the distinguished lecturer section, the use of the word 'stellar' should be replaced with exemplary or outstanding; the word application should be applicant; what is the	Senator Anderson will repost an updated version for comment and send to Dr. Arant.

		relevance of going thru Human Resources?; senator Anderson added a note that the university should be able to hire at this level, which seems not to be the case with wording.	
	Senate membership requirement discussion	Do we need to be more specific in the constitution as to who can serve on Faculty Senate? A question arose through the elections as to whether program directors are considered part of the faculty for the purposes of serving on the senate? Current interpretation of general faculty by the senate is that If you evaluate people or are responsible for a budget, then you are not considered as part of the general faculty. CBL to add wording to the definition of general faculty to address whether program directors or associate directors/deans can serve.	Senators were asked to send thoughts/comment to Dr. Anderson about this issue. The CBL was charged with addressing this issue before next meeting.
	Scantron poll	Faculty were polled about the cancellation of scantron services but only the first 25 responses could be accessed, which didn't show a strong need to keep scantron services; office of Academic Affairs was not consulted before changes were made; final plans have not been made but the prevalent option is to make scantron machines available in each College; a comment was made that scantron apps may not be an appropriate option due to increasing the workload to upload scantrons individually by faculty.	Senator Anderson will post a forum to allow for further discussion.
Old Business			
	None		
Adjourn	Time: 1357		