**FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES**

**North Carolina A&T State University**

**101 Academic Classroom Building**

**Tuesday, September 24, 2019**

**3:00 p.m.**

**Dr. Julius Harp, Chair Presiding**

**Senate Members Present:** Jeff Alston,Mohd Anwar, Stephen Bollinger, Dewayne Brown, Steven Culver, Nicole Dobbins, Paige Dunlap, Yewande Fasina, Galen Foresman, Tony Graham, Julius Harp, Elizabeth Hopfer, Sherrell House, Abebe Kebede, Hyung Kim, Elon Kulii, Minyong Lee, Anna Lee, Ahmed Megri, Devang Mehta, Shona Morgan, Cephas Naanwaab, Robert Newman, William Randle, Thomas Redd, Philip Rubio, Amy Schwartzott, Kimberly Smith, Tobin Walton, Jacqueline Williams, Danielle Winchester, Alexander Yap.

**Departments Not Represented:**  Agribusiness, Applied Economics and Agriscience Education; Chemical, Biological and Bioengineering; Computational Science and Engineering; Electrical and Computer Engineering; Mechanical Engineering; Nursing; Applied Engineering Technology; Graduate College.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Julius Harp at 3:10pm.

**Roll Call**

**Approval of the August Faculty Senate Minutes**

* It was moved and properly seconded to approve the August minutes.
* Senators approved the minutes by unanimous vote. There were no corrections or additions.

**Statement from the Chair Dr. Julius Harp**

* Dr. Harp shared committee updates:
	+ All senators are required to serve on at least one standing committee. Members are particularly needed for the Constitution Committee and the Nominating Committee. Dr. Harp will circulate the sign-up sheets for the various standing committees during today’s meeting.
	+ Three committees have not identified a chair (Nominating, Constitution, Welfare). Dr. Harp will reach out to members of these committees to set the initial meeting date so that chairs may be selected.
	+ To facilitate high-functioning committees Dr. Harp made the following recommendations:
		- Meeting schedules for each committee should be shared with Mrs. Ingram so that they may be distributed.
		- Committees are asked to record minutes from each meeting using the template that Dr. Harp created. They should be shared with Mrs. Ingram after each meeting.
		- Committees should develop standard operating procedures.
		- Committees should track attendance at each meeting. Meeting attendance will ideally be shared with Deans and Department Chairs so that faculty are recognized for their service. Dr. Harp will also attend an upcoming Dean’s Council meeting to discuss the importance of the Senate and Senate Service.
	+ The Faculty Handbook Committee should identify a schedule for regular annual review and revisions.
	+ Dr. Harp requests that committee chairs from 2018-2019 submit year-end committee reports by October 8, 2019. These will be used to create the Senate annual report.
	+ 2019-2020 Committee budget requests should be submitted to Dr. Harp and Mrs. Ingram in the near future.
* Dr. Harp also discussed several charges and goals for the upcoming academic year:
	+ Continue to work with NC A&T Administration and the Faculty Assembly of the UNC System toward advancing salary-related issues.
	+ Continue to assist the Welfare Committee in resolving the concerns of non tenure-track faculty, adjunct professors and instructors at NC A&T. This may lead to the development of an ad-hoc, sub or new standing committee.
	+ Charge the Senate to identify its role toward the UNC System’s student success agenda.
	+ Continue to work with NC A&T Administration, the Senate Educational Policy and Welfare Committees to resolve the office-hours policy at NC A&T.
	+ Charge the Nominating Committee to make recommendations on the number of Faculty Assembly alternates and the terms for Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate.

**Academic Calendar Committee Report Dr. Galen Foresman**

* The committee met on September 17,2019 to review the proposed calendar for 2020-2021. The committee paid particular attention to start/end dates to ensure the correct number of total days and a full three-month summer. The committee approved the 2020-2021 calendar and it now needs to be approved by the Senate.
	+ It was moved and seconded to approve the 2020-2021 calendar. During discussion, there was a question about why the Fall semester begins on a Wednesday. Dr. Foresman said that it isn’t entirely clear, but that it may have to do with ensuring the correct number of contact hours for all courses.
	+ Senators unanimously approved the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar.
* The committee also reviewed 2021-2022 and 2023-2024 calendar proposals. They have noticed an issue with the length of the summer for 2023-2024 and will offer recommendations to resolve the issue.

**New Programs and Curricula Committee Report Dr. Galen Foresman**

* Presented curriculum modifications for Sociology, Aerospace Studies, Military Science, and Mathematics.
	+ Sociology proposed a new course, entitled Political Sociology.
	+ Aerospace Studies and Military Science proposed various changes that were mandated by the U.S. Military.
	+ Mathematics eliminated MATH 105 from the general education course listing.
* It was moved and properly seconded to approve all curriculum changes presented. The motion carried with unanimous approval.

**Faculty Handbook Committee Report**

* Dr. Ajibade invited senators to serve on the Faculty Handbook Committee and to consider serving as Chair.

**Constitution Committee Report**

* No report

**Faculty Welfare Committee Report**

* No report

**Nominating Committee Report**

* Dr. Redd asked for members of colleges other than College of Science and Technology and College of Engineering to consider joining this committee.
* There was a question about whether the committee reviews applications of individuals interested in serving in various roles in the Senate and on university committees. There is no formal application process that is currently followed.

**Educational Policy Committee Report Dr. Zachary Denton and Dr. Stephanie Kelly**

* Dr. Kelly and Dr. Denton presented the final revisions of the **Faculty Teaching Evaluation Instrument**. The following italicized statements provide the context in which revisions were requested.
	+ *The Education Policy Committee was appointed to take the existing instruments currently used for face to face classes and online classes and combine and edit them into a single instrument that can be used for all classes across campus. The primary motivations for the resulting document include:*
1. *To be as general as possible so that the instrument can be used widely. This disallows very specific questions, e.g. questions referring to “textbooks” or “technology” since it may exclude certain classes or styles of classes.*
2. *To simplify and shorten the length of the instrument. Part of this involved removing any redundancies or combining questions that were extremely similar.*
3. *To be as fair as possible while adhering to the above criteria. Any items that were deemed unfair were removed or altered as necessary. Items were added to have the student reflect on their own performance to be in line with evaluations from other institutions.*
* *Frequent questions and concerns.*
1. *To mitigate the generality of this instrument, it has been confirmed that departments and/or colleges can add specific items for their own use. This document only proposes items that should apply to all classes across campus.*
2. *Many of the concerns regarded how the evaluations are disseminated to students. Of course, this proposed document does not address this issue.*
3. *These items are meant to evaluate the instructor of a course.*
4. *This proposed evaluation instrument is not perfect, however the timeline for instituting it is very brief, but that corresponds with the urgency for having a better instrument in place. The Education Policy Committee welcomes any feedback, comments, or concerns; however, they must be submitted to the committee as soon as possible to be considered. It is asked that all requests to add questions need to come with the necessary approvals and the Dean of the College must submit the revisions to OSPIE (vice provost) by the sixth week of the semester.*
	* Changes reflected in the instrument today included:
		+ Change from “instructor is knowledgeable’ to “Instructor communicated clearly”
		+ Added an item that allows students to leave general feedback about their learning environment (such as building or classroom quality)
		+ Removed “course structure and design were appropriate for the delivery platform” and suggested its inclusion for specific Distance Learning questions
	* Feedback from the Senate included:
		+ *Question 2* – There is concern that some students might use this question to negatively rate faculty with different accents.
			- Several wording variations were proposed: (1) The instructor communicated course material effectively; (2) The instructor taught material well; (3) Course material enhanced learning.
			- Some senators do not believe that the original wording is an issue because faculty with different accents are aware of their accents.
			- Wording was finally determined as: *The instructor communicated the course material clearly.*
		+ *Question 4* – There is concern about the difference between faculty being “available” vs “present” during posted student hours and/or scheduled appointments.
			- Senators recommended a change in wording to: *Instructor was present to provide me assistance during posted student hours and/or scheduled appointments.*
		+ *Question 7* - Senators recommended changing “you” to “I”
		+ In the section asking about the grade the student expects to earn in the course:
			- Senators wondered if the scale should be +/-? The answer was that it should be kept as a more general grade prediction.
			- Senators recommended that a “Pass” option be added to accommodate Pass/Fail courses.
		+ Senators voted to approve the instrument with the recommended changes. There was one abstention.
* This committee will also address the **Office Hours Policy**. Last Spring, the Senate drafted an office hours policy and shared it with the Provost’s Office. The Provost’s office sent a revision back and it is not ideal (1 office hour for every credit hour). The committee is creating a survey to gauge faculty use of office hours. The survey will be shared with all faculty. The committee is also considering policies at other institutions.
	+ The office hours policy is desired to apply to all levels of faculty. There is particular concern about this for adjunct faculty, who are not compensated for the extra time.

**Other Business**

* QEP Overview
	+ Dr. Stephanie Kelly, Director of the Quality Enhancement Plan, provided an overview of upcoming initiatives, which revolve around performance in math courses. She has asked senators to encourage their faculty to attend college forums. The QEP will affect all faculty and is faculty driven. Faculty are asked to share information about how the plan affects all majors.
* Background information about student performance in MATH courses at NC A&T:
	+ A&T DFW rate is lower (33%) than USA.
	+ Assessed performance in MATH 101/102/103/104/110/111/112/131/132 (General Education math courses) - Roughly 2800 students per semester
		- Students who failed the second course in a sequence are typically the same who failed the first course. It doesn’t differ by style/format/delivery of the course.
		- Attendance is a big issue, conditions in Marteena Hall are poor, and students have poor skill retention. Students are driven to complete the course rather than comprehend it.
	+ Thus, QEP will focus on attendance and goal orientation in math in particular, but it should affect all areas.
* Strategies to address the QEP
	+ Can build a tutoring space or change the learning environment
	+ Can institute policy changes or student success changes
		- One possible issue affecting attendance: *Attendance is required* statement is no longer shown in the Student Handbook.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45pm

Dr. Elizabeth Newcomb Hopfer

Secretary