

FACULTY SENATE MEETING MINUTES
North Carolina A&T State University
Academic Classroom Building (101)
Tuesday, March 27, 2018
3:00 p.m.

Dr. Julius Harp, Chair Presiding

Senate Members Present: Phoebe Ajibade, Geleana Alston, Barbara Butler, Angel Dowden, Sherrie Drye, Yewande Fasina, Bonnie Fields, Galen Foresman, Julius Harp, Emily Harris, Joshua Kirven, Anna Lee, Daniel Limbrick, Mary Lind, Ahmed Megri, Devang Mehta, Mahour Mellat-Parast, Gregory Meyerson, Cephas Naanwaab, Elizabeth Newcomb, Andrea Ofori-Boadu, Elimelda Onger, William Randle, Thomas Redd, Katherine Silton, George Stone, David Tidwell, Li-Shiang Tsay, Cindy Waters, Dwana Waugh, Danielle Winchester, Jinsheng Xu.

Departments Not Represented: Agribusiness, Applied Economics and Agriscience Education; Chemical, Biological and Bioengineering; Industrial and Systems Engineering; Administration and Instructional Services; Biology; Energy and Environmental Systems; Physics; Nanoengineering; Graduate College.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Julius Harp at 3:05 pm. To ensure that the meeting proceeds on schedule, the Senate body agreed that the meeting begin with speaker presentations; after the presentations, the roll call and approval of minutes will be done.

Presentation from University Police Department (UPD)

- Major Cherry led the presentation about active shooter scenarios on campus. He shared a video and short PowerPoint presentation.
 - Those interested in sharing the video with students can look it up on YouTube (search “Shots Fired”).
 - Some key pointers regarding safety on NC A&T’s campus:
 - The university collaborates with Guilford County, Greensboro, and other UNC System Police Departments in the event of threats or emergency situations.
 - Faculty, staff and students should have a survival mindset to give themselves the best chances in the case of an active shooter situation. Emergencies such as this call for proactive behavior, rather than passive. Do not cluster together in groups or try to negotiate with an active shooter. Instead, throw things, spread out, barricade the door and do anything that can be done to throw the shooter off mission.
 - Faculty, staff and students can download the LiveSafe app to establish a quick connection to the UPD.
- Questions posed to Major Cherry:

- Do you think there will be a time in which faculty are asked to carry guns in the classroom?
 - UPD feels that more guns in the classroom could be more confusing and would increase the chances of friendly fire in the case of an emergency.
- What is the UPD doing about crime on this open campus?
 - Every incident is investigated using community policing methods. UPD also conducts a monthly crime analysis to determine what types of crimes are happening, where, etc. They use that to drive policing activity across campus.
- Is it possible to increase cameras on campus to monitor for issues?
 - There was a recent camera assessment; need was identified and new cameras have been installed in various locations across campus.
 - To reduce the chances of electronic theft, make sure that individuals keep a record of the serial numbers for all electronics. This allows UPD to track down stolen electronics more easily.
- Dr. Childress will send out an email to all Academic Affairs officials to ensure that all interested areas have received training. Emergency management staff and a UPD representative will visit all buildings to assist with emergency preparedness planning.

Roll Call

Approval of the February Faculty Senate Minutes

- It was moved and properly seconded to approve the February minutes.
- Senators unanimously approved the minutes with no corrections or additions.

Institutional Effectiveness Presentation

- Ms. Quinn Jernigan presented on proposed changes to course evaluations, for anticipated implementation in Fall 2018. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness will share the proposed changes to the Senate, electronically, and would like for senators to obtain departmental feedback by the middle of April. The goal is to return to the April Senate meeting with a revised evaluation that can go through a vote.
- Senators expressed significant concerns regarding the proposed process:
 - Senators would like to incorporate a method in the evaluation that will demonstrate whether or not a student is reading each question. This could be done through a specific question or by randomly ordering or reverse scaling certain questions.
 - The evaluation questions do not appear to accommodate new teaching methods.
 - Ms. Jernigan said that her offices welcome a more customized approach in the survey design and encouraged faculty to provide that kind of feedback.
 - There was also concern regarding how these surveys are used to measure teaching quality, particularly considering that there is no correlation that has

been shown between high evaluation and the achievement of learning outcomes. In addition, response rates are often very low.

- Ms. Jernigan encouraged faculty to ask the administration that type of question.
- Several senators questioned the timeline for the design and approvals of the revised evaluations.
 - Ms. Jernigan said that faculty should suggest more reasonable timelines. Right now, she plans to send out the surveys with a request for feedback, with the cutoff being the middle of April.
- The general consensus among the Senate is that faculty should be involved in the design of the evaluations from the beginning. Senators recommended that we utilize one of the standing committees (Educational Policy or Faculty Welfare) to take charge of this issue.

New Programs and Curricula Committee

- Dr. Foresman presented the committee report.
- The committee met on March 13, 2018 and reviewed changes for Chemical, Biological and Bio Engineering; Mathematics; Agribusiness, Applied Econ. & Ag. Sci. Edu; Natural Resources and Environmental Design; Economics; Business Education; Management; Energy & Environmental Systems; Applied Engineering Technology; Accounting and Finance; Marketing, Transportation and Supply Chain; Psychology; Mechanical Engineering; Social Work and Sociology; and Computer Science
 - Senators asked a few specific questions about items affecting the Mathematics department.
 - One asked for more details about the Math changes proposed. Most were title and prerequisite changes, with 1 new course.
 - Applied Engineering Technology proposed changing MATH 111/112 requirements to MATH 131/132. The Math Department does not support this change, as it may require students to take additional prerequisite course(s). No one from Applied Engineering Technology was present to respond to the concerns, so Dr. Redd limited his comments to indicate his concern on behalf of the Math Department.
 - Another senator asked if any of the changes impacted other departments?
 - The College of Business met together to discuss changes in their curricula, which will impact each other.
 - Dr. Foresman encouraged senators to be mindful of other departments when they propose changes. Talk to other departments if their courses are affected.
- Senators approved the proposed curricula changes, with only 1 abstention, remaining in favor.

Faculty Handbook Committee

- Dr. Alston presented the committee update.

- This portion of voting will focus on Chapters 4, 5 and 6, and the appendices that were previously shared for review. Dr. Alston started with a reminder that the revisions currently on the table are only the beginning of revisions that will hopefully occur on a much more regular basis. In addition, she reminded senators that faculty comments that were previously shared were included – as much as possible – in the revisions to be presented at this meeting. Comments not addressed were considered outside of the purview of the committee.
- Senators will vote on each chapter and appendix individually:
 - Chapter 4 (Constitution of the Faculty Senate) – approved, with 2 abstentions, remaining in favor
 - Chapter 5 (Committees of the Faculty and the University – approved, with 2 abstentions, remaining in favor
 - Chapter 6 (Policies of the University) – There was considerable discussion regarding several pieces of Chapter 6:
 - One senator asked if any of the linked policies were changed?
 - The reply was that the links would be activated once the editor has edited the document. Some unlinked policies (such as the nepotism policy) were pulled out to be voted on separately.
 - One senator expressed concerns about the inclusion of a policy that addresses the contract period for 9-month employees.
 - There is no portion of the Chapter 6 revisions that addresses this issue, even though several senators thought it should be included in the section on External Professional Activities.
 - Senators would like the 9-month contract to be specified in clear terms (such as the number of working days or weeks), to ensure that faculty can pursue external or summer employment for a full 3-month period. Senators suggested that the Academic Calendar Committee focus on this topic.
 - The Senate did not have a quorum when voting was called for Chapter 6. Therefore, the committee will present Chapter 6 and appendices at the April meeting for a vote.

Nominating Committee

- Dr. Fields presented the report.
- Dr. Harp is the only current nominee for the open Chair position.
- There is an open position for a Faculty Assembly delegate and alternate.
- Dr. Fields called for further nominations, and she will follow up with these individuals personally.
- Voting to fill vacant positions will occur in the April meeting.

Other Business

- There was a recommendation that the Senate agenda include committee reports and voting items at the beginning of the meeting, and to hold presentations for the end.

Speakers who do not need to be present for important Senate matters could be asked to wait outside until their presentation.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15pm.

Dr. Elizabeth A. Newcomb
Secretary