

Faculty Senate Meeting

April 15, 2021 at 3:10 pm.

Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 3:10 pm via Zoom video conferencing.

<https://youtu.be/sMI0wchcX2A>

Senators in Attendance: Charlene Simmons, Tammy Garland, Nominanda Barbosa, Jamie Harvey, Nicholas Boer, David Giles, Julia Cummiskey, Natalie Owsley, Alexandra Zelin, Erika Schafer, Christopher Stuart, Joshua Hamblen, Cuilan (Lani) Gao, Phil Roundy, Stephanie Gillison, Ron Goulet, Liz Hathaway, Joanie Jackson, Barry Kamrath, Beth Crawford, Bernadette DePrez, Wes Smith, Anne Swedberg, Jodi Caskey, Donald Reising, Irina Khmelko, Eleni Panagiotou, Mengjun Xie, Chandra Ward, Ethan Mills Ignatius Fomunung, Marisa Colston.

Senators not in attendance: Hill Craddock (**on sabbatical**), Priscilla Simmons-Robertson, Charlotte Ellington, Sarah Einstein, Spencer Usrey, Susan Thul, Zibin Guo

Approval of the minutes:

Approval of the minutes of the March 18, 2021. There were no revisions nor objections, so the minutes were approved.

Administrative Reports:

Chancellor Steve Angle:

Reported that the Vice Chancellor for diversity and engagement search is continuing and the hopes is that it will be concluded before the end of the month. There will be a campus announcement.

Dr. Angle also thanked faculty senate for persevering in a very difficult year. He believed that the zoom meetings have worked well. There was a lot to do and a lot was accomplished. Many were very deep and significant subjects. He ended by expressing his appreciation for all faculty senate has done.

Provost Jerold Hale

- A. Brief update on Spring 2021 semester face to face commencement ceremonies:
Confirmed that there will be nine commencement ceremonies for graduate and undergraduates. There will be approximately twelve hundred and sixty students participating across the nine ceremonies. The ceremonies are schedule for next week. Those on Friday, Saturday and Sunday are full or nearly full. Those on Wednesday and Thursday still have

some available. These seats can be taken by faculty that voluntary would like to attend. He reminded faculty that an email had been sent with indications on how faculty could sign up to attend.

- B. Provost reported that Information related to tenure and promotion has left campus to the system office. He took the time to congratulate the candidates for tenure and promotion. He acknowledged that there was a very strong group of candidates considered this year and that the cases were successful. Dr. Hale said that he will be following up with the deans and RTP committee chairs related to couple of issues. There were at least two instances where there was something less than an arm's length relationship between a candidate and external reviewer. Because of that, he will be providing more guidance, so it does not repeat. There was also an instance where a candidate reached out to an external reviewer directly, something that is not supposed to happen. However, none of those instances appear to have affected the dossiers or the candidate's cases in part because the RTP committees did a very good job of having additional external reviewers. None of these instances kept the cases from moving forward.
- C. You might have heard yesterday on Chancellor's webinar that an announcement is being put together related to returning to work for the Fall 21. He said he has recommended to the Chancellor that the return to work date for faculty members returning in person is August second. Contracts for nine-month faculty members are usually sent in August first. However, because August first is a Sunday it will be happening on the following Monday (August 2nd).

Question from a member: what is expected of faculty in totally online program?

Provost: In this case, the person would be expected to be on campus for departmental functions that may be meeting face to face. There won't be expected to be on campus for other reasons.

UTC Police Chief Robert Wratchford (as a special guest):

He first thanked President Simmons for the opportunity to speak on this meeting. He wanted to briefly cover few things going on campus that involve the police department. He welcomed all input that may be able to improve sources inside the community. He reported that one of the major issues the police department has been dealing with and most people are probably aware of is the theft from automobiles. This is not just confined to this University, but it has become a nationwide issue. He said he has spoken with chiefs across the region and most recently to chief Roddy of Chattanooga which graciously has included the university on a new crime prevention program called lock it, hide it (keep things out of sight), hold it (if you cannot lock it or hide it then take it with you). The department leadership team has been having conversations on how to address the problem. He added that the majority, probably 90 to 95 % of the vehicles that are burglarized have been unlocked. The best step that we all can practice in keeping our property secure is by locking up our vehicles. He called them crimes of opportunity and said that the department has put out some information on how to prevent them. He also encouraged everyone to report all suspicious persons and activities on campus.

Questions (concern) from a member: the member wanted to raise a concern related to reporting suspicious persons. There's been an encouragement from the law enforcement in general to focus on suspicious activities rather than suspicious persons as that has frequently and historically led to profiling of people based on race and people who are perceived to appear to belong or not. The member wanted to know any thoughts and suggestions on how we can reconcile that with safety concerns and whether the police department keeps statistics on what kind of people do get called in as suspicious.

The police chief thinks that suspicious activities and suspicious persons go hand in hand or are closely connected. It does not matter who the individual is, male or female it doesn't matter. He then listed few examples of what could be considered suspicious (activities that may make a person look suspicious). He added that in terms of statistics, they keep statistics in pretty much everything including the number of vehicles that have been unlocked compared to those locked and the properties taken from the vehicles.

Another member wanted to follow up with the concern expressed above. She said that as we all know at least in the research and in the practice that our black colleagues and community members are often more targeted as acting suspiciously when in fact they are not. She is especially concerned with the safety of black colleagues and community. Her concern comes with the fact that especially within the past year it has been demonstrated in United States an inequitable treatment of our black colleagues and community members. Black colleagues and members of the black community are more likely to be called in as suspicious persons. We need to think of ways to ensure their safety.

Chief Wratchford said that one of the things they do is to annually offer a diversity training to all campus officers. Also, he said there are several policies, general orders and procedures put in place. They train all their officers on how not to discriminate based on race, ethnicity, background etc. and they do not believe in biased based policing. They base strictly on the activities and not necessarily on the person first.

The member thought that the answer from the chief of police was useful. However, she brought about another point saying that however well trained the officers are the people in the community that are being urged to call to report suspicious persons don't always have that training. Also, she strives that the escalation of a situation pointing out somebody as being suspected of a criminal act does place certain people in greater danger and this is well documented. She suggested that maybe it would be worth to have a larger conversation about the best measures to take to protect the property without placing our people on campus at a greater risk.

Chief Wratchford thanked the member for her concerns and suggestions and said that his department is opened to additional dialogue at later date to further discuss this matter.

Committee reports:

A. Undergraduate Admission Committee (Aaron Shaheen, chair)

Proposal to make ACT/SAT Test Optional

The committee is tasked with looking at appeals from students coming out of high school who don't meet the regular admission criteria. The committee also looks into students who have been put on suspension and want to come back but have to come through the committee for recommendations. This particular year, the faculty senate president has tested the committee with considering a test optional admissions criterion for incoming students. Currently and especially related to Covid-19, there is a provisional admission that is test optional in place in part because many high school students could not take the ACT or SAT tests last year during the pandemic over the academic year. This new proposal is to make a test optional admission criterion a part of our criteria. It does not replace the testing option criterion that UTC has in place in which a student needs to have a 2.5 GPA and an ACT of 18 or higher or a 2.5 GPA and a 21 ACT upon completion of a 16 core high school courses. With the new proposal perspective students with a 3.0 or higher accumulative grade from high school can choose the test optional process in which case, they will be required to provide a teacher recommendation in place of those standardized test scores to be considered for admission and they would still need to complete the 16 high school courses.

More information on how this proposal would reflect the admission of incoming students to UTC and data (presented on this meeting by Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, Yancy Freeman) that can show and support why a 3.0 still gives a best measurement for evaluating a student's potential for academic success at UTC can be found on the website <https://new.utc.edu/document/74066>). Also, there are other schools around the nation moving toward a test optional admissions process and when the admissions committee voted on this proposal the vote result was 8 to 1 in favor.

After the data presentation a roll call to vote on the proposal took place and the motion passed with 32 "yes", zero "no" and zero abstentions.

B. Reimagining General education Committee (Laura Ingraham, chair)

Report (update) to the Faculty Senate

Four subcommittees have been meeting with faculty, students, staff and community members for the last several weeks to listen intently to their concerns and suggestions around general education. Within the groups, there is the faculty subcommittee which is the group that most concerns faculty senate. This group held six faculty townhalls from March 8 to March 19 in addition, we met with five departments who requested a meeting to hear their specific input. In terms of some insights that this committee gathered around concerns there was some concerns about workloads and staffing issues. Faculty also acknowledged that often students do not understand or appreciate the Gen Ed program. There are also some concerns on focusing on skill-building versus content knowledge acquisition. And it seems that there is a consensus on wanting to do some of both. There are some perceived strengths that faculty talked about the

current program such as it does offer students the opportunity to get a broad liberal arts education, students have the opportunity to explore Gen. Ed before declaring a major. According to faculty (insights) there is a long list of skills that all graduates should have. These are things such as critical thinking, reading comprehension, practical experiences etc. The subcommittee made a list of broad observations after hearing from faculty. In general, faculty are willing to make some significant improvements to our Gen. Ed. Education offerings if they have sufficient resources to do that. Everybody agree that the current Nonwestern requirement is outdated. There is a need to embed diversity, equity, and inclusion throughout a Reimagined Gen. Ed. Program. Faculty are divided on where students complete their Gen. Ed. Program. There is some interest in a Gen. Ed. Capstone that brings upper division students from various majors together to work on addressing a significant problem. Faculty appreciate the cohorting opportunity and understand that incoming students would benefit from having a community. According to faculty we need to adjust expectations for how students develop quantitative reasoning/ numerical literacy. As example, pedagogical practices for teaching math majors often don't work for teaching general education.

Further information on the presentation mainly student subcommittees and insights, staff subcommittee and insights as well as community insights can be found via the link <https://new.utc.edu/document/74066> or via <https://youtu.be/sMI0wchcX2A> meeting recording).

The next steps for the RGE Committee are as follow:

Gen Ed exists in an ecosystem that must involve both Enrollment Management/ Student Success and Academic Affairs. We should explore options for program design and develop a prototype during summer 2021 and bring back to faculty in the Fall to gather more feedback and refine the design prototype. Hopefully during early Spring 2022 we can present the refined design to faculty for consideration.

All these reports are available on the General education website and there is a new section now called Reimagining Gen Ed.

Questions, comments and concerns:

A member of senate: it seems that all students like a well-rounded education and then also later focus on their major. He said that maybe he does not quite know how to adequately get the message across. He thinks it's partly been a messaging problem. He acknowledged that personally there was so much that he got out of his general education experience as an undergraduate student, but he did not fully appreciate it until later. He believes that at their position undergraduates might have a limited definition of use.

Laura Ingraham agreed with the comment and added that one of the comments that they saw repeatedly was that a lot of the language used around general education right now is not student facing and that's one thing that the committee want to work on. Another thing that she thinks can help is to ask parents during summer orientation how many of them have a college degree or working in the field they majored in. That could be a away to begin talking to students about the value of a broad education that prepares them for life in general.

A follow up comment on the previous comment from another member: about messaging there is now an opportunity to adjust the message, make it more relevant. She added that she heard from an interview in NPR about how there is a bipartisan effort to put a billion dollars into civic education and history because partially spurred by January 6 and misinformation that has permeated our culture and the fact that a thousand times more money has been given solely to the STEM Education to the detriment potentially of other types of courses. She believes that general education courses are important to public citizenry and crucial for democracy and we should stress the importance of all of these in critical thinking as well as why we need critical thinking.

Another senate member agreed that it was great to have completed the survey and hear the opinions of students. He stressed the importance of practical base classes and working together to figure what are the real skills that people need to be successful in life.

C. Faculty Senate Executive Committee (Charlene Simmons)

1- Proposed bylaws change related to FARC (Faculty Administrative Relations Committee)

Everything related to the committee is explained on the handbook. The proposal is not to change anything related to the charge of FARC or how it operates. However, the process for electing FARC members is currently undefined on the handbook. Currently, members are elected each year by the full faculty. Section 5.5.1 of the Faculty Handbook says: "Two committee members are elected each year for three-year terms by the full faculty in accordance with the Faculty Senate Bylaws." Yet, the Faculty Senate Bylaws does not contain any information about how the elections should be conducted. The proposed bylaws change outlines the process by which the full faculty will elect two FARC members each year.

Current Bylaws Language:

See responsibilities, membership, voting, and process in the Faculty Handbook, Chapter 5, Section V.

Proposed Bylaws Language:

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 5, Section V), FARC consists of six faculty members in which two faculty members are elected each year to a three-year term by the full faculty. Members shall be elected from members of the faculty who meet the following criteria at the time of election: (1) full-time appointment with the rank, or equivalent rank, of associate professor/lecturer or higher; and either engage at least half time in teaching and/or academic research or serve as head of an academic department or hold rank as professional member of the library staff, with the exception of the Dean of the Library. The term of office for elected members will begin on August 1 and is a year-long commitment in which faculty must be available for a portion of the summer. Any ongoing cases that have not been closed prior to new members taking office will be completed by sitting members.

Nominations for FARC shall be solicited from the full faculty by April 1. The Secretary of the Senate shall issue to the faculty a description of membership criteria and faculty members eligible for nomination. Any full-time faculty member can nominate candidates to FARC. Elections shall be conducted via majority electronic vote of the full faculty. Election results shall

be determined by simple majority of the ballots as determined by Faculty Senate Executive Committee and announced by the Senate President to the faculty:

There was one simple and minor correction suggested by a member of senate on the statement present above and the corrected statement reads:

Consistent with the Faculty Handbook (Chapter 5, Section V), FARC consists of six faculty members in which two faculty members are elected each year to a three-year term by the full faculty. Members shall be elected from members of the faculty who meet the following criteria at the time of election: (1) full-time appointment with the rank, or equivalent rank, of associate professor/lecturer or higher; and (2) either engage at least half time in teaching and/or academic research or serve as head of an academic department or hold rank as professional member of the library staff, with the exception of the Dean of the Library. The term of office for elected members will begin on August 1 and is a year-long commitment in which faculty must be available for a portion of the summer. Any ongoing cases that have not been closed prior to new members taking office will be completed by sitting members.

No questions or comments so the proposal was brought forward for a roll call vote and the motion passed with 32 “yes”, zero “no” and zero abstentions. The bylaws will be updated and a call for nominations will be put out for the two new FARC members.

2- Bylaws Change – Adding the Honors College as a Division

Until recently, all faculty who taught in the Honors College were tenured to other departments, so the Honors College was not listed as division in the Faculty Senate. But recently the Honors College began hiring non-tenure track faculty who work full-time for the Honors College. Last month the Faculty Senate changed our bylaws to create full-time non-tenure track divisional members. Since the Honors College has non-tenure track faculty, it is appropriate to add the Honors College as a division of the Faculty Senate. For this to occur, a minor change of the Faculty Senate Bylaws is needed.

Current Bylaws Language

Article 2, Section 1:

Apportionment of Divisional Members

Divisional members shall be elected by the following voting divisions:

- a) Fine arts (art, music, theatre and speech)
- b) Humanities (communication, English, modern and classical languages, history, humanities, philosophy and religion)
- c) Behavioral science, (criminal justice, military science, political science, psychology, sociology, anthropology, geography)
- d) Mathematics and sciences, (biology and environmental sciences, chemistry, mathematics, physics, geology and astronomy)
- e) College of Engineering and Computer Science

- f) College of Business
- g) College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies; and
- h) The Library

Proposed Bylaws Language

Article 2, Section 1: Apportionment of Divisional Members

Divisional members shall be elected by the following voting divisions:

- a) Fine arts (art, music, theatre and speech)
- b) Humanities (communication, English, modern and classical languages, history, humanities, philosophy and religion)
- c) Behavioral science, (criminal justice, military science, political science, psychology, sociology, anthropology, geography)
- d) Mathematics and sciences, (biology and environmental sciences, chemistry, mathematics, physics, geology and astronomy)
- e) College of Engineering and Computer Science
- f) College of Business
- g) College of Health, Education, and Professional Studies
- h) The Library
- i) **The Honors College**

Questions, comments:

A clarifying question from a senate member: Is it a question of adding them as a division which will have ramifications outside of Senate representation or we are just listing them or does the division designation only affect Senate representation?

President Simmons answer: this is solely for Senate representation. This part of the bylaws is just defining the voting divisions so it's creating a voting division for the Honors College.

Another member asked how the number of seats would be calculated. President Simmons answered that the Honors College currently has 2 NTT faculty, so according to our bylaws, the Honors College would have one NTT divisional member.

Dean Frost spoke on behalf of the Honors college just to make a quick correction; she added that in the college they currently only have one faculty member. The faculty member is a NTTF. There is also one administrator who also teaches. However, his appointment is solely administrative.

No further discussions so the proposal was put forward for a roll vote call and passed with 32 "yes", zero "no" and zero abstentions.

President Simmons took the time to remind Faculty Senate that nominations for NTT divisional members or any of these divisions were still open through Sunday April 18.

D. Undergraduate Academic Standards Committee (Amanda Clark):

Current Catalogue Language

Taken from the Enrolling at UTC section of the 2020 - 2021 Undergraduate Academic Calendar.

To change language related to Prior Learning Assessment (PLA) credit.

There is a section of the academic catalog in the section about enrolling at UTC. In that section it discusses things like admission criteria, transfer criteria etc. and in addition there is a section in the catalog that talks about prior learning assessment. PLA credit is awarded to students based on previous learning experiences before coming to UTC. The proposal is to make a relatively minor amendment to the language in the catalog about PLA credit. Essentially, is to make a bit more explicit what the process is for our admission and Registrar's offices to determine what should be awarded credit and what shouldn't.

The sections of the PLA credit to be amended were shared:

A number of students will pursue PLA credit through the portfolio process that currently is administered through our integrated studies program. However, there is a number of other examples of PLA credit that might be awarded. So, there is a section of the catalog currently that says examples of these types of PLA credit are and there is a list and in the list are AP credit, CLEP credit, military service credit, Portfolio and currently it also lists that PLA credit might be awarded for course work or prior learning that is approved through the American Council of Education. In the last couple of years, it's becoming a little bit problematic to figure out which types of courses should be awarded PLA credit if they are approved by the American Council of Education because ACE is not an accredited institution nor an accreditor. There are a number of online learning platforms that are currently offering course materials to students for a nominal fee and that have been approved by American Council of Education through websites like straighterline.com, Sophia.com. In many of the circumstances the coursework can be self-passed over a certain period with unproctored exams and syllabi that are not all that explanatory about what the coursework is like. What is being proposed with the revision of the section of the catalogue is to make it explicit that PLA credit is awarded contingent upon department head approval. This way, when students come to admission or to the registrar's offices with some previous learning that they would like to receive credit for it puts a process in place that pushes that to the department head that then can request the materials from that course to review before making a decision about whether to award credit. It's important especially because some of these courses are often prerequisites for further study.

In the proposed Catalog Language with the changes to be made upon approval the American Council of Education College level credit recommendations was removed from the list of examples and below that we indicate that other types of PLA may be awarded. Coursework from ACE may still be awarded but we just haven't explicitly listed that and instead want to push it through the department heads to make a final decision.

Questions, concerns, suggestions:

A member asked what's the anticipated workload for department heads? How many of these requests come in?

Amanda Clark: historically it has been less than a dozen in a given academic year that has gone to department heads. To clarify the current process that admission and registrar's offices use is to send it to the department head for approval but is not explicitly stated that is the process. Workload will change on department heads, it will just make it explicit that this workload is part of their role as department head and put it in the catalog so that students and our administrative offices know what the procedure will look like.

There was no further discussion, so the proposal was moved forward for a roll call vote and the motion passed with 31 "yes", zero "no" and zero abstentions.

More information on any of the Committee Reports can be found via <https://new.utc.edu/document/74066>

New Business:

1- Accommodating students serving in the military (Brett Fuchs)

State law requires that students who are in active military service who are deployed whether that be domestically or abroad be given reprieve from their classes. This means if a student is for example sent to assist with Covid vaccination site or with the tornadoes from last year. That would generally mean giving the student an incomplete and allow them to make up the work when they return from that service.

One of the reasons why this item was included in this agenda is because there are already a quite few students who will be having military training which is also covered under this state law. We are anticipating that this will be applied already in Fall 21 semester and we will be contacting Fall instructors to let them know so that they can make appropriate accommodations.

One question from a senate member: a number of online classes will allow a specified drop for assignments. Are those drops allowed to be given to students so they are not behind, and they can continue their work when they get back?

Brett Fuchs: the law is not specific on it. Our recommendation to faculty has been into students that they should continue the work and use those drops and then come the end of the semester if they really done poorly in assignment, they would normally use a drop. We could try to reexamine that with the course instructor, but they should do their best not to meet that drop in the class.

2- Bookstore: new system for adopting textbooks (Kelly Wright)

The bookstore is going to start using a new portal for adopting course material. We are still working through some of the setup details. Once the work is completed a message will be sent out to campus which will include training sessions and support for the portal process. The new platform that we are going to use is going to be called AIP: Adoption & Insights Portal. This new application is to strive to give faculty a personalized experience. With that said, it would pull all the courses that a faculty is potentially teaching and create a landing page so that when the

faculty signs in he she can adopt the course materials at that time. It will simplify the adoption process for book material if faculty is teaching multiple sections.

The current platform, Faculty Enlight is scheduled to sunset on April 30 th. We could have some extra days that it will still be available for book orders to take place. However, after this date no one will have access to the system, not even to view previous adoptions. After the date, any remaining Fall orders must be submitted via email or in person. We should begin sending emails to faculty by next week. In the meantime, while we continue setting up the new platform please respond back to that email coming either from Chelleigh Bruce TM430@bncollege.com or Kelly Wright SM430@bncollege.com.

3- QEP: Quality Enhancement Plan for SACS/COC (Tammy Garland)

It is time again for re accreditation for SACS/COC and part of the re accreditation is a QEP. The University has selected dean Teresa Liedtka and Cindy Williamson to chair the committee and the committee is been made up of members of the faculty, students, executive branches, community members etc. All the activities will begin this coming Fall semester.

Teresa Liedtka: Every ten years SACS accredits the University. The review is conducted by a group of faculty and staff peers from accredited SACS Institutions who will visit us in an offsite fashion and onsite fashion. It will involve literally every department here at UTC in some capacity or another. There are two main components to the review the compliance certification report which are the 74 standards of current operation and how they address the quality of the programs and the curriculum we provide to our students. The piece we are talking here today is the second piece which is the Quality and enhancement Plan (QEP). QEP is a nod to the future. It is SACS allowing us to develop a program to improve achievement or to improve student learning outcomes. This can be done by combining existing programs or creating entirely new programs. The job of the committee and Tammy Garland is the rep. for the Faculty Senate is to help the campus understand, select, recommend, and design this new QEP. The group will have organizational meetings and is currently made of around 30 plus people and will pick up a few more starting the Fall semester. Earlier in the process (Spring) we worked with colleagues from the Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Institutional Research we took a broad look at all our institutional data. From there, we came up with seven potential topics from which we recommended three to the Executive Leadership Team and they came back with three topics to start our efforts. The three topics the committee is considering taking up for campus input are Equity Diversity and Inclusion, Cohorts or Collaborative Learning and Community Engagement. The intent of QEP is to base it on a topic defined by our Institutional Planning.

Next steps for the committee are on Monday April 19. An email be sent to campus where we will be offering daily fifteen minutes meetings on the QEP topic so that everyone can get a chance to understand the components as well as provide comments, suggestions on their preferred QEP topic. From there, we will launch a campus survey that will go out to students, faculty and staff. We will then put all the input received from the open sessions and from the survey together and recommend QEP topic by June 1st. At that point OPAIRS steps back in and will do a deeper dive into institutional data and then we will reconvene back in the Fall and begin the real work, we will begin calling for preproposals from the campus. The committee will work for the next

sixteen months on this and the visit culminating as part of our SACS visit will be on March 23. At that point, our QEP will be reviewed and officially approved or not.

Please know that if your department wants to meet and talk about the QEP we will be happy to come to you. Also, feel free to come and join one of these campus meetings.

4- TUFS Workload results for UTC (Charlene Simmons)

Last Fall between November and December a survey went out and there was a very good return rate, the second highest return rate of all 14 Public Institutions in Tennessee. UTC was only second to MTSU and their faculty is much larger. We already got results for the State back in January/February and those were shared with the Senate and Administration. Our partner in this core which is a group at MTSU was processing the data for each individual campus. We have now received the report for UTC campus. The data can now be compared to the statewide data. The data has been distributed to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and administrators (Chancellor and Provost). The four campuses in the UT system will share reports will also be shared at the UFC meeting coming next week (Wednesday) and then create an executive summary specific to Tennessee UT schools and present the summary to the Board of Trustees. Just to recall, this data covers two important areas workload in general including how much work nine-month faculty members do in the summer and how much or little of it is compensated and the second area was comparing workloads between pre-pandemic and pandemic times and noting the changes that have occurred in different areas. The data from the State results for instance has demonstrated that faculty are spending more time on teaching, less time on research. President Simmons thinks that this data can really help particularly individuals who are not in the day-to-day operations of academia such as our board and potentially legislatures to better understand the what faculty do. This is a set of data that faculty/ senate can use to support arguments that we are making.

5- Faculty Townhall on Handbook

There was a townhall on handbook about areas we could improve. We collected feedback, compiled them into a document and distributed to the Provost and Vice Provost. This is something for next year and it will get to the handbook committee for next year and that committee can start looking at how they might tackle some of the things that we've identified.

Unfinished Business

Faculty Senate Exec Committee: discussion regarding creating a Faculty Awards Committee (President Simmons)

This is an item that was part of March's meeting agenda but got postponed. Faculty Senate Executive Committee decided to postpone the conversation to Fall 21. That committee won't be doing work until next Spring so there is time to tackle this topic in the Fall.

Faculty Concerns:

One member brought back a concern related to **summer pay inconsistencies** he had already brought in last meeting and expected some feedback.

Provost Hale answered that the deans have not met yet.

President Simmons then finished by saying that something about summer pay will come later and that she will continue following up on the subject.

Announcements:

No Announcements

Adjournment:

At approximately 5:56 pm Don Reising put a motion forward for adjournment. The call was seconded by Beth Crawford.

The meeting was adjourned.

Planning meeting for next year - 2021-2022

New president Tammy Garland will call an introductory meeting for the new senators

A member of the senate encouraged that any suggestion be left in the faculty site

Next year meeting will remain on zoom

Tammy Garland thanked President Simmons for her service

President Simmons welcomed and thanked the new president Tammy Garland

At approximately 5:02 pm Nicholas Boer put a motion for adjournment. The call was seconded by Jamie Harvey.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully,

Nominanda Barbosa, Senate Secretary 20/21