**Minutes of the Faculty Senate**

**Regular meeting held in Reynolds 205**

**January 19, 2023**

Present: Senators Oden, Petty, Pfannenstiel, T. Schroeder, Tucker, White, Fanning, Paulson, Overholser, Nelson, Samples, Logan, Djiguimde, Valenzuela, Coppersmith, Hudgens, Schneiderwind, Almotairi

Ex-officio and guests: David Lanoue, Donna Allen, Deborah Wilson, Gerald Plumlee, Karen Landry, Robin Sronce, Connie Wilson, Vanda McLelland, Sheryl Edwards, Wilson Impson, Josh Kee, Jennifer Rowsam

Call to order: 3:40 pm

Reading of Proxies: No proxies

1. **Approval of Minutes**

Minutes from November 17, 2022 were approved with error correction (motion – Nelson, second – Schneiderwind)

1. **Reports of Committees**

Report from the Faculty Senate Handbook Committee (Senator White)

Senator White discussed the policy regarding elections to standing committees in the University and provided a motion for approval, Senator Logan seconded the motion and the policy was approved. The Faculty Assembly will now be asked to vote on the policy later this semester.

Report from the Faculty Senate Budget Committee (Senator Tucker)

No report from the committee.

Report from the Faculty Senate Parking, Facilities and Grounds Committee (Senator Hudgens)

No report from the committee.

1. **Liaisons from other Standing and University Committees**

Academic Appeals Committee

Senator Logan noted the committee had reviewed 12 appeals. Four were approved for early reinstatement, seven suspensions were upheld and 1 was not reviewed. All recommendations had been forward to the Provost.

1. **Old Business**

Report from Ad-Hoc Committee on Student Evaluations (Senator Schroeder)

Senator Schroeder provided those present with a copy of the revised version **(attachment one)** of the student evaluation survey instrument. The survey had been condensed to ten questions and those present discussed question order, clarified wording throughout, reviewed the use of “neutral” or other options in responses, and discussed appropriateness of instrument for both online and in-person courses. Revisions received from this meeting are attached as **attachment two.**

The ad-hoc committee will meet with ITS to create a mobile-friendly version of the survey and review formatting to ensure the best presentation of the survey to encourage full responses.

Schroeder first, Logan seconded the motion while committee, motion passed in Senate with changes agreed upon by group.

1. **New Business**

Members of the Faculty Senate took a moment to officially recognize the passing of Dr. Margaret Downing, a pioneer in advancing women’s sports throughout Arkansas.

Charge to the Handbook Committee for integration of Mentor Platform to the Tenure and Promotion process.

President Oden asked the Handbook Committee to review the current language related to the tenure process within the handbook and update it so it reflects the current Mentor-based process. She asked Gerald Plumlee to serve as a member of this ad-hoc committee.

Senator Schroeder provided a first for the motion, Nelson seconded the motion, motion passed.

**6. Special orders of the day**

Provost Lanoue provided a full report of current events on campus at a recent campus-wide meeting where an endowment gift was provided in support of the College of Liberal Arts.

**Questions for the Administration**

* Please provide information regarding state law/ADHE/HLC requirements for evaluation of higher education administrators. Is it the same law requiring annual evaluation of higher education faculty, regardless of tenure status, or is there a different law congruent with SAU’s pattern of every other year administration evaluations?
	+ Provost Lanoue noted that there are no laws regarding yearly evaluations but that all administrators are evaluated every year by their supervisors.
* Is there an opportunity to evaluate administration every year?
	+ Provost Lanoue stated that while he would defer to the Senate, concerns regarding yearly evaluations of administrators include decreased participation and the additional workload required of the HR department.
	+ Provost Lanoue brought attention to the current administration evaluation instrument, which needs a total overhaul. He invited the Senate to review the document and see if the instrument itself could be made more useful vs. increasing the occurrence of their use.
	+ General Counsel Giles shared that because this evaluation is only for academic faculty, Faculty Senate is an appropriate location for the revamping process to occur.

Adjournment @ 4:25pm. Senator Logan provided a first motion, White seconded, motion adjourned.

 **Attachment One**

**Course Evaluation Questions, version 2.0**

To be presented to Faculty Senate at the January 2023 meeting

**Student Questions**

1. I made a good faith effort to meet or exceed the expectations of this course to the best of my abilities.

**Assessment Questions**

1. The assigned work and/or exams accurately reflected the content presented in this course.
2. The assigned work and/or exams were graded and returned in a timely manner.
3. The instructor provided helpful feedback on assigned work and/or exams.

**Teaching/Instruction Questions**

1. Resources for this course were easily accessible.
2. The online and technology components of this course were beneficial to my learning.
3. The instructor established an environment that was conducive to learning.
4. The instructor presented materials in a clear and well-organized manner.
5. The instructor was available to students to help them succeed in this course.
6. Overall, the instructor was highly effective in teaching this course.

**What are some of the things that you liked about this course? (open response)**

**What are some of the things that the instructor can do to improve this course? (open response)**

**Attachment Two**

**Course Evaluation Questions, version 2.1**

Approved by the Faculty Senate at the January 2023 meeting

**Student Questions**

1. I made an honest effort to meet or exceed the expectations of this course to the best of my abilities.

**Assessment Questions**

2. Resources provided by the instructor for this course were easily accessible.

3. The online and/or technology components of this course were beneficial to my learning.

4. The assigned work and/or exams accurately reflected the content presented in this course.

5. The assigned work and/or exams were graded and returned in a timely manner.

6. The instructor provided helpful feedback on assigned work and/or exams.

**Teaching/Instruction Questions**

7. The instructor established an environment that was conducive to learning.

8. The instructor presented materials in a clear and well-organized manner.

9. The instructor was available to students to help them succeed in this course.

10. Overall, the instructor was highly effective in teaching this course.

**What are some of the things that you liked about this course? (open response)**

**What are some of the things that the instructor can do to improve this course?**

(open response)

\*\*\*In addition and as approved by the Faculty Senate on January 19th, 2023, the calculated Instructor Average response used for the evaluation of faculty will be calculated using questions 4-10 on this version of the evaluation form