

MINUTES  
**Faculty Senate**  
 Friday, March 27, 2015 9:30-11:30 am  
 Cohen Center 213

**In Attendance:** Acheampong, Daniel; Jiang, Yabing; Zhao, Fan; Jani, Nairruti, Anstadt, Scott; van Duijn, Arie; Felton, Shawn; Stecher, Jo; Bevins, Brendan; Felke, Tom; Brown, Trent; Crenshaw, Dean; Kakareka, Joe; Lingle-Martin, McDowell, Kimberly, Melissa, Niner, Patrick; Paine, Morgan; Pavelka, Sandra; Rosenthal, Martha; Sakharuk, Alexander; Strahorn, Eric; Thomas, Serge; Carlin, Anna; Finley, Penny; Hung-Simons, Olivia; Johnston, Vicki; Nguyen, Long; Torres, Jorge; Villiers, Claude

**Guests:** Dr. Toll, Dr. Snyder, Jennifer Baker, Cory Mentzer, Nicholas Gallo, Beth Elliott, Michele Yovanovich, Patrick Riley, Cecil Carter,

**Media:** Naples Daily News and Eagle News

**Summary:**

Agenda Item	Responsible	Discussion	Action/Vote	Follow Up
1) Gathering at 9:30 am	Shawn Felton			
2) Approval of Agenda	Shawn Felton		Tom Felke Moved Daniel Acheampong, Second	
3) Approval of Minutes of March 13, 2015	Shawn Felton		Brendan Bevins Moved Tom Felke Second	
Guest	Jorge Lopez	<p><b><u>Director of FGCU Financial Aid on Title IV Requirements</u></b></p> <p>The requirement of financial aid calls for attendance and the completion of an academic activity prior to the disbursement of financial aid. Examples of this would be: submitting an academic assignment, taking an exam or quiz, participating in an online assignment, posting in an online study group, or discussion forum.</p> <p>The importance of this for financial aid is that it has become a hot item for auditors, not necessarily for FGCU, but others have failed to be able to confirm attendance for students who have failed to attend classes and money had to be returned. We are about a year or two behind audits done on the larger state schools. The use of Canvas will be the best solution for tracking assignments or related activities. This is data that is collected for ONE TIME at the beginning of the course to verify their attendance.</p> <p>Niner- question about online assignment for a face to face course.          Lopez – A face to face course could have an online assignment to verify attendance. The challenge with an in person course is that simple attendance taking is not enough. We are looking for ways to extract          Niner – He would recommend the rewording of the third bullet point under in person classes.          Lopez – He recommends careful attendance taking for the first two weeks.          Stecher – When we do not know who is receiving financial aid: what happens with students who withdraw before the deadline?          Lopez – The drop process remains the same. Banner and Gulf line do not provide the same system to keep track of this data. Canvas will be the better source for collecting this data. How much has the student earned of the money received and how much (60%) of the course allows them to keep their financial aid based on time spent in class not work done or</p>		

		<p>whether they were passing or not.</p> <p>Elliott – When is this to be completed for face to face and online courses?</p> <p>Lopez – After the deadline for not dropping a course, then financial aid is disbursed. Ideally the first week of course is the time for confirmed attendance.</p> <p>Elliott – In a MWF course if they come on Monday and then do not show up again, how will this . Do you have to verify a MWF?</p> <p>Lopez- The student may withdraw himself or my become fee liable.</p> <p>Paine – In his program courses meet only one day a week, some on Fridays. Students who add the class after the first class may show up the second Friday of the semester.</p> <p>Lopez – In that case the student’s aid will be delayed until the second Friday. Reports will be run on a daily basis.</p> <p>Paine – Adjunct faculty will need to be brought into this conversation as well.</p> <p>Lopez – You may not know who is affected by this. This is to be completed for all students. Some may become financial aid eligible in October, so this is not just for recipients, but for all since others my become eligible later in the year.</p> <p>Stecher – Are we permitted to know who is on financial aid. We are notified about athletes and do grade evaluations, could we use an email similar to the one for athletes for those receiving financial aid.</p> <p>Rosenthal – There will be many in classes of 120 to be checking and verifying.</p> <p>Niner – Can you describe what the Canvas reporting tool will look like?</p> <p>Lopez – it will be a spread sheet of CRNs for confirmation. We will be looking at an array of assignments.</p> <p>Felton – When we have talked with the committee, they have been trying to find a way with the less impact on faculty. Lori Hickox on the IAT will take suggestions as we move forward.</p> <p>Alexander – What if we do not use Canvas?</p> <p>Lopez – Canvas will be the only option.</p> <p>Elliott – When will this be put into place?</p> <p>Lopez – fall 2015</p> <p>Elliott – Will we have to make sure all students do the assignment no matter when they show up?</p> <p>Bevins – Can this be as simple as a 5 question syllabus quiz on Canvas and then never use Canvas again.</p> <p>Alexander – Can faculty have the option of not using Canvas?</p> <p>Lopez – Yes to completing that assignment. Yes to the simple quiz. As for the Canvas option, we will try to continue with IT to get it all in one system such as Banner and Gulfline.</p> <p>Simmons- The center for academic achievement has a module that is sent out. Can you use this system?</p> <p>Felton – I will filter these and other suggestions to Lori Hickox.</p>		
4) Old Business	Cecil Carter	<p><b>FPED Update</b></p> <p>The committee spent a great deal of time working on nomenclature as well as trying to make this document consistent with all others.</p> <p>At the end of last semester he sent some changes and today will address the changes and respond to questions.</p> <p>A summary of changes was distributed.</p> <p><b>The changes include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)I Preamble condensing and shortening of the preamble</li> <li>2) II no changes</li> <li>3)III PDP date changes for the PDP</li> <li>4) IV Evaluation Criteria – changes in desired outcomes</li> <li>5)V Performance Reviews –removal to the term tenure addition of external reviewer</li> </ol> <p>McDowell – pointed out another section where the word tenure is used.</p> <p>Elliott – to avoid confusion changing article numbers should not be done.</p> <p>Paine – Presented a list of concerns with the revised document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Fundamentally disagrees with the decision to remove the guiding principles From the principles section. 2) Diversity is beginning to lose visibility in the institution and should not be removed from the document. 3) Scholarly</li> </ol>		

		<p>activity should not be changed to Scholarship. The meanings are not the same. 4) The timeline for turn around for a PIP is also a problem. Turning in the PDP before the university president's roadmap is not compatible.</p> <p>5) Finds that this document is not the same as the one</p> <p>Carter – The broader timeline will be taken up with the FAT</p> <p>Rosenthal – We can split the vote and vote to accept those areas that we are comfortable with to have ready for SACS.</p> <p>Paine – Move to accept the draft revisions made by the FAT</p> <p>Second - Hung Simmons</p> <p>Paine (amended motion) Motion to accept only the substantive changes. We will split out the nomenclature changes and the substantive changes will be brought up at our next meeting.</p>	<p>Morgan</p> <p>Paine Move</p> <p>Olivia Hung</p> <p>Simmons</p> <p>Second</p>	<p>Motion</p> <p>Carries</p> <p>28-0</p>
Action Item	Shawn Felton	<p><b>Proposed Bylaw Amendments</b></p> <p><b>GRT</b>- nomenclature changes 26 in favor – passed</p> <p><b>IAT</b> – change in their responsibilities as well as some nomenclature</p> <p>Paine – Does the IAT have the resources to actively investigate? The wording seems to indicate they have the resources to find outside sources.</p> <p>Strahorn – The IAT does have resources and is receptive to investigate needs.</p> <p>Stecher – change the wording <i>will investigate to may investigate</i> as a friendly amendment</p> <p><b>PRT</b> – recommended addition and clarification of their duties Alexander/Trent</p>	<p>Eric Strahorn</p> <p>Move</p> <p>Tom Felke</p> <p>Second</p> <p>Alexander</p> <p>Sakharuk</p> <p>Move</p> <p>Trent Brown</p> <p>Second</p>	<p>28-0</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Carries</p> <p>28-0</p> <p>Motion</p> <p>Carries</p>
Action Item	Mary Krome In her absence Beth Elliot, Tom Felke and Nick Gallo	<p><b>Adhoc Scheduling Team Report</b></p> <p>Felke – The committee reviewed the proposals brought forward by the proposal and the committee reviewed all from a faculty, student, staff, and contract perspective. The issues are between a 7am vs. a 7:30 start time.</p> <p>Strahorn – concerned about the evening start times from 4:30 to 5?</p> <p>Rosenthal – There is no room for science classes in this schedule.</p> <p>Felke – this schedule is a recommendation of the committee from the proposed schedules brought forward by the provost.</p> <p>Elliott –our charge was to look at 7 or 7:30.</p> <p>Paine – who is the audience for this document and who will negotiate this policy</p> <p>Elliott – this is not policy; this is a recommendation. The committee looked at this from input from faculty, staff, and students to try to help academic affairs.</p> <p>Felton – thanks to the committee members. This is a recommended shot at the schedule as well as two documents analyzing the proposed schedules .Call for looking at the motion:</p> <p><b>The faculty senate supports the work and products of the senate scheduling ad hoc team and encourages administration to implement the suggestions and recommendations in the submitted report for future scheduling of courses</b> dated March 13.</p> <p>Toll – which of the documents (Feb. 13 or Mar 13) can be found this statement that we are voting on?</p> <p>Elliott – March 13 is the latest version.</p> <p>Niner – Motion to support the given statement</p> <p>Brendan/Serge</p> <p>Strahorn -- Friendly amendment to include the statement that the faculty does not support a 7:00 am start time.</p> <p>Felke – could we reword this in the affirmative, that we support a 7:30 am start time. This was not intentionally left out of our document.</p> <p>Revised statement: <b>The faculty senate supports the work and products of the senate scheduling ad hoc team and encourages the administration to implement the suggestions and recommendations outlined in the “Proposed Faculty Statement Regarding Course Scheduling” report dated March 13 (with support of a 7:30 am or later start time for classes. )</b></p>	<p>Brendan</p> <p>Bevins</p> <p>Move</p> <p>Serge</p> <p>Thomas</p> <p>Second</p>	

		<p>The amendment was amended and revised to finally resent with the words in parenthesis eliminated.</p> <p><b>Patrick/serge</b></p> <p>Paine – This may actually eliminate time slots in his department that would never use the 7:30 am timeslot.</p> <p>Villiers – We have to look at the larger picture if we are to move forward.</p> <p>Elliott – reminder of the other statement in the document:</p> <p><b>We affirm that individual faculty assignments, as part of our responsibility for the content and delivery of our curriculum, should not be arbitrarily assigned by college or department administration as outlined in the CBA.</b></p> <p>Toll – The CBA is owned by both faculty and administration. This is adding in language that might detract from the CBA.</p> <p>Baker – suggested changes to remove the “arbitrarily assigned’ language</p> <p>Kakareka – call for vote on the statement.</p> <p>Motion to call the question failed 10 in favor.</p> <p>Paine – CBA document read on the scheduling – There is the wording that you should have the ability to discuss with your chair about time, scheduling, and duration of your course schedule.</p> <p>Rosenthal – It should be up to the faculty who know best what is the optimal scheduling time for our courses.</p> <p>Stecher – We do not have a handle on scheduling of rooms in the university. It should be a collaborative approach.</p> <p>Brendan- can the wording be softened to say should suggest the optimal scheduling.</p>	Patrick Niner Move Serge Thomas Second	Call for Vote 21-0-4 Motion Carries
	Eric Strahorn for Dorothy Rae	<p><b>Action Item: IAT Textbook Affordability</b></p> <p>The IAT was asked to look at various proposed bills in the legislature and offer suggestions. They came up with a 1 page document for which the bill has changed since. One area that is very serious is the deadline for submission of orders for textbooks to 15 days before registration. There is also the proposal that textbooks and instructional materials must be used for 3 years.</p> <p>Felton – If this document is accepted, it will</p> <p>Eric/Claude 27-0 motion carries</p>		
5) New Business	Parliamentarian Arie Van Duijn	<p><b>Action Item: Nominations for Faculty Senate President</b></p> <p>Elections will be held at the last meeting of senate. Nominations are made today and taken back to constituents. This portion of the</p> <p>Felke – nominates Shawn Felton</p> <p>Felton – willing to accept for one final year</p> <p>No other nominations</p> <p>Paine – move nominations be closed</p> <p>All 4 officers will be voted on during our next session.</p>		
Action Item	Rosanne Spiegel and Ann Marie	<p><b>Direction on Future Education – On line Education</b></p> <p>Presentation of the work of the committee and data collection and gave an overview</p> <p>Defining quality in online education is very difficult.</p> <p>Looking what faculty value in education all together to find some common ground was their next step.</p> <p>Perceptions of quality had large areas of consensus.</p> <p>There should be the same standards for online and face to face courses.</p> <p>Learning is different from content delivery.</p> <p>Successful transmission involves a community of learners with close personal connection.</p> <p>The assignments and assessments need to be robust and academic integrity is a concern for all.</p> <p>This is the second phase of on line education and agreement on quality needs to be our next step .</p> <p>Action items for areas that need improvement. The IT department gives us</p>		

		<p>great support. The Lucas Center is a source for faculty support.</p> <p>Felton – This was a carryover from last year. Please take this back to your constituents.</p> <p>Kakareka – support of the content of the document</p>		
	Dr. Paul Snyder	<p><b>Information Item: SACSOC Visit</b></p> <p>The SACS visit is for next week Tues, Weds, Thurs.</p> <p>The principle reason for this visit is the QEP.</p> <p>Dr. Gunnels has been working with the Honors Program to inform faculty, staff, and students.</p> <p>This will be a low key visit. There is general satisfaction with all that has been provided to them over the past weeks.</p> <p>If you have not heard from Dr. Snyder already, the chances are very small that you will need to meet with SACS.</p> <p>Following the visit we will know about their impressions of all the work we have done and a report will follow in about a month, with time for us to respond. Our reaffirmation during the December meeting with a formal letter in January.</p> <p>He is confident that we will have a successful visit.</p>		
6) Standing Reports	Dr. Ronald Toll	<p><b>Provost Report</b></p> <p>We scored 38 points on PBF. This was excellent.</p> <p>The BOG issued a statement saying they had made some errors in calculations that changed our position from 4<sup>th</sup> to 5<sup>th</sup>. Last year we were 6<sup>th</sup>. We are in the money and will wait to see how much.</p> <p>We beat FSU that says something amazing about us.</p> <p>We were successful with the DNP degree.</p> <p>SACS and the QEP are coming up next week.</p> <p>FGCU day will be reported on by Dr. Felton.</p> <p>Lobbying will continue with one more trip to Tallassee.</p> <p>Eagle Advocacy had a strong showing.</p> <p>Paine – Do we know when next year’s metrics will be identified? Where will we be able to pick up more points?</p> <p>Toll – The rules are subject to change at any time. We did not get 39 points since there was a rule change in the cost of the institution for a degree. All of the numbers for next year were to be finalized by March 1. There is now enough data out there that once we finish with SACS we can begin working on next year. Once you move to a certain level, we move from excellence side to improvement side.</p>		
	Elspeth McCulloch	<b>SAC Report</b> - none		
	Cory Mentzer	<p><b>SGA Report</b></p> <p>Reviewed an Azul statue. April 14<sup>th</sup> will be the kickoff for the statues.</p> <p>The new SGA representative will begin at the next session.</p>		
	Morgan Paine for Beth Elliott	<p><b>UFF Report</b></p> <p>Weekly meetings for 3 ½ hours for negotiation process. Working on the FPED With the CBA. Summer pay and assignment issues also have been worked on.</p> <p>UFF membership meeting and social event in early April.</p> <p>Election at that point with a number of open positions.</p>		
	Shawn Felton	<p><b>Senate President’s Report</b></p> <p>Tallahassee the last two weeks.</p> <p>Common learning Management System for the entire state system. UNISON for \$100K total was suggested.</p> <p>BOG task force for quality of online learning.</p> <p>Robbie Roepdorf was reappointed, but we lost Ann Hamilton. Christian Spielker was appointed.</p> <p>FGCU Days was successful talking about the good work of FGCU especially with the work of the students.</p> <p>Budget differences are still an issue.</p> <p>Service letters for Senate are being worked on.</p> <p>PDG letters will be sent out soon for notice of funding.</p> <p>Appreciation to Dr. Toll for increasing the budget to support faculty.</p>		

7) For the Good of the Order		none		
8) Announcements		none		

**Next Faculty Senate Meeting:** April 10, 2015, Cohen Center Rm 213 9:30 am – 12:00 Noon

APPROVED