



FACULTY SENATE

Est. 1991

Eric Howington
President

Debbie Paine
**Vice President/
President Elect**

Crystal Randolph
Secretary

Dee Ott
Parliamentarian

Brian Ring
Past President

Agenda

August 23, 2018, 3:30 pm
University Center Magnolia Room

Items in **bold print** are items that require action by the Faculty Senate. Other items are for information only.

Special Request: At the request of the Senate's Executive Committee, any actions sent to the President for possible inclusion in the Senate agenda should be accompanied by a written document with the rationale and purpose of the decision. The Executive Committee requests that these documents be submitted via email as Word .doc attachments.

For the benefit of record keeping, we ask that senators and visitors please identify themselves when speaking to an issue during the meeting. Please use the microphones to assist with accurate recording. All senators must sign the roster in order to be counted present. If you have a senator's proxy, please place their name tag beside your name tag on the table in front of you.

1. Call to Order – Eric Howington
2. Reading of proxies obtained prior to the meeting; Request additional proxies for those not given from Senators in attendance – Crystal Randolph.

Note: Please send an email to Crystal Randolph (crandolph@valdosta.edu) regarding proxies a minimum of one (1) week prior to the scheduled Faculty Senate meeting or as soon as possible if an unexpected absence needs to occur.

3. **Approval of the minutes of the April 19, 2018 meeting of the Faculty Senate.**
<http://www.valdosta.edu/administration/faculty-senate/minutes.php> (See link here for minutes for all faculty senate meetings).
4. VSU President, Dr. Richard Carvajal: VSU Updates
5. Welcome Newly Elected or Returning Senators:
Evalyn Davis-Walker – College of the Arts
Joe Mason – College of the Arts
Mark McQuade – College of the Arts
Matt Roehrich – College of the Arts

Ryan Smith – College of the Arts
Ligia Focsan – College of Science and Mathematics
Linda de la Garza – College of Science and Mathematics
Peggy Moch – College of Science and Mathematics
Jose Velez – College of Science and Mathematics
Can Denizman – College of Science and Mathematics
Beatriz Potter – College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Attila Cseh – College of Business Administration
James Archibald – College of Education & Human Services
E-Ling Hsiao – College of Education & Human Services
Steven Kohn – College of Education & Human Services
Hanae Kanno – College of Education & Human Services
Charles Talor – College of Education & Human Services
Kwanza Thomas – College of Nursing & Health Sciences
Jamil Davis – College of Nursing & Health Sciences

6. Welcome COSA Chair, Sterlin Sanders, ssanders@valdosta.edu to Senate and encourage Standing Committee chairs to contact him regarding getting COSA representatives to serve on Standing Committees.
7. Introduce 2018-2019 SGA President, Jacob Bell, jacobell@valdosta.edu to Senate and encourage Standing Committees and Institutional Planning chairs to contact him regarding getting SGA representatives to serve on the various committees.
8. Old & Unfinished Business
 - a. Statutory Committee Reports
 - i. Academic Committee – Sheri Gravett
 - ii. Committee on Committees – Catherine Bowers
 - iii. Faculty Affairs – James Archibald
 - iv. Faculty Grievance Committee – Deborah Davis
 - v. Institutional Planning Committee – Mitch Lockhart
 - b. Meeting minutes from the various committees should be sent to FS Secretary (Crystal Randolph (crandolph@valdosta.edu)) to be uploaded to the Faculty Senate website **AND** to the library (archives@valdosta.edu) with “Archives Faculty Senate Papers” in the subject line. Minutes from 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 meetings from the various committees should be sent so these documents can be archived properly. Please label minutes documents as shown in the following examples:
 - i. Technology_Minutes_04-29-2015
 - ii. Academic_Honors_and_Scholarship_Minutes_08-28-2015Thank you for your assistance in getting and keeping our records up to date. 😊
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee: Continue review of University Tenure & Promotion Committee revisions remanded to FA in April 2018.
9. New Business
 - a. Standing Committee Reports:
 - i. Academic Honors & Scholarships – Blaine Brown
 - ii. Academic Scheduling & Procedures – Jennifer Branscome
 - iii. Athletic Committee – Napoleon Bamfo

- iv. Diversity and Equity Committee – Anurag Dasgupta
- v. Educational Policies – Kelly Davidson Devall
- vi. Environmental Issues – Donald Thieme
- vii. Faculty Scholarship – Luis Gonzalez
- viii. Internationalization and Globalization Committee – Cindy Tori
- ix. Library Affairs – Mary Block
- x. Student Affairs – Jamie Workman
- xi. Technology Committee – Attila Cseh

b. Concerns about technology issues and needs across campus brought forward by Gary Hackbarth. See Attachment A. Remand to Technology Committee.

10. General Discussion

- a. Comments on Senate operations – Eric Howington

11. Adjournment

Attachment A

Colleagues,

There are a number of Technology Topics/Issues relevant to the Technology Committee important enough to address in future meetings. My intent is to suggest some broad areas of interest that impact all VSU faculty and include a brief discussion of the problems and propose possible solutions to start a discussion. Clearly there is some overlap. Ideally, our committee would look deeper into these issues and propose faculty and administration policies that standardize policies across the campus.

1. Online Teaching

a. Cheating in the online environment.

- i. Students have the ability to use technology to cheat. For instance, cell phone cameras can be used to take pictures of tests and assignments. In fact, exams can be videotaped in real time or in just a few short seconds and shared later or in real-time.
- ii. We are not sure who is taking a test or quiz in the online environment.
- iii. Students can also be taking exams together and we would not know it.
- iv. It must be assumed that students in online courses are using their textbooks and other line materials as opposed to students taking an exam in a controlled classroom. If you have two sections as an instructor, one online and one in class, the testing environment is different.
- v. Possible solution is to require 30% of grade be determined in a ProctorU environment.

b. Cost of Proctored Examinations

- i. There is a cost to having and staffing campus testing centers.
- ii. While ProctorU is an alternative to in class exams or testing centers it does come with a student financial cost. ProctorU exams, if scheduled in advance, are relatively inexpensive. However, as students delay in scheduling an exam, the cost goes up and can become prohibitive.
- iii. The additional fees charged to online students with gradually disappear over the next three years making online and in class courses cost the same. This has had a negative impact on the budget. However, given that students are not traveling to class or do not have other expenses related to in class classes, the relative cost of ProctorU should not be a factor.

2. Students with Disabilities Access to Course Materials (online and in class)

a. Legal Requirements

- i. Students with disabilities are required to have to course materials available the first day of class.
- ii. Videos and websites should have text alternatives as well as other accommodations.
- iii. There are resources on campus to accommodate students with disabilities but they are limited and require advance notification.

- iv. Some classes use course materials that are updated in real time. This places faculty in an awkward position to create materials in real time.
- v. Faculty are not aware of current legal requirements in dealing with students with disabilities.
- vi. Faculty are unaware of ways to create classes that create materials that address students with disabilities but also better serve the standards classroom environment.
- vii. Technology exists to resolve or better serve our students but faculty are unaware such technology exists or are not consulted on what technologies might best suit our needs.
- viii. Faculty are not involved in technology software or hardware selections.
- ix. Solution would be for IT to engage with the technology on a regular basis with updates about software and software purchases.

3. Academic Freedom

- a. Faculty believe they have the unfettered ability to choose how to run and teach their classroom. However, choices of software and hardware by others limits this freedom. IT security and freedom of access can be limiting factors to what can or should be done in the classroom.
- b. Faculty who ignore testing security place other faculty in an awkward position. Students will elect courses viewed as easier and cheaper based on how an individual faculty member tests rather than what is best for a student's life or future career.
- c. Faculty send wrong message to students if they do not adhere to strong IT access policies.
- d. Industry is increasingly using testing centers for certifications and professional advancements.
- e. Faculty can no longer plead ignorance to the impact of technology on teaching.
- f. University wide procedures and expectations for online learning should be established such as requiring all online courses to grade 30% within ProctorU environment.

4. Technology upgrades

- a. Much of the campus is still using Windows 7 vice Windows 10. Windows 10 was introduced in July of 2015. Windows 7 is no longer being sold or supported, except under limited circumstances, by Microsoft.
- b. Faculty hardware, particularly in the online teaching environment, is dated.
- c. Computer lab hardware is past warranty or approaching end of support dates in some cases.
- d. IT classrooms are being created based on perceptions of need and are not being used to full potential.
- e. Faculty are not being trained or made aware of technology decisions.

5. Faculty Software

- a. Faculty are using registered but self-purchased software to better serve their interests and students wellbeing.

- b. IT has a policy of not allowing personal software yet faculty continue to use because it is needed for research, classroom activities, or just works better than the software provided. For instance, Dropbox works much better than the equivalent Microsoft OneDrive.
 - c. Disconnect between IT Policies and real-world.
6. Software Approval Cycle
- a. There is a long approval cycle to put software like TaxAct software in Accounting classes. We need a faster response time and improved procedures to approve and install software.