

Faculty Senate Meeting  
When: Tuesday, January 10, 2023 ±3:30pm  
Where: Zoom @ <https://fit.zoom.us/j/95744544218>  
Minutes

Senators Present: Faculty Senate President Tolga Turgut (Aeronautics), Ersoy Subasi (Aeronautics), Jordan Poole (Aeronautics), Charles Bryant (Business), Abram Walton (COB), Don Platt (APSS), Razvan Rusovici (APSS), Manasvi Lingam (APSS), Csaba Palotai (APSS), Kenia Nunes (BCES), Mehmet Kaya (BCES), Vipuil Kishore (BCES),

Spencer Fire (OEMS), Kevin Burke (SAC), Angela Tenga (SAC), Patrick Converse (PSY), Gordan Patterson (SAC), David Wilder (BA), Jessica Wildman (PSY), Julie Costopoulos (PSY), William Bowman (LIB),

Senators Absent: Steven Rivet (Business), Angel Otero (Business Online), Luis Otero (CES), Nakin Suksawang (MCE), Hamidreza Najafi (MCE)

Proxies: Vladislav Bukshtynov [for Senator Aaron Welters (MTH)]

Other Attendees: Jessica Ickes

### Call to Order

Pres. Turgut called the meeting to order at 3:30pm. The minutes from the Dec. 6 meeting were approved and recordings of the meeting were acknowledged.

Update on SACSCOC accreditation, rankings and our upcoming 2025 SACSCOC accreditation reaffirmation cycle by VP for Compliance and Accreditation Ms. Jessica Ickes

Jessica Ickes begins by telling the Senate that we are heading into our reaffirmation process for 2025. Please reach out to me if you would like to participate in this accreditation process such as if you have done so in the past as there will be lots of opportunities.

We just returned from orientation which kicked off our reaffirmation in the beginning of December. I want to spend time today giving you a bit of an update on the standards that are related to faculty and to help you understand some of the things that have occurred in the past two years, the request that will be made related to faculty, and how they relate to our accreditation standards.

The accreditation process is to ensure constituents, students, the public, etc. of the quality or integrity of a higher education. This is related to the Federal funding that institutions receive related to accreditors. In a lot of industries, the Federal Government is more involved with the organization and ensuring quality and consumer protection, etc. In terms of higher education, that is delegated to accreditors on behalf of the

Federal Government. When an institution is recognized by a regional creditor, it allows them to do things like access, administer, and award Federal financial aid funds. Accreditation is done by voluntary organizations. We are members of SACS, we have a vote, our President is our voting member and our interim President currently does that. It is founded on the premise of internal and external peer review. For SACS purposes, that is based on self-assessment and the demonstration of compliance with the principles of accreditation which are the standards.

Regional creditors have been the gatekeeper for access to funds. There has been the removal of a distinction between institutional and regional accreditors which happened under a prior federal administration. Historically, you could only be accredited as an institution by your regional accreditor, except in a handful of circumstances, and for SACS that used to be the southern region ±Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Kentucky. The removal of that distinction has allowed institutions to be accredited in other regions.

For our purposes we are accredited by SACs. We go up for our reaffirmation on a 10-year cycle. Here is an update of those key accreditation dates, considered as a countdown to 2025. In July, 2022 we went to the summer institute which is where you refreshed on the things of particular importance. It focuses a lot on assessment and really preparing to do that well including ensuring that your processes are in place to do that well.

The December 2022 orientation occurs at the annual SACS business meeting. Dr. Carvalho, the interim president, Dr. Subasi, the interim CFO, and CJ from her staff, went to Atlanta, along with pretty much a representative from every other organization within that region, to attend the annual meeting. A subset of organizations, those that are up for reaffirmation in 2023, were invited to orientation. This is where they make sure that those folks in those key roles understand what the timeline is and what the expectations are heading into reaffirmation.

Between now and then, what we do is we develop our compliance certification essentially our self-study report. That is our demonstration of compliance with the standards that will be due in September of 2024. Those reports are a documentation of the good work that the institution does to remain in compliance through all of the 10 years, which is why we're very proactive in ensuring that we're maintaining compliance with the standards, and that we're generating that documentation to minimize the pressure, to gather that information as we move closer to that timeline, and if institutions are doing this well, we are regularly generating this information. This is a documentation of our ongoing processes, which is why those are important in November of 2024, when the offsite Committee Review will occur, which an external committee will do it. They first read the report, ask questions and give us feedback. We will respond to that in mid-February of 2025 and we will submit our QEP 3 (our quality enhancement plan, the third iteration of that).

Our on-site visit will occur between April 7-10, 2025. We will have until fall to respond to that on-site report if there are questions or follow-up. The reaffirmation decision coming at the annual meeting in December 2025.

Ms. Ickes next says that she will briefly highlight some of the standards that are related to faculty and if you are interested in a more detailed conversation she is happy to have one with you (at the end of her presentation she gives a link to the standards

and the Resource Manual). Any of those with a CR are considered a core requirement.  
This is



learning information resources that there's appropriate staff, and that faculty and students have access to those resources.

Next, Sec. 14.2 Substantive Change - ``The institution has a policy and procedure to ensure that all substantive changes are reported in accordance with 6 \$ & 6 & 2 & S R O L F \ ' 7 K L V L V D changes at the institution that in some way either be a consumer protection, or change the institution in a notable way that should be approved as it could raise a conflict or concern with accreditation standards.

Next, Sec. 14.4 Representation to other agencies - ``The institution (a) represents itself accurately to all U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting agencies with which it holds accreditation and (b) informs those agencies of any change of accreditation status, including the imposition of public sanctions. '

Ms. Ickes provides a slide that shows the most commonly cited standards and how they progress after the three stages of review. Then a slide for the keys to SACSCOC success which are: 1. Have a policy where appropriate; 2. Follow any written policy or procedure documents; 3. Ensure standards that require regular (i.e., at least every three years) review or as often as policy states; 4. Ensure adequate documentation.

7 K H U H Z L O O E H W U D L Q L Q J V W K U R X J K R X W W K L V S U R F H V available, and some of you will be asked to meet with the visiting team. Please do, and please maqe2 0 612 7 >., at

contact Dr. Costopoulos whom is the chair of this committee and her email is provided under the Faculty Senate webpage under our committees.

2. Academic Policies Committee: Senator Vipuil Kishore said we had a meeting yesterday with the academic policies committee, and there were a couple of issues that we discussed that I would bring it up to the Executive Committee the next meeting, so as a new business item. They have three committee members all from COES so they would like additional members from other colleges.
3. Scholarship Committee: Senator Nezamoddin Nezamoddini-Kachouie said nothing to report.
4. Welfare Committee: Senator Nakin Suksawang was away and no message from him.
5. Administrative Policies Committee: Senator Mehmet Kaya said he had nothing to report.
6. Technology, Resources, and Infrastructure (TRI) Committee: Nothing was discussed as this committee needs to elect a chair.

### 3 U H V L Report ¶ V

President Tolga Turgut begins by saying the over the winter break he was still working this. As discussed in the last meeting, the timeline is being closely followed when it comes to the President's Search Committee, and he is one out of seven members there representing the faculty. He reminds the Senate that there is a webpage where you can with respect to developments about the President's search will be made by the chair of our Board of Trustees which he anticipates they will be announcing the finalists around

Proposed Modification (recommended by the AFTC and has been discussed since October 4, 2022 meeting) to the Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee Charter for endorsement:

President Turgut begins by saying the plan today is to endorse the proposed modification recommendation by the AFTC which has been discussed since Oct. 4, 2022 Faculty Senate meeting. Before this he provided some detailed background.

As you know, all the academic Freedom and Tenure Committee members are comprising of our colleagues who represent each college within our university. They were all endorsed by the Senate, and they made revisions to the AFTC charter with the purpose of further clarity, improving its functionality, and to promote a more impartial charter that guides them. They made this as a recommendation to the Faculty Senate.



Spencer Fire	COES	OEMS	Yea
Kevin Burke	COPLA	SAC	Abstain
	COPLA	SAC	Nay
Gordon Patterson	COPLA	SAC	Abstain
David Wilder	COPLA	BA	Abstain
Patrick Converse	COPLA	PSY	Abstain
	COPLA	PSY	Abstain

Discussion on term limits for senators, committee chairs and senate officers:

President Turgut says he began discussing about this during our last meeting and also in his vision statement he had discussed term limits for the Faculty Senate, Committee Chairs, and Senate Officers. His objective is to have a more diverse and inclusive representation of the senate, because the institution of the faculty senate must be reflective of all the voices among the 300 full-time faculty. He sees serving in the Senate as a senator and president to be an honor and privilege, as he said before, and we must provide this opportunity to all the faculty.

In order to assure this, he thinks, limiting the terms for Senators, Committee Chairs, and Senate Officers by two terms may be a good idea. For example, this would mean serving in the Senate for 6 years as a Senate Senator maximum, 4 years as a committee chair, and so forth. This would promote more rotation among the faculty in the Senate and, as well as other committees. This would lead to a more educated and versatile faculty population who has awareness and knowledge of the Senate, and also the other committees in our institution.

Also, if we can promote a more competitive environment and culture to serve in the Senate then we will have more competitive senator elections in the departments and colleges as well. This will also reflect in making committee chairmanships and senator selection more competitive. For example, other than the year he was elected, President elections recently have been mostly unopposed. The same goes for Senate Secretary, who happens to be the other Senate officer for our Constitution.

He asks the important question: Can you please (asking all the senators who are in this meeting, and those who will watch the recording later on) take this issue of term limits of senators, committee chairs, and senate officers to your constituents and we discuss and possibly vote on it during our next meeting?



Senator Bryant responds: Is there a timeframe for that, Julie? Like when their