

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

**Senators Present:** Paula Adams (Library), Becky Becker (COA), Jan Burcham (COEHP), Josh Eyler (COLS), Susan Hrach (COLS), Brenda May-Ito (COA), Nick Norwood (COLS), Lisa Oberlander (COA), Neal Rogers (COBCS), David Schwimmer (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), Sandra Stratford (Library), John Studstill (COLS), John Theis (COBCS), Paul Vaillancourt (COA), Dan VanKley (COLS), Troy Vidal (COLS), Elizabeth Wurz (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS)

**Guests Present:** Provost Inessa Levi, Brian Schwartz, Chuck Williams (Columbus Ledger-Enquirer), Roger Brown, David Mitchell, Tony Holt, Tina Butcher, Dan Ross, Darryl Holloman, Carole Burke, Erma Banks, Bill Edwards, Richard Baxter, Alicia Tatum, Bill Frazier, Ron Linton, Bob Pardee, John Lester, Warren Church, and others.

**Meeting called to order at 3 pm.**

1. Report from the Provost's Office – no report

Question: We read the message from the President and the Provost, sent on Friday the 16<sup>th</sup>, regarding promotion and tenure decisions. Will those who were turned down for tenure in November be able to reapply in Fall, or now?

Dr. Butcher responded that she didn't know, asked that the question be deferred for the Provost's arrival later in the meeting.

Dr. Hrach stated that the written response sent on Friday, and read part of the response aloud.

*Dear Colleagues:*

*During its meeting on April 5, 2010 the Faculty Senate made three recommendations in regards to promotion and tenure, (see [http://faculty.colstate.edu/senate/P\\_and\\_T\\_Resolutions\\_April\\_10.pdf](http://faculty.colstate.edu/senate/P_and_T_Resolutions_April_10.pdf).) We write to respond to these recommendations.*

*Columbus State University is in transition to raise academic expectations in all the areas, to support our mission to "achieve academic excellence through teaching, research, creative inquiry and student engagement." We agree that higher expectations, commensurate with a position of a best-in-class comprehensive state university, should be put in effect during the Academic Year 2011-2012. We agree that the tenured/tenure-track faculty applying for tenure and/or promotion during the Academic Year 2010-2011 be evaluated for this year by the standards that were in effect during their last pre-tenure, tenure or post-tenure review. We thank all the members of the Faculty Performance and Expectations Task Force, (<https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/faculty-performance-and-engagement-task-force/?AuthEventSource=SSO>) for their work on promoting and supporting academic excellence at CSU. After developing the first version of the document, the Task Force made this version available to the entire faculty through the Web posting, soliciting comprehensive feedback electronically as well as through three public forums. The document also was reviewed, with feedback, by the University of Georgia System Office. The Task Force is in the process of reviewing and incorporating the feedback from both sources. Once the Task Force completes its revisions, and the document undergoes legal review by the Georgia University System Office, we will proceed in accordance with the Statutes of Columbus State University, Article IX, Section 2, to ratify the document.*

*We expect that the departments will conclude their review/revision of departmental standards in alignment with university guidelines by the conclusion of the current calendar year. These will certainly align with any college guidelines that might exist.*

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

*Additionally, we would like to announce that, responsive to faculty input, we will soon begin a search for the dean of the libraries, and in fall 2010 we will begin a search for the dean of the College of the Arts.*

*Going forward, we sincerely hope we can all work together in the spirit of shared governance, deliberative thought, and constructive discussion while pursuing academic excellence commensurate with a university providing world class education and assuring student success through creative inquiry and community, regional and global partnerships.*

*Inessa Levi, provost and vice president for academic affairs*

*Tim Mescon, president*

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification was also issued today: Any endorsed at College level may reapply this semester. Those will be evaluated based on pre-tenure review, or post-tenure review standards. Deans will provide details on process.

The email from Friday also addresses other issues, particularly the work of the Performance and Expectations Task Force.

Comment: So they mean right now. So tenure or promotion would go in effect in August, as if they had been awarded it in January. Response: The salary issue isn't addressed at all.

Comment: So they aren't being penalized? No, they aren't, but that's not stated in the email.

Comment: If they were promoted out of their College, we should suggest that they are promoted. They should not have to resubmit.

Comment: If it just means re-send that folder, that's not too bad.

Comment: But that doesn't mean they will be promoted.

Comment: But that's something we can address as well.

Comment: We can ask, and get the Provost on record when she arrives later.

Dr. Hrach – The email continued with a Thank you to task force. (see above – pasted in its entirety above). The document undergoes legal review by the Board of Regents. It will then proceed with Article 9 Section 2 from the University Statutes to ratify the document. Will review current university standards.

Later in agenda we will hear from P&T Task Force.

## 2. Old Business

### a. Report from Elections Committee

- The committee does not have a report yet, but will suggest electing an alternate for each College.
- At this point, the committee thinks they have a head count for each College.
- New people coming on in May should not vote in elections for next year's Senate officers, but should be encouraged to attend the May meeting.
- Question: Would it still be the case that new senators can be considered as nominees for senate offices? Response: It seems reasonable, but hasn't been discussed by the committee at this point.
- Each Dean needs to know how many to elect, and quickly, since elections need to be held within two weeks.
- The idea of an alternate from each College is that there would be someone available to sit in for senators that are absent, and so probably will attend most of the time.
- The issue of the COLS reorganizing has changed the head count for each caucus. Basic

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

Studies is back in COLS through the end of the semester, and will transition to Provost's Office by May 1<sup>st</sup>. Bylaws specifically say representation is determined by College – so how do we legally have representation for Library and for Basic Studies.

- Response: There are 6 full time faculty in Basic Studies. Library was specifically mentioned in the bylaws. Not clear how to handle Basic Studies.
- Comment: This issue needs to be resolved before the next senate meeting.
- Comment: We need to get the elections underway, so send the Deans the numbers they need to elect.
- Question: There's another issue – what day do we use as the official “census” day that we use for representation?
- Question: One of the things we have been wrestling with is, are there subdivisions within colleges. Health professions representation within COEHP? Computer Science representation within COBCS? Basic Studies within COLS?
- Comment: May not work within COLS, since we are so big. Perhaps Basic Studies should make their own recommendations.
- Question: Is COLS going to elect many people this year? Replacing 3, plus those leaving, but is losing several positions on Senate due to College reorganization. For example, if Basic Studies could choose one person, COLS can choose one person to be the Basic Studies Senator.
- Comment: Or we could put Basic Studies back in COLS and not worry about it. But that's not happening.
- Comment: My concern is that COLS has 3 or 4 positions to elect, and so we need to start that election soon. Response: We will work with Dean Stokes to get the election going.
- If you can determine the minimum number, then get what is needed from Basic Studies.
- Question: Are you recommending that recent members stay in? Response: Yes.
- Comment: Elections committee needs to report to Deans as quickly as possible.

b. Faculty Handbook Committee

The committee has an 84 page document with changes to the Handbook, highlighted. The committee wanted to highlight changes. Only the Faculty Affairs sections of the handbook is currently affected, but some sections are incomplete. What the committee wanted to do was make this document available to Senators, to get input from them. They were tasked to make the handbook more concise, more accessible. There is a lot of information that is direct verbiage from BOR policy. If items are lengthy passages directly from BOR, the committee added a hyperlink to BOR page and deleted the text. There are some sections that even though they are direct quotes, they are important enough to stay written parts of handbook. An example of this is the sexual harassment policy. These are all suggestions from handbook committee. Another example – financial exigency policy. The original wording has been maintained, but changes have been marked with a strikethrough; new information is a yellow highlight; green highlight indicates questions from faculty on the committee. Currently being revised with help of VPAA/Provost office to be sure we aren't overlooking anything, and being consistent to BOR policies.

Comment: Thanks to committee for all the work they are putting into it.

Question: What form should this be put into so that all faculty can look at it? We can send it as attachment over email, or we can post it to Senate minutes web page (available to all that way).

Comment: Dr. Howard has been assisting with the document, which is not currently public.

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

Comment: I suggest it put on the website, and then email all faculty for feedback with link to it.

Comment from Dr. Tatum: Can resend the changes as a pdf file before posting to senate page.

Question: Is there an email address for the committee, to collect the comments from faculty?

Response: Faculty can give comments to a committee member from your college.

Question: Is there a deadline to get this done? Response: Last meeting is the 29<sup>th</sup>, but we can take comments after then – work in progress. We want all feedback we can get. We didn't originally think we would get this far.

c. Feedback about proposed Faculty Executive Assistant to the President

Comment: My 1<sup>st</sup> thought is that having a faculty work in the cabinet is good. My concern is what this reads like is just making another admin, but without the salary or the time. I know what just the extra committee work is like, not to mention all of the other responsibility. I also have concern about the direction of the position – a downward direction, rather than representing the faculty to the president (upward direction). A faculty member who could play a part, preferably a senate person, would be a good thing. How much of this doubles what the Senate Exec Officer does?

Comment: The most crucial issue is, who selects this person? Will the Senate choose? Will they be selected by President? Totally different thing, dependent on unspecified decision.

Comment: Trouble with administrative positions is that now you have a position to lose, and you become invested in the administration. The plus is that the position is an outreach to faculty – but we already have that in Senate. Everything in the job description is what Senate should be doing. Positive outreach, good sign – but it is not needed. Administrative jobs makes you lose faculty credibility. Given the budget, do we need another administrator?

Comment: There is no mention of salary # in the position description.

Dr. Levi responds: The intent was not to raise salary, but just to replace that person's teaching in their department, for the release time.

Comment: It is a 12 month position, so summer would have to be addressed, which would be a de facto salary increase.

Comment: Echo previous comments. We could rebuild a sense of trust lost over last year, but a person really would need to owe job to faculty, either the Senate, or the whole faculty, not the administration.

Comment: Felt that this position just creates another bureaucratic wall, rather than mending fences. If there is money for this position, I would rather see more teaching faculty instead.

Comment: One thing is different than Senate Executive Officer position, and that is that this person reports to President, not Provost. That might be worth something.

Comment: Formal administrative position takes away ability to “speak to power” effectively. The Senate fills that role well. It is good to have official liaison, but that liaison should be Senate exec.

Comment: To address concern, it works *against* us if President decides if person keeps job, but *for* us if the faculty decide.

3. New Business

a. Branding Consultant report draft [copy posted to Senate Minutes website](#)

Presentation by Bob Harty, consultant. The scope of his assignment was to evaluate University perceptions in the minds of key stakeholders; align communications strategy with university strategic plan, suggest approaches for CSU brand, develop long term marketing plan, conduct

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

communications audit of CSU outreach materials, provide consultation on development of PR office strategic plan, counsel office of public affairs, student recruitment and branding issues. Performed interviews with 25-30 key audiences, all of whom were promised anonymity. Great response rates, except from students. No responses from admitted but not enrolled students; 1 of 50 non-enrollees, 3 out of 150 current students.

There is a high degree of familiarity and awareness. Recent developments well known. There is a strong sense of affiliation and investment. Alumni and non alumni alike feel strong connection, pride of affiliation, value to community. Commonly cited benefits are workforce development, student retention and economic impact, cultural arts, teacher, nursing, and business exec placement, servant leadership. Some sense of lack of appreciation in CSU's own back yard. One person commented that it is interesting to watch the evolution of CSU alums – used to be that we trained the worker bees, but now we train the leaders in the community.

Quality communications materials, but students don't remember getting them, signage downtown an issue. High quality academics cited, quality consistently cited, and that faculty are proud of excellence in teaching. All groups talk about high quality of academics, especially faculty and staff. *This is a major point of differentiation that we can focus on.* Faculty have pride in the merits of teaching, came through loud and clear with faculty, alumni, students. Strong town/gown relationship. University built by the community, downtown is emblematic of positive synergistic relationship.

President Brown and Mescon both respected. President Mescon has energy, vision, broad academic experience, essential to a university on the rise. President Brown had a steady hand, was inclusive, instilled community spirit.

Even President Mescon's critics give him benefit of doubt – willing to see how things pan out. (Interviews performed before November 2009).

CSU perceived not as a top tier school, but on the rise, competing with next level schools such as UWG, Valdosta, Clayton State.

There were consistent areas of concern, such as the impression of growth for its own sake. Vision not clearly articulated. However, no one is advocating staying just as is. But worries about quality, student focus and state finances lead to skepticism. Many feel that we are taking a chance on compromising core features of the university.

There are concerns about growth and ambition in a time of significant budget cuts are happening. What is the personality here? Most have a hard time articulating this. President usually personifies a place. This place does not have a strong identity. "What we've been we don't want to be anymore, and what we're becoming we're not yet sure." was a quote from one of those interviewed.

Icons identified: clock tower; cougar; downtown campus. Tower most recognized, but not exciting. Downtown difficult to translate graphically.

The CSU Brand: it is a challenge to brand CSU in a cohesive and meaningful fashion, while showcasing its varied and robust components. CSU logo is very focused. It should be a part of the visual manifestation of the brand. Logo usage should be integrated and closely guarded to prevent diminishment of the CSU brand. With logos – less is more.

Does the image personify quality? Express community relevance, leadership? Express characteristics of a university on the rise? Mean something to alumni and larger community pride?

Don't try to be all things to all people. The brand should be synonymous with our reputation, our major differentiator in the market.

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

Next, the presentation showed a brand pyramid. Foundation (reasons for existence, aspirations); icons (symbols experienced); features (relevant, tangible, verifiable characteristics); benefits (positive end result produced by brand); reward (how brand makes users feel – good student community, close to home, access to faculty); value – principles and ideals; place has to stand for something.

Our Foundation – provides a creative deeply personal and relevant educational experience for students in the Southeast who are looking for the total college experience, to realize their full potential, and find a meaningful career path

Icons – clock tower, cougar, “degrees of success”, “It’s your life. It’s your world. It’s your classroom.”

Features – high quality education, personal relevant educational experience, charming community with metropolitan attributes, creative epicenter, diverse environment

Benefits – quality education, close to home, close interactions with professors, chance to play NCAA sports at high level, many ways to get involved beyond sports

Reward – sense of pride; belonging (close to friends, family); unique – not an educational corporation; accomplishment – many 1<sup>st</sup> generation students, independence (dorms, downtown living), relevance

Value – high ethical values, strong creative environment

Personality – career prep, enhancement, personal attention in diverse environment, creative aspirational culture

Research in the community reflects a very positive image

Areas of improvement – establish stronger sense of community and tradition; concerns about future growth and resource issues.

Key concepts – educational quality and personal attention

Brand catch phrases must evoke emotions; capture moments in a way that evokes CSU.

Developing new logos, new branding template, etc.

Question: Could having larger classes, or those on internet, impact this? Don’t know, but quality is in the eye of the beholder. Make sure quality flows through to it.

Question: How many faculty surveyed? Invited 12, 9 participated. Small #. Not a quantitative survey. Probably represented each college.

Question: When were interviews done? Fall 09, ended in November.

Comment: Results seemed to ring pretty true, but still feel skeptical about results.

Comment: International Education is missing. Response: It was not mentioned by anyone. Not to say it isn’t a selling point – perhaps we aren’t communicating it well. Comment: Best kept secret next to honors program

Question: COLS didn’t have any programs highlighted, basic academics. Only mentioned things with persistent references. COLS would have mentions throughout.

Question: Should we have a logo/slogan contest? Response: Not a big fan of contests, but this research should build to that end result.

Comment: I wanted to share that message you heard about personal attention, small class sizes – as a faculty, I have felt invested in as faculty, proud of that feature of CSU. We receive consistent affirmation from students about this. My observation about that because I and others here are invested in it – and much of the current frustration about current model for growth comes from this.

Response by consultant: All 1<sup>st</sup> semester freshman asked – have any of you tried to see a professor, and failed to do so? Answer was no, not a single one could answer that way.

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

Question: Was diversity of student body addressed? Response: this has changed over the years. Students feel comfortable here, tell their friends about it. Largely but not wholly seen as a positive.

Comment: This presentation will be brought to special designation task forced when they meet – the special designation is different from the brand, however. Who you are and how to market are different.

Followup comments should be sent to John Lester.

b. Bookstore representative - David Mitchell and Tony Holt.

Windows in Davidson will look into expanded bookstore in Davidson. Follett investment paying for this.

Initiating an “early book” program – credit given to students the week before class starts (up to \$600) to purchase books before classes begin. Moving refunds back to end of drop add.

The bookstore will be adding a book rental program. Feel free to contact Tony Holt at bookstore with questions. Handout provided. This is part of our response to cost of textbooks.

Tremendous savings to students – students need a credit card # to guarantee, and a student ID.

There is a national list with 20,000 titles available. This program is now at 501 universities signed up for rental program, so they are expecting the list of titles to grow – list available to students as of 4/21, and email will go out to faculty. Searchable by isbn, title, author. Working on subject search, projected for 5/15. Not searchable yet by publisher, projected for 5/15. Turn in adoptions for fall – ask for a 4 semester commitment (includes summer). There are conditions if the book isn’t already on the title list. Other conditions need to be met.... Encouraged to go to [www.rent-a-text.com](http://www.rent-a-text.com)

c. Report from Performance and Engagement Task Force

Dr. Howard agreed (on the spot) to update Senate. Task Force has met again, gone over all feedback. They have prepared a new draft, that was emailed today to Task Force for check to be sure of adequate representation of what they addressed. This will then be brought to faculty.

Dr. Levi added: The faculty received a communication from Dr. Mescon and myself on Friday regarding further steps for adoption. (See copy of email, pasted at top of document in red). Once the task force is done with deliberation, there is a process for reconciliation. It will be reviewed by the System Office from a legal standpoint in view of official BOR policies. Once that is done, our intention is to precisely follow the statutes of our University for ratification. We will bring to Senate for possible comment, and the faculty as a whole can review it.

Added agenda item, at the last minute. Laurie Jones from Human Resources distributed information about voluntary early retirement options, for Senate comment. Due to the timeline, it is necessary to get details out quickly. HR needs input.

Ms. Jones: First of all, the program is voluntary. Second of all – it’s voluntary. This is the most important thing to remember. The program provides incentive for retirement, in order to avoid involuntary reductions in force. Conditions to be eligible: if you are eligible to retire through ORP or TRS, you are eligible for this program.

Next page – there are 3 incentive options. In order to have this work for next year, have short application timelines (May 5, May 17, May 28).

The document also describes amount of resources designated, which will be given out on a first come, first served basis. Feedback from Senate requested.

Approval voted completed 4/29/10

Comment: If voluntary, how could it be objected to?

Question: How are you getting the word out? Campus wide email.

Question: Are these options consistent with what peer institutions in state doing? Comment: None other in state doing this that we know of, and we are offering more flexibility.

Question: Why different opportunities, and time periods? There is a shorter time for more the lucrative options.

Please keep this closed for now, let all know at same time.

From the Executive Officer: Are there other items of business?

Questions for Provost Levi, deferred from beginning of meeting.

Clarification question: if faculty who were promoted out of the Colleges resubmit materials, will they be on track with those approved in fall for salary increases, other items? Response: Salary has not been determined yet, so no impact has been made. It will be determined for everyone who goes through process at the same time.

Question: Do deans have details on what process will be? Response: In summary, the complete file and copy of personnel documents in effect in department in Fall 2009 should be submitted. So they can just resend the complete package from fall again.

Question: So did we ask whether the package will be acted on for promotion/tenure effective for fall? Response: It will be acted on in this academic fiscal year.

Motion to adjourn 4:53.