

Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

Senators Present: Clint Barineau, Becky Becker, Phil Bryant, Lisa Frander, Tim Howard, Katey Hughes, Mariko Izumi, Patrick Jackson, Linda Jones, Michelle Jones, Krystal Kennel, Yesem Peker, Amanda Rees, Dan Ross, Kimberly Shaw, Nehal Shukla, Joy Thomas, Neal Thomson, Alan Tidwell, Aimee Vael, Kevin Whalen

Guests Present: Richard Baxter, Tina Butcher, Mary Covington, Zane Everitt, John Finley, Mark Flynn, Joseph Jones, John Lester, John McElveen, Eliot Rendlemen, Gina Sheeks, Stephanie Speer, Dee Spivey, Cindy Ticknor, Tara Underwood, Dustin Worsley, Wayne VanEllis

- I. Call to order at 3:00 pm
- II. President's comments and announcements

He stated that he is happy to answer questions about last week's talk.

Update: Institutions in the USG are responding to the reports on hoverboards. The Executive Council and I will be hearing the VP for Student Affairs recommendation about them tomorrow. We hope to have a decision about a policy on hoverboards no later than the end of this week.

- III. Provost's comments and announcements – update on strategic plan (time stamp 1:45)

I thought Gina Sheeks did a good job of speaking about strategic plan. The good news is that we are working on the things that the committee recommended. We are going to commission a look at a 2-year calendar. We are looking at some issues regarding cohesiveness for our two campuses. We are also looking at workload policy, in line with the things we are emphasizing at CSU. In terms of environmental sustainability, we are doing ok, but we can do more. We do a lot of good things here, yet some of them are not connected. We are also starting a new salary study based on *present* data, not older data.

There are a couple other things: we need to take a look with faculty and staff and promotion and tenure policies. We looked at developing those 5 years ago – but 5 years is an eternity in higher education these days. Looking at new faculty coming in, we will see the behaviors from them that we reward. We probably need to look at the grievance policy as well. There are some holes in the current policy, and committees at times need further guidance. The President is securing full time legal counsel for the university to ensure due process, and for other reasons.

QEP. “We solve it!” I love the idea. I love working to develop critical thinking skills in our students. When we ask businesses what they look for in graduates – want employees who can solve problems independently, work with others. If we tie it all together, it will be more effective.

Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

Question from Brian Tyo – If there isn't much money coming from the state, what's the point of another salary study? Response - When we did the last salary study, we did what the committee recommended. But even when there was no new money, we found ways to do *something* through tuition dollars. We want to look to incentivize faculty behaviors through P&T guidelines and salary... What you focus on is what you make a difference in. There will never be enough money from the state, so we will have to do some things on our own. Sometimes you have to look at university priorities and focus on that first.

Comment from Brian Schwartz – As far as P&T guidelines go, 5 years may seem like a long time, but that's a tenure cycle. Last time, they were implemented mid-stream for many faculty, which penalized them. Can we apply new guidelines to those coming in, but not those mid-stream? Hopefully these will not be changing every 5 years. Response: Standards are not changing every 5 years. The process is different now. But the process is currently implemented haphazardly. We hope we look at a uniform process in order to be consistent and treat all fairly.

IV. Executive Officer's comments and announcements (time stamp 11:30)

We need to move the bylaw votes forward. Please look for emails and details to come out in the next few weeks as that moves forward.

V. Standing Committees Report

a. Committee on Committees (time stamp 12:10) – Krystal Kennel

We have not met since last report as a committee. Working on institutional committees, and cleaning up the website. We are also working on changes to these for the faculty handbooks, in order to clean up this document.

b. International Education (time stamp 13:10) – Becky Becker

- We had a busy semester last term. (Handout distributed, and attached in separate file). The theme for the year is "Identity and Belonging". Schedule for activities this term is attached for those who are interested. Last term about 400 students attended events.
- How can we link international learning to the QEP, and to other learning communities?
- As far as certificates awarded, students have completed 3 capstones, and one has graduated. This semester we will probably have 6 capstones, and 6-8 graduates.
- International student orientation was last week, and we have about 120 international students throughout the year.
- In a move to make things more efficient, we are combining Latin American Studies committee and European Studies Committee to create a Visiting

Approved Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

Scholars Committee. We are brainstorming ways to make faculty aware of these opportunities to bring people in for these visiting professors. There is an ad on the back of handout for visiting scholars. Alvarro Perez is a Visiting Scholar in Biology through this program, nominated by Kevin Burgess.

- Internationalizing campus: We have added a multilingual welcome sign at the main entrance. We want flags for Schuster, Davidson, and for Student Convocation to happen in Fall during International Ed week.
- An ad hoc subcommittee to look at international ed strategic plan.
- Sept 28 – Oct 2 will be study abroad week.
- We are trying to implement new software to work with study abroad that will facilitate status of applications, etc
- Tweaking scholarship criteria, currently have 160 study abroad students but that's a little low – we are hoping this will increase this term.

VI. Old Business - none

VII. New Business

a. Student Priority Registration Privileges - Stephanie da Silva

How prevalent is it for students to have priority registration? Nearly 30% of CSU undergrads are allowed to register prior to opening, but only half of those do so. All graduate students allowed, too. Reasons for granting priority registration include: recruitment tool, the curriculum needs of certain programs, a thank you for veterans, and a perk for certain student groups. The impact is that this kept seniors from classes they needed to graduate.

We could whittle priority registration list. We could also do so by establishing open registration to seniors for 12-24 hours before other groups. Are there other avenues?

This issue was addressed by Faculty Senate in Spring 2013. It created a review process: an annual review for each group that had this benefit, but the Registrar left, and the process was never implemented.

Question: Could some of these issues be solved by requiring senior standing for some of these courses, and then add other students later after seniors have a chance to register? You would individually override for juniors as appropriate. Can also list a lower cap, add a few students in afterward. Response: Those solutions are workable, but add to student stress and faculty/staff workload.

Question: Who is a “senior”? Are they graduating, or graduating based only on credit hours?

Comment: For music education – schedules are so compacted and brittle, if they don't get the right class at the right time, it delays graduation.

Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

Comment: To me there are 2 points to consider: how is this affecting RPG? Favorably or not? Can we do something with this to improve RPG? It really is an issue where some could say we are valuing some students in a different way from others. When we define a privileged class of that size, and some are at a greater risk than others.....

John McElveen – If you add all graduate students, that’s a bigger group. But graduate students are typically not the problem here. The numbers are less than 30%, really looking at a little over 2130 students that potentially have access, but 1250 who actually used it, including 209 graduate students. Out of 7000 students.

Comment: Graduate students do compete for many of the senior level courses, since they are dual listed.

Comment: I know that for freshman orientation groups, we set caps so that some seats are saved for later orientation groups. We can do that, but how complicated is it?

Question: Could you examine which classes are the issue, and then just exempt certain classes from this process?

Comment: Sometimes there are curricular issues – like athletes have afternoon practices, honors students have honors courses they must also take, and they need to get certain sections.

Comment: Not holding seats in preregistration anymore – bringing caps back up is manual, and it didn’t happen in a timely way last summer, so we have discontinued that process.

Comment: Is this a necessity or a perk? Also, note that transportation between campuses also cuts out a class period. This also limits what courses some students can take. More students will be making that transition in future, which makes this program a necessity. If we have to set things up without priority registration, may see RPG in some programs go up to 5 years from 4.

Comment: I am thinking of students with jobs that don’t get priority registration. Who is the appropriate committee to examine this, determine where priorities are necessary, make it an even playing field.

John McElveen: The largest group using this benefit is the VA benefit group. For students receiving those benefits (700-800), many are active duty, and many assign their benefits to their dependents. Part of this is also that the VA is the most strict in terms of course taking only towards degree completion. About 1000 active duty, only 337 take advantage of benefits.

Question: Could we have priority only apply to class level? Can we have priority registration in front of others in your class (senior priority registration in front of other seniors).

John McElveen: Some curricular needs like music, and some students with disabilities that have this (priority registration) as an accommodation may need to be considered. Most of the bigger

**Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting**

**11 January 2016
Minutes**

groups have scheduling or disability rationales. Smaller groups, like student ambassadors, are a perk, but most have some sort of timing challenge. When we looked at this before, we suggested a review group made up of the following people: Registrar would chair a group annually, with the Assistant Provost for Undergraduates, Assistant Provost for Graduate and Distance education, Senate Executive Officer, Chair of Academic Standards Committee.

Question: How widespread is this problem? How you deal with this depends on the scale of the problem. Put them in the schedule, with zero cap. Student services adds students to it when they come in for graduation check, not earlier.

Question: How widespread is this at other institutions? If so, what criteria do they use to deal with it?

Comment: I would add the advising center to that review group (Lisa Shaw or her representative).

Comment: At other institutions, we are in line with what other schools do.

Question: Do we have efforts to identify classes that fill quickly and have long waiting lists?

Comment: This is an issue of timing and availability. If departments make projections, they can do a better job of offering courses.

Comment: If you have more students qualified for the class than seats, the real problem is the number of seats.

Comment: Another big issue is when transient students come and try to register now, there are few classes that they can enroll in easily. It is difficult for those students, and for those that failed a course or a program. Often this results in a lost semester for them.

Brian Tyo: It sounds like we have a group that can address these questions.

Question: Does this group represent all the viewpoints? We need a representative from department chairs. Can we add someone from Chairs Assembly?

John McElveen suggests in cooperation with the Provost that we expand that group's membership, look at this issue, and come back to report on the issue.

Neal Thomson moved, Patrick Jackson seconded that the previously approved group, in cooperation with the Provost that we expand that group's membership, look at this issue, and come back to report on the issue. Motion passes unanimously.

- b. Funds for Faculty to Supervise Student Travel (time stamp 54:15) - Stephanie da Silva

Approved Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

No established funding exists for faculty to go with students that had SRACE funds to go to a conference. Our strategic plan encourages producing student scholars. Typical funding sources for travel are the Provost, Departments. Deans vary widely, but mostly funding comes from the Provost and Departments. There is no formal process for this, and no identified pot of funds. There are university grants, but this is used for professor research/travel, and it is not a priority to supervise students. The Faculty Center funding is devoted to teaching and pedagogy. SRACE grants limited to student travel only, \$300 limit, and it is now funding grad students as well, so they cannot fund everything they get. External grants sometimes provide funds. Question: Is there a funding gap? Should the university fund this? Are there examples of this? Response: Yes, often.

QEP funding a source? It is likely that this will be focused on professional activity of faculty member, not mentoring students.

Seems like QEP might be a good fit. There will be course-based stipends for reinventing aspects of classes, project grants. Tend to fund projects, equipment, rather than travel, on the whole.

The QEP Budget is not here yet, but it can be considered.

Every year, Department of History/Geography takes 4-5 students to a conference. Only when you get enough with grants can you pay for a van, travel together. You can't always present something at the same conference as the students. It is a very important tool for those students that want to continue to graduate work.

Looking at QEP, this makes sense there. Perhaps someone can make a project proposal to set aside a pool of funds for student travel supervision.

College of Business has earmarked funds for this sort of thing. If a department lacks the funding, the College gets the department the funding. However, COLS had no money for this. Other colleges replied that they find a way to make it happen. It should be a commitment by the faculty and the department to make this happen.

Talking about priority areas: if we are going to have research as a priority, this needs to be talked about and funded. If not, then that needs to be clear as well.

Part of the problem is that things like Council for Undergraduate Research conferences are interdisciplinary – you could have a student and faculty member both go to something disciplinary and then have the department fund it. It would be totally different to fund the interdisciplinary project. The Office of Undergraduate Research at other institutions would fund this, but we do not have one.

If we send students without faculty supervision, do we have a liability problem?

**Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting**

**11 January 2016
Minutes**

Also sounds like as we put together future strategic plans, we need to align budgets with that: if we value student research, we need resources to help faculty support it.

Please let Dr. Izumi know what would be useful in QEP budget as this moves forward.

c. EAB (time stamp 1 hr 7 minutes)- Dustin Worsley

Education Advisory Board (EAB) – spinoff of company called Advisory Board, in health care consulting for 20 years. They take best practices in health care, apply to higher education. This will be used only at undergraduate level. Part of data improvement initiative launched by Provost in Fall 2015. Complementary to Degree Works. We have a dedicated consultant through EAB.

This seems to center around advising, but departmental advising models vary widely. How does this affect that? Can't answer what the future holds, but there is a national trend to centralize freshman and sophomore advising.

Question: When is it too much? We can't solve the problems for our students – or at least we shouldn't always do so. We ought to have a conversation about where the boundaries are.

Response: College is new, especially for first generation students. We see this as a process to help students grow. The goal is for the students to grow, take more responsibility.

An initiative like this can be limited by how much faculty are involved. What range of number of advisees per faculty advisor, what is the ideal number? If we are much above optimal, we will limit our success.

Question: What is the bottom line cost? Response: He does not know.

Dr. Markwood's Comment – The decision to adopt this was made prior to Dr Markwood joining CSU. However, I have been part of their roundtable before, and they expanded use of it. It is among the best of the country. Georgia System Office encouraged the use of this, based on success at Georgia State University. We know more than 30% of our students are first generation, which is a high risk group.

We can have conversations on how best to use this.

d. Faculty Senate Committee assignment procedures (time stamp 1 hr 33 min) –
Brian Tyo

In the past, we have filled Committees, and the work begins between May and early fall to fill committees in a short period of time. Often, there are many positions to fill.

Perhaps they should start work in March, rather than at that point. Faculty evaluations have been completed late February/early March, seems a good time to check in with faculty while that feedback is present. What are your thoughts on that?

Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

Maybe the summer – some faculty are more present than others. It is a matter of thorough communication, and they can go through Chairs if you do not hear back from a faculty member. Earlier may be a better time.

The downside is that some faculty leave at the last minute, so some may have to be re-done. But this happens anyway.

Now that Committee on Committees fills Institutional Committees, too, this workload becomes even harder. We can reach out to departments to end of semester, find members in a more systematic manner.

We need more people to do the work of the Committee on Committees. Co-chairs, one for Senate Committees and one for Institutional Committees, and we need direct access to the website to post minutes.

One person from each college at a minimum should be on this committee. Were you bringing a proposal to Senate later? Please add this.

We have talked about rotating membership for committees – need to establish this for some.

Is March the right time? This is soon after Spring Break, and a communication in May with a reminder of what was agreed to.

Tim Howard moves, and Nehal Shukla seconds, that the Committee on Committees begin work in filling committee assignments in March, with expanded membership. Motion passes unanimously.

It has been a while since we had a group vet our current committees. Are there some that don't exist anymore? Some that can be better combined? What do you think about ad hoc committee to make recommendations regarding current Senate Committees?

Can we do this without an ad hoc committee? There are some hardworking committees and some that almost never meet. What about a committee of the chairs of senate committees?

Can we just poll the chairs to get a categorization of the intensity of work, whether they should continue to exist?

Motion (moved by Tim Howard, seconded by Dan Ross) to poll Chairs of Committees to get their sense for the need for their work, and to ask about the need for maintaining their committee, and level of activity. The Committee on Committees will take this on.

Question: Would it help to ask how many hours are put in each term? Some meet a lot.

Question: Ask if the mission is clear and useful, not duplicating other work.

Approved
Faculty Senate Meeting

11 January 2016
Minutes

Comment: There are some structures that are quite massive. Often subcommittee work is extensive as well. Ask if they have subcommittees.

Vote is unanimous to approve.

Other Business

- Dr Markwood interjected that he had a report from Tom Helton regarding the EAB cost. To get the system set up costs \$55k to consult this year. If we continue, \$150k/yr. This is paid for out of a UITS allocation which had been set up years before to develop this. If it is not working, we can opt out. EAB is a membership organization. If you look at the website, there is a lot of research funded for their clients, including custom work.
Question: Will it have synergy with Dashboard data, and other work? We don't know, but we hope so.
- One other thing – part of “listening and learning” is talking to the community. Cunningham Center is setting up focus groups throughout that community, including business groups and hiring managers. We are looking forward to getting that information as well, and also hoping for some clues about local industries that we can be working to assist by developing programs.
- Question by Neal Thomson: Having been a chair in the past, I had the impression that only 3-4 faculty fill out chair evaluations, but receive no further feedback. Is there any value in doing this, and should we continue doing so?
Response: Perhaps we can have that committee report next time.