

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

Members Present: Linda Jones, Joy Thomas, Becky Becker, Dan Ross, Patrick Jackson, Amanda Rees, Kevin Whalen, Brian Schwartz, Katey Hughes, Krystal Kennel, Michelle Jones, Mariko Izumi, Nehal Shukla, Tim Howard, Alan Tidwell, Dell Miller, Shamim Khan (alternate), Kim Shaw, Brian Tyo, Phil Bryant

Guests present included: Wayne Van Ellis, Stephanie Speer, Dustin Worsley, Zane Everitt, Andrea Frazier, Tara Underwood, Lisa Shaw, Stuart Rayfield, Kimberly McElveen, Tom Hackett, Tina Butcher, Elliott Rendleman, Casey Hergett

- I. Call to order at 3:02 pm
- II. Executive Officer's comments and announcements (0 min 4 seconds timestamp)
 - a. COEHP move

Informational item: The majority of the academic units, but not all, in COEHP are moving downtown when the new building is completed. The Departments of Counseling and Foundations, Nursing, Teacher Education are moving. However, HPEX and UTeach are staying on main campus in their current locations.

- b. Public Archiving of Senate-Presidential Communication

See example table below. This will have a docket number, a linked senate action item, date of action item, and presidential response. The numbering system will be based on date, then number for item. 201501, etc.

Example table:

DOCKET NUMBER	FACULTY SENATE ACTION ITEM	DATE OF ACTION ITEM	PRESIDENTIAL RESPONSE
201602	Standards of Excellence-Amendment	February 12, 2016	
201601	Statutes and Bylaws-Amendment	February 12, 2016	
201501	New Statutes and Bylaws	August 12, 2015	

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

Dean Flynn suggested burning a copy periodically and submitting to David Owings in CSU Archives for a true archive, as web sites are not truly archival.

Secretary of the Faculty Senate would need to be point of contact to maintain this.

Is there a timeline for this? Should these items be held for a while before they are posted? These are Georgia Public Records, and have to be provided on request, so there is no need to sequester them.

c. Voting Procedures for Faculty Senators (5 min, 40 sec timestamp)

We will need to be electing a new Executive Council, and new members to the Faculty Senate. New members need to be elected, and the number and distribution is marked in yellow in the spreadsheet displayed (*see attachment*). Also Dell Miller will be retiring at the end of the year, so there will need to be a one year replacement for her position.

Significant committees need to be considered as well. Some members will be rotating off, and some members will stay. We will need to think about those memberships. The Committee on the Evaluation of Administrators should be doing its work soon as well.

The Elections Committee is in charge of balloting in the Colleges. Timeline: New senators should be expecting to attend the Senate meeting on May 2. Not all colleges will meet in April, so elections will need to take place outside of normal college meetings. The procedure can be determined by the Elections Committee, within the constraints of the bylaws. The spreadsheet will be sent out to the Elections Committee.

III. Standing Committees Report

a. Faculty Handbook Advisory- Nick Norwood (21:27 timestamp)

We are presenting some recommendations for changes to the Faculty Handbook. *Summary of proposed changes attached in the Appendix.* Many of the changes are resulting from typos that were found, and one place in the Handbook where the Executive Officer is referred to as male. There was also a curriculum change issue.

It was proposed that he modify item number 4 so that it reads “current curriculum database” rather than CurricuNet, as we may switch databases at times.

There was a question as to whether the USGFC Representative should be listed under elected committees, since this is a position for an individual rather than a committee. Can this be listed in the section with the Executive Committee? Make it clear it is not part of the committee.

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

Dan Ross moved that we accept the changes as modified. Mariko Izumi seconded.

Student Tech Fee Committee should be an Institutional Committee, not a Senate Committee, and is required by the Board of Regents. There is already a Tech Fee Advisory Committee, so this appears to be a change of title. This is, however, different from the IT Utilization Committee, which is a Senate Committee.

Vote: 19 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstain. Motion passes.

b. Honors Education- Andrea Frazier (10:36 timestamp)

Honors

The Honors College is interested in pursuing alternate capstones to a Thesis. We had asked for some ideas at Faculty Senate previously, and from the other Colleges. Alternatives are already built into some HONS courses and majors such as HONS 4901/HONS 4902. Internship experiences have been proposed as a course, added on to the alternatives to thesis, and made a year long. This was approved by Honors Education Committee, and sent to the University Curriculum Committee. They are testing what options students are interested in.

The Leadership and Career Advising track will result in letter of endorsement in leadership and team building for portfolios. The path starts with the ITDS 1779H course. Courses would include HONS 3000 courses in soft skills, team building, work/life balance, global perspectives, and service learning. The students would also be expected to attend a leadership conference and may participate in leadership development seminars offered by the Cunningham Center. The Committee approved this track. One course will be piloted. However, the Committee is still debating how we include transfers, and how do we align to the rest of the Honors curriculum.

The Committee decided to revise transfer process to include an essay.

The Honors Advisory Board encouraged Honors students to be involved in internships. Dean Ticknor proposed adding a research paper about the Internship experiences, creating an alternative to the Honors Thesis, through HONS 4698 + HONS 4901 + HONS 4912. This will be offered soon, to see if there is interest in this option. One of the reasons for an internship was for students interested for a professional experience as a complement. Not a requirement, just another option, keeping the rigor of the Honors experience.

c. Information Technology Utilization- Mark Flynn (15:36 timestamp)

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

Report handout. Met once on 2/29. Dr Flynn reported on plans to upgrade CougarNet, and a data storage upgrade. Announce new cyber security lab to go with new program. There was also a discussion of need to standardize clickers. Clickers commonly used on campus are Turning Point and iClicker, and this committee is trying to thrash out a policy to adopt just one.

Will clicker group investigate flipping this just to phones? They are investigating that option.

I think continuing to use clickers we buy will go against current trend, since phones will be cost-free for students. Hopefully by the end of the process we can conclude something along those lines. Can do this to coopt phone use.

This breaks down a barrier between academics and real world, and makes what we do more real.

There are plenty of opportunities to look at the technical aspects. But some cell phones don't work in many buildings on campus – so we should consider this.

IV. Provost comments:

President Markwood is in Atlanta at a President's meeting today, but has asked Provost Hackett to share his thanks for everyone's participation in Investiture Ceremonies, and the support from the faculty. Special thanks go to Stuart Rayfield for coordination of the festivities.

As part of the investiture events, there was an evening reception, and Dr Hackett was delighted to see Kevin Whalen and the faculty jazz outfit perform. They were wonderful!

If you get a chance to see Tartuffe directed by Becky Becker this week, it is really a funny play.

V. Old Business

a. LEAP- Tom Hackett and Dennis Rome (32:25 timestamp)

Dr Hackett stated that he felt bad that at the last Senate meeting, and that he felt he had done a poor job of relating what the LEAP initiative is all about. *presentation in appendix from 4/4 meeting.*

Much of what we already do ties to LEAP Initiative ideas. However, they understand faculty reticence to adopt a new initiative.

Nothing will cause us to rework anything we are doing now. It is an affirmation of our work. It is not unrelated to QEP, the Faculty Center, First Year Experience. It is not inconsistent with Tower Day, or undergrad research.

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

LEAP is based around a set of educational outcomes, that we say are germane to learning in the 21st century. It promotes high impact educational practices, and authentic assessments.

If we are already doing it, why participate? If you are doing your own thing, when it comes time to ask the state for resources, the question will be asked why we aren't participating in state initiatives? It puts us in touch with a national community committed to these ideas, and is useful to tie into national standards.

LEAP can provide workshops, paid for, to aid in problem solving (for example, with enrollment dip) and provides experts and information to help us work through issues, and to find ways to get data and determine solutions.

One thing I saw is that student signature work: all students do it (I don't think we do that) and interdisciplinary - often we are within department only. The importance to society of studying basic research questions is emphasized. Often research can be more about training students to do research than in solving society's problems. Response: each institution does these things in ways that work for them. This should be faculty driven. One of the President's initiatives is to work with MCS D to improve instruction across the board. We don't think an imperfect match is a reason to opt out of LEAP. The way I understand it is as a capstone experience for students. We hear students have good technical skills, but poorer soft skills. This is not about accreditation so much as generally affirming these principles.

Much of this reminds me of things we have instituted over the years, such as first year experiences and international learning communities. I hope we can use this to integrate things, rather than having stacked programs. Requires us to branch out and cross borders, but a chance to connect good programs. Response: making the connections is important to our students, and to the core.

We do that in a certain way, but what if we have majors to which this would not apply at all? In practice, what happens at the school once this is initiated? Response: A group will not come here and monitor us. This is a clearinghouse of resources. They are not intrusive. They will sponsor workshops. They offer assessment of problem areas if we want it, but do not mandate this.

This is all about self-reflection. You identify places to help students. They offer best practices resources based on what you identify.

But the presentation slide said that they would do assessment to help with problems.

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

Response: No, you do the assessment and they will facilitate what you determine you want help with. LEAP promotes solutions, not requires or dictates..... Does that put some areas of the university above others? If LEAP promotes cross-disciplinary inquiry, that's great. Did you look at the LEAP website? That gives a sense of what is available for resources for faculty. This helps us teach in a way meaningful to students, serve as a general resource.

Maybe one concern I have is this: who does something for nothing? Does anyone gain by this? Response: This could open us up to a community of learning, and potentially external funding. But LEAP is a branch of AAC&U, so the dues we pay to that organization fund LEAP initiatives already.

Practical example: we just received email about what local employers want to see in our students, but how do we integrate these into the curriculum? Those are some things, not just in the core, to be sure that they get the skills they need.

Would it be fair to compare this to membership in a professional organization? Yes, good analogy.

Aren't we already a member of AAC&U? Yes. This would just be a statement bringing us more in line, be a statement of support within Georgia. It would align us with USG policies, and better position us when we want resources from BOR.

Website supported by Leadership fund for Liberal Education.

Amanda Rees moved, and Becky Becker seconded the motion, to support LEAP membership.

When did liberal arts education become liberal education? Response: That's a very different definition of liberal. Very long-lived definition of multiplicity in the core. It is certainly much a part of how education works K-21. It is not appropriate to put it in a political context.

18 in favor, 0 against, 1 abstain. Motion passes.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z9Bg7sAFJsA>

b. QEP Update- Mariko Izumi (1 hr 13 min timestamp)

We had our 1st QEP event – a problem solving competition for students last week as part of the Investiture. We had 110 people attend. Judges chose the winning

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

solution, which was using tablets/foot pedals to minimize paper used by music students. We hope to implement their solution.

Assessment. SACS asked us to revise an assessment area. It is a challenge to have a consistent data point at the institutional level. There is no direct access to this data. Two ideas are being considered. We could modify course evaluations. This will provide more detailed data. We understand that not all classes address this specifically. Most of what we teach does address these, even if not explicitly.

We can also add questions from a cognitive learning scale post test. We are planning to do a longitudinal study to track students across their 4 years as they progress.

Please take this idea back to your colleagues, ask their feedback and concerns, send them to QEP. The pretest happens before the course, or could be up to QEP faculty. The University is interested in the post-test, can embed in evaluations.

Do we know that students will differentiate between taking a class and participating in it?

It seems you want to evaluate QEP, but this will be part of each person's evaluation. It will double the length of the evaluation, and the questions are redundant as well. I am really concerned about changing evaluations in such a big way. This becomes an evaluation of the faculty instead of student learning. If we leave that to chairs, faculty may now be evaluated on things that are not relevant to course goals. Response: Generally, chairs will understand those differences.

The mean of means does not make sense at end of evaluation either – not all chairs recognize that.

Some courses will not have the same level of problem solving, and instructors should not be punished for that, particularly in college committee for P&T review.

I think we miss an opportunity to look at dialog with students about course evaluations. We can provide a short, clear reflection on evaluations that can address chair, college committee. We do not have to be passive in this process. Susan Hrach would be happy to work with evaluations committee to inform the process. Encourages faculty to be less passive.

Current evaluations do not reflect 21st century teaching. It often feels 19th century.

I'm not sure what is being assessed by current evaluations. Benefit of CLS is that it helps us look at cognitive learning. If not attached to course evaluations, it would be

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

helpful to have an assessment tool that is embedded, or where else can we put it in order to gather data?

We could add these, but keep the overall number of questions the same.

It seems to elevate the mean we just argued is meaningless.

The separation between faculty and programmatic evaluation is important. Can we make that part of the architecture of the evaluation? We shouldn't expect students to be outstanding as freshmen. How can we evaluate a program in a way that is genuine and authentic? Additional surveys may be better. A two part survey may not be valuable to QEP, as these responses may be tinged by like/dislike of their instructor.

Purpose of one to evaluate instructor, one to evaluate QEP – students and faculty and administration won't do that differently.

If this is added to evaluations, it also makes the QEP less voluntary.

We will take this to committee for further work. Please share and send her feedback within next two weeks.

Will you send this out to all? We are waiting for committee first. If you want faculty feedback, why not send it out? First, talk to students.

Attach handout

VI. New Business

a. CougarNet Portal- Casey Hergett (1hr 36 min 44 sec timestamp)

Attach handout

Mr. Hergett presented information on the upcoming portal redesign and upgrade. Cougarnet is not changing its name even though we will no longer be paying for an external LMS. He wanted to be clear that this is not UITS saying use it or else. The process of gathering usability information is important. Thanks to Dean Flynn, John Lester, Dr Easton, Dr DaSilva: he is working with them closely to talk about this process. We will have focus groups for data gathering about 3 main areas: 1. usability of the portal. Use on mobile device, customization. 2. Focus on content: info on what you do/do not want to see, new features you would like, single sign on. 3. The portal should be data driven. Data should be unique to you: how do we deliver information to you? 4. We should be leveraging information in the data trust? Example: building a risk profile for a student. Use business intelligence,

Approved Minutes Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

predictive analytics. Think about what would be valuable to you in what you teach, and the students you advise. Continuous improvement is important. There are ways for everyone to provide feedback, and to create a prioritized list. They have a beta portal to be on the edge, to help test new functionality. When will faculty focus groups be? They are “shamelessly” asking for volunteers, and trying to wrap up focus groups by end of April.

It sounds great that we are building this, but this could also be really rough if the deadline is April. Is this being forced on us? Are they decommissioning the current LMS? Should 6 months to a year be more appropriate? If it doesn't work perfectly right away, this will be a problem. This date is somewhat of a soft start. The Ellucian license will be de-supported at USG level. We will have to check what that means, since that comes due in September. We need to see if we can get an extension for a year or two.

Summer grades due August 8, and the soft start of new system is on August 1? We would prefer an extension, because the timeline seems too short. Even if it is operational, no one will be trained.

Why did we choose to build ourselves instead of purchase a system? The options are: pay for a product you have to customize, use open source software you customize, or build your own system. The effort to customize would have taken more work than starting from scratch. There are really good tools out there, and we felt we could get what we needed faster and better than if we customized. So there is an incomplete beta version now? Yes, but they are not comfortable sharing that with the entire campus yet. However, the link here will allow senators to investigate.

cougarnetbeta.columbusstate.edu.

This system should be more intuitive than we have now. No feedback from faculty or students yet, but we already have a beta system? The content hasn't changed, but the usability has. We want to bounce that off focus groups, and get feedback. Feedback so far has been very positive. No official concerted requirements gathering initiative up to this point.

Another thing: there is some familiarity when using common systems. Why create something totally unique when others standardize? Students come from other schools to us, as do faculty.

Approved Minutes
Faculty Senate Meeting

4 April 2016

- b. Other new business (1 hr 58 min timestamp) Women's Advisory Committee will report next time. We have asked them to report on salary differences, if any, by gender; any harassment policies at CSU and how they appear to be working, FMLA policies and how they are applied across campus.

Also: Affordable Care Act requires a room for nursing/lactation as part of the law. But we do not have such a room anywhere on campus except for in Ilges Hall, and women have been told to go across campus, or use the restroom.

Adjourn 5:03 pm