

Faculty Senate Minutes

Senators present: Clint Barineau, Becky Becker, Phil Bryant, Katey Hughes, Mariko Izumi, Patrick Jackson, Linda Jones, Michelle Jones, Troy Keller, Dell Miller, Yesem Peker, Amanda Rees, Dan Ross, Brian Schwartz, Kimberly Shaw, Nehal Shukla, Alan Tidwell, Joy Thomas, Neal Thomson, Aimee Vael, Kevin Whalen

Guests present: Amy Thornton, Stephanie Speer, Ellen Roberts, Richard Baxter, Kristen Hansen, Mark Flynn, Clifton Ruehl

- I. Call to order at 3:01 pm
- II. Provost's comments and announcements, made by Dr. Ellen Roberts. Dr. Markwood, Dr. Hackett, Dr. Butcher, and Dr. Rayfield are in Houston for SACS meeting today. Our off-site review of SACS materials has been conducted and we are now preparing for the on-site visit 2/23-25 of next year. The materials submitted to them had 96 standards to address. Of those 96 submissions, CSU is currently found in compliance for 84 standards. We are creating a focused report on the other 12 standards to be submitted on January 12th, 2016. For some standards, we knew we were not finished: for example, we did not submit most recent audit data, because we don't receive that information until this month. We had a very rigorous off-site committee, which we feel is good because the on-site committee will be less likely to find us out of compliance on other items. Our biggest items to address will be assessment of programs and general education.
- III. Executive Officer's comments and announcements On the question from our last Senate meeting about the Chancellor's response to the resolution: we still don't have it, but we should soon. Dana Eckart was on Executive Committee, but is resigning from this position. Since his contract is not being renewed, he is resigning from that role.
- IV. Standing Committees Report
 - a. Women's Issues (*timestamp 1 hr 34 minutes 30 seconds*). Report by Gail Jones. Feb 5th is designated for the Red Dress Project, which promotes Women's Heart Health Initiative.
 - b. Readmission Appeals (5 minutes)- Cliff Ruehl (*time stamp 6 min 05 sec*). The committee has met three times. The report is attached to these minutes as an appendix. In May 2015, the committee heard 15 cases, and readmitted 8 on probation. In August 2015, the committee heard 26 cases and readmitted 20 on probation. On December 3rd, the committee heard 10 cases and readmitted 6 on probation.

Question: What are criteria for denying readmission? In the panel's view: failing to make progress to be ready to come back: plan for major, for classes to take, how they will improve grades, pay for college? Do you link in with the academic advisor? Response: We tell them to meet with advisor, but it is up to them to do so.

Question: Are they automatically denied if they are no-show? Response: Yes, with one more chance to reapply.

V. Old Business

- a. USGFC Representative- Nominations and Vote (time stamp 9 minutes, 30 seconds)

Nominate Brian Schwartz as USGFC representative, (motion by Dan Ross, seconded by Becky Becker). Vote 19 in favor, with 1 abstaining.

- b. Senior Lecturer (*time stamp 11 min, 0 seconds*)

Handout appended to the minutes.

Dr. Roberts highlighted proposed criteria for a university policy permitting promotion of Lecturers to Senior Lecturers. This should likely focus on demonstrated teaching ability thought to be of importance. Departments and Colleges will need to develop standards, afterward. However, currently the university has no policy. Brian Schwartz moved to approve the policy as proposed, and Katey Hughes seconded. Question: What are the benefits? Response: Salary is a somewhat separate consideration, but the recognition is important even aside from that. Question: What process would this body or others be involved with for additional benefits? Response: Senate can make a recommendation to the Provost, but at this point, the question is whether we wish for this kind of promotion to be an option or not at CSU. There are potentially 5 lecturers who would be eligible in the next year or two if this policy passes. They would then go through typical promotion procedures for faculty. So if it is approved here, those colleges and departments will need to come up with standards of excellence that are applicable for Lecturers.

Question: Should we amend this to say that in years with promotion raises for tenure track faculty, lecturers that are promoted should also receive a raise?

Reply: Can we make it a second motion instead?

Question: Is this mostly in a few departments? Response: They are in all of the colleges, not concentrated.

Vote: 20 votes to approve, zero no, zero abstain.

Dan Ross moved that lecturers get same consideration for raises as faculty in other ranks. Alan Tidwell seconds. Question: Does "same consideration" mean the same size of raise? Response: At some level, perhaps, but same value? Is the

raise amount the same from assistant to associate, and associate to full?

Response: Yes, \$5k for both promotions. Revised motion: Lecturers being promoted to Senior Lecturers should also be given pay increases, but the amount is not quantified.

Vote: 20 approve, zero oppose, zero abstain.

VI. New Business

a. CSU Mobile Application - Amy Thornton (*time stamp 23 minutes 20 seconds*).

Flier distributed (will be scanned, attached as appendix). The Distance Learning Committee requested this mobile access for students. We will be doing future upgrades, but CougarView was the main focus in preliminary development. Please encourage students to download and use it. The plan is to add functionality as they get feedback and suggestions.

Question: Will CougarView be more fully functional on iPhone or iPad? Isn't D2L trying to improve? Response: Yes, but not working as well as hoped. Comment:

There are problems with email in D2L as well, because it currently is set up as mail forwarding only. Question: Can emails through CougarView be clearly

labeled as "do not reply" to help us realize they are through D2L instead of getting the bounce back notification? Response: I will research it.

Comment: It would also be good to facilitate students doing course evaluation, make links easier. Reply: There is a separate app for Evaluation Kit, and I will see if they can be linked.

Suggestion: there should be a feedback link for students. Reply: there may be one under University Relations. Go through helpdesk to send feedback.....

Faculty can use the app also, but won't be able to do much editing and other heavy work on CougarView.

Question: Can we also link it to advising as well? It would be useful to facilitate advising during student meetings.

b. Teaching & Learning Enhancement and Scholastic Honors Committees - Amanda

Rees, Brian Schwartz, and Kristen Hansen (*time stamp 36 minutes 38 seconds*)

CSU's Strategic Plan includes a recommendation to recognize faculty staff achievements. TALE met with the Scholastic Honors Committee to determine how to make it happen. According to the Handbook, the Scholastic Honors Committee in charge of the reception, and many of the awards. At the moment, awards decisions are a bit ad hoc. Looking at model having a 3 year rotation to learn requirements of other colleges as well as your own.

Recommendations made by Committee follow:

1. *A name change of the USG Regents' Award institutional nominees to the:*
 - CSU Faculty Teaching Excellence Award
 - CSU Faculty Teaching Online Excellence Award
 - CSU Faculty Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Award.Winners will still serve as institutional nominees for the state-level award, but a name change brings these into better alignment with our other faculty awards.
2. *A new teaching and learning award, the CSU International Educator of the Year Award.*
3. *Changes to the Awards Selection Process*
 - i. That the Scholastic Honors committee coordinate the faculty awards process, including issuing early January calls for nominations and providing clear instructions for the nominating process, with the administrative support of the Provost's office.
 - ii. That the Scholastic Honors committee coordinate the faculty awards process, including issuing early January calls for nominations and providing clear instructions for the nominating process, with the administrative support of the Provost's office.
 - iii. That the two sub-committee structure presently in place for awards selection be maintained; one to select both the CSU Research Award and the CSU Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Award (institutional nominee for the USG Regents' SoTL Award), and one to select both the CSU Service Award and the CSU Teaching Excellence Award (institutional nominee for the USG Regents' Teaching Excellence Award).
 - iv. That the membership of the sub-committees be elected at annual college level meetings for staggered 3-year terms. For this year, we recommend those positions be elected at January college meetings or by electronic means. Members of these selection committees are currently appointed by the deans on an ad-hoc basis.
 - v. That representation for the two sub-committees include two (2) members each for COA, COEHP, and COBCS, and three (3) members each for COLS.
4. *CSU Research and Service Awards:* That the traditional blazer/sport coat awarded for the CSU Research and CSU Service awards be changed to a medallion suitable for wearing

There is space for faculty to take more control, more ownership. First – Honors call for nominations in early January, with administrative support of Provost Office. (CSU Research Award, CSU SOTL Award – nominee for Regents SOTL award, CSU Service award, CSU Teaching excellence award - nominee for Regents, CSU Teaching Online award – nominee for Regents award). Currently a call goes to Deans in December, second reminder in January from Provost Office. Suggest it go automatically to Chairs, attach criteria and due dates. Materials submitted to Dr. Roberts office, completed ones sent to committee members. In the past, two selection committees – some colleges have former nominees on the committee, others do not. Recommend that college membership is voted on by the college, 3 year rotation of membership. Membership will rotate off – 2 subcommittees will make these choices. Real change is that there will no longer be ad hoc committees, but rather committees elected by faculty, and reporting to Scholastic Honors Committee. Will they need to be members of the Committee, since these are subcommittees. Does not need to be a member of both. S.Honors also manages student awards.

Membership: 2 members for Arts, Education, Business, 3 members from COLS. Switch medallion as award instead of the traditional blazer. (get them from Manda for formal statement)

Library not mentioned. It will be added.

How many will require changes to handbook? None, but will need to hold elections.

Honors College membership? No, but no faculty.

How do you foresee streamlining awards nominations, etc? Is there always representation from each college? COEHP may encourage self-nominations in order to encourage the process? If you are going for USG, very specific format.... Perhaps Scholastic Honors could take this on with another group to train faculty for these award applications. Self-nomination should be encouraged in case administration isn't encouraging of this sort of thing. Could also have Dean tell chairs that each award has a nominee from each department, with dean evaluating nominees.

A few years ago, awards submissions for CSU are most important details, with further portfolio development only from Regents award nominees. Often, faculty submit more than is needed in the initial nomination process.

Any word about proposed International Educator Award? Established. But unclear who will be choosing that award winner. CIE will assess award nominees, part of the Scholastic Award ceremony.

Should probably not get in the way of the College nominating process.

Concern: have been involved in picking College winners – can be politics of sharing awards equally among departments – perhaps better to have committee for each award, no history in order to avoid the politics. Better to make selections solely on merit. Response – better understanding of strength of portfolios across disciplines comes over time, strengthens the multi-year approach. Another issue – repeat members of committee. Nominees can't be on committee – difficulty for small departments. University Committee member for 2 years. Having an understanding of different disciplines better in second year... Politics hasn't factored into University department.

Seems that people in the room were experienced faculty, knew how to ask right questions – not sure I see rationale for changing to a 3 year structure.

Dr Roberts agrees – not a way in which current process hinders selection.

Committee members come interested in learning. Hindrance is that there isn't a commitment to look to improve process for the next year.

But there was a request for the committee to review the process, so some may feel that it will be a problem. Nomination process may need to be changed. Also specific request to change awards to split research from creative endeavors – request came from last ad hoc committee since COA doesn't seem to get that award.

Simplest to separate these awards. Committee felt that this was in context of University grant awards.

Perhaps a hybrid solution – 2 year committee to decrease baggage, but aid with education and institutional memory?

This is a big committee. Are there other senate committees that could take on some of this role? What is the composition of the two committees? They are ad hoc – 1 person each college for one; 2 per college for University grants. There are benefits and challenges to developing faculty leadership by providing this kind of opportunity.

Recommended that we table the proposals, come back with them in writing.

Titles of awards may change, as well as whether Dr Roberts or Dr Hansen sends out notice.

Had also discussed that awards nominated for Regents level award, should also have award named as CSU award winner (eg, CSU Teaching Excellence Award is nominated for the Regents Teaching Excellence Award). Endorse this idea at least?

Name changes for awards – motion to approve?

Biggest complaint has been for people who didn't know about them, so send to chairs and deans in future.

Approved

7 December 2015

Motion by Dan Ross, Brian Schwartz seconded.

Vote: twenty approve, one abstain.

Ask that in future bigger items be sent to Senate a week ahead.

Table the rest of the proposals.

New executive committee member election. Linda Jones nominated by Dan Ross. Vote 21 in favor, zero opposed, zero abstain.

Adjourn 1;37:25