

Approved

Senators Present: Becky Becker, J.Dana Eckart, Elizabeth Frander, Tim Howard, Katey Hughes, Patrick Jackson, Krystal Kennel, Michelle Jones, Amanda Rees, Dan Ross, Brian Schwartz, Kimberly Shaw, Nehal Shukla, Rylan Steele, Joy Thomas, Neal Thomson, Brian Tyo, Aimee Vael, Kevin Whalen

Alternates Present: Troy Keller, Alison Sperry

Guests present: Tom Hackett, John Finley, Abraham George, John Lester, Jon Haney, Richard Baxter, Lisa Shaw, Zane Everett, Tina Butcher, Mary Covington, Barbara Hunt, Laurie Jones, Dustin Worsley, Mark Flynn, Andrea Frazier, Paula Adams, Jennifer Brown

- I. Call to order at 3:00 pm

- II. Provost's comments and announcements

Dr Hackett announced a new event for the year, and distributed a flier (attached) for WinterFest. This will focus on bringing the community to CSU. We are trying to engage the community to come on campus, and enjoy a celebration of the holiday season. There is an FAQ section on the back of the flier.

There is now an initiative to improve data in Banner, and a trial group will be contacted shortly (if it has not been already). One of the issues they hope to address is that if two people go into Banner to pull similar data, they may get different results, dependent on the phrasing of the data request, and we need to be able to trust data here. We need to be sure that academic data, and any improvements to Banner as it gathers and reports the data, goes through the academic "side of the house". As a result, they are reorganizing data entry, which had reported to UITS. UITS, registrar, enrollment, institutional research, Dustin Worsley all on task force to improve Banner, and the Provost chairing it. The committee is also completely auditing Banner data, and looking at the reports. They are soliciting information from all those who use the data: if you have input into this process, you are asked to send them to Sri or to Wayne VanEllis. We will find issues that need to be solved – want to have honest discussions to make the data system better.

We have a task force from the strategic plan commission that is assessing our progress on it, at the request of President Markwood. We can do a better job assessing the strategic plan, so let's begin the process of assessing it, and use that to plan the process of developing the next strategic plan. This is a

Approved

good way to determine where we are as an institution.

III. Executive Officer's comments and announcements

a. USGFC Report

The USGFC met on October 24, with Brian Schwartz and Brian Tyo attending. All but one institution attended. Two major themes of discussion at the meeting were salaries and communication. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor were there.

One thing that did transpire: Hughston Davis has issued an open invitation to any USG institution to have him visit. Dr Markwood would like to invite him to do so, in order to meet with faculty but would like to have some real questions that the Vice Chancellor can address with us. This can be a good opportunity to interact with him. One potential topic: how does CSU fit into new initiatives coming down from USG now? We would be open to aligning a visit from Davis with a senate meeting, but would depend on his availability. There is no stated format at this point. He (Davis) seemed open to meeting with Senate particularly, but he could meet with others as well.

Another possible question to address to the Vice Chancellor: twice they have mentioned our possible growth target being 20,000 – how are they projecting that number of students? Is there a possibility of consolidation? For that matter, what are current consolidation plans for USG? Schools in southern Georgia seem to be struggling more than northern Georgia schools. There are currently no plans to take consolidation off the table, but no concrete plans for the next round yet.

It would perhaps be better to have a visit from the Vice Chancellor once we have a better feel for Dr Markwood's vision for CSU.

Other priorities for discussion could focus on faculty academic matters, such as expansion of ecore, and the comparison of assessments between ecore and our courses? These need to be on the table with the Vice Chancellor. These will impact how we would grow to 20,000 students.

Question: We had a resolution for the USGFC at the beginning of the year – was there a response? The response was sent to Ft Valley State, 10 days prior to meeting via mail, but mail delivery has been irregular there, and it had not yet been received as of the time of the meeting. There was no discussion of the resolution in the meeting.

IV. Standing Committees Report

Approved

a. Diversity Programs and Services Advisory- Paula Adams *19:30 time stamp*

Handouts attached.

The Diversity Programs and Services Advisory Committee worked to put on the annual CSU diversity conference in April 2015. This was done in conjunction with the Legacy Program in the evening – merged the two conferences into one. They had a great response from CSU faculty, students, and folks from the community. There were breakout sessions on LGBTQ issues, same-sex marriage, and there are programs every month in the Diversity Office. The Committee would like to work more with faculty and staff – few workshops are currently held. They will start up next semester with training sessions for faculty/staff. They will also host Diversity Forum on 3/9 or 3/10. They have also met with Chairs Assembly and Deans Council, and they would like to encourage faculty to attend.

David Mitchell has worked to get donations/sponsorships to make this effort self-sustaining. Waffle House, Piggly Wiggly, and potentially Aflac will sponsor the Diversity Forum. They are also trying to get Mayor Tomlinson, the Muscogee County School District and others involved as well.

If you would like to facilitate a session, please contact the Committee.

b. Honors Education- Andrea Frazier (5 minutes) *28:45 time stamp*

The Honors Program has completed the transition to the Honors College. Scholarship applicants to the Honors College must have 3.5 GPA or 1200 SAT with combined 550 minimum math/reading, or 26 ACT score. Only one application needed for admission to Honors College and scholarships, instead of two applications as was the case in prior years. There will be four rounds of interviews for scholarships.

In order to be eligible for a Presidential scholarship: maintain full time status as well as having a high GPA and test scores.

The Honors College is also exploring the creation of internships in Atlanta, New York City, and more.

There is currently a discussion about whether a student can be designated Honors or High Honors at graduation (with High Honors designating a student that completes a thesis). Some students do not complete thesis, and then currently they cannot get an Honors designation. Thesis work can conflict with field experience courses, and the requirements can be intimidating. The Honors Advisory Committee is exploring alternatives, soliciting ideas from departments, discussing with Honors Advisory board, and working to make these graduates competitive.

Exit interviews will be added to find out why students leave program without completing the Honors degree.

Dean Ticknor is also examining whether student status is dependent on multiple factors, and is exploring dual designation as a factor in completion.

Question: Should we raise the bar on SAT scores for qualification to the Honors College? Would this enhance

Approved

the program? These scores were the scores we started with for Honors Program 15 years ago. The quality of students that are admitted to Honors has been increasing, and effectively the minimum GPA for scholarship awardees was a 4.0. And the long-term goal is to have 6.5% of CSU enrollment in Honors, but we are currently at 4%.

Question: Has anyone looked at those majors to see if there is equal representation among colleges, departments? She believes so, and will send Fact Sheet from Honors College, which includes College information.

Question: Can departments nominate students to the Honors College? They would definitely be interested in that, in order to increase participation.

The study being done on Honors attrition rates indicates that 30% of those who initially enroll in the Honors College graduate with Honors. However, this is complicated. Is thesis a good fit for all students based on majors? Can we build on other capstone coursework? Should this requirement evolve? Criteria across the nation includes High Honors, so the committee is considering if we should bring this designation here for Honors College, have thesis option be High Honors? We don't want students to walk away from Honors solely based on the thesis requirement. We can also ask students who complete why it was that they completed their thesis, instead of just talking to leavers.

Do you know number of those who graduate, from those who enroll? I believe 90%, is on Fact Sheet.

Some are moving on to graduate school before thesis complete, using CSU as a feeder to other schools.

Email Andrea Frazier with questions. Attach the Fact Sheets in the Appendix.

c. Information Technology Utilization- Mark Flynn *44:10 time stamp*

Handout attached in appendix. The Information Technology Utilization Committee has met 2-3 times a semester, to advise and guide UITs, provide feedback and promote use of technology, to promote technology adoption on campus. Currently their major work is developing a new strategic plan. UITs is now using project management software. The committee also has subcommittees: one assisted with review of vendors proposing new data storage solutions.

d. Retention, Progression and Graduation- Jennifer Brown *48:20 time stamp*

Handouts attached. There are recommendations from CCG and RPG committee, including data, in the handouts. The committee wants to set retention rate (from first to second year) to be 75% by 2020, amounting to a 1% increase each year. They also propose a (six-year) graduation rate goal to be 36% by 2020.

Dr. Brown received thanks from Provost Hackett for taking the task of chairing of the committee on.

Question: This issue was discussed in strategic planning. We have seen upticks in retention rates from 1st to 2nd

Approved

year recently, yet the 6 year graduation rate is still between 30-33% each year. What are your thoughts about that? From COEHP data, change of majors is often an important factor. Transfers (to or from CSU) also factor in to these values. There is a real push to track these rates within USG instead of just here at CSU.

Question: Perhaps this could be something to ask when Hughston Davis visits?

There is also a National Student Clearinghouse, so you can track students' data nationally.

Question: What would advice be to the Provost – what are the things that the institution should think about?

Improving the classroom is the first priority. We are a commuter campus, and students see this as a job, but we are not their first priority. Change the classroom environment, change how we grab their attention.

Question: How do we compare against similar institutions? We are comparable. But many of them have football, etc. We lack in the social integration factors, so we have lower retention. It's just the nature of this type of institution.

There is improvement after freshman year, but not as much afterwards? Why are graduation rates up and down? Is it possible that an area of improvement is due to the establishment of freshman learning communities? Why don't we follow with a second semester, or perhaps a sophomore learning community? Those classes are smaller. Faculty student contact matters greatly in student retention.

Question: The data shows that there are pretty large differences between male/female graduation rates. From the literature, do we know what's going on there? Why are males doing so poorly? Males getting jobs to support their families is what literature says is a primary reason. Can institutional research look into this?

USG had a Diversity Summit 2 weeks ago, and reported that the male population enrolled is decreasing overall (2-3% difference) system wide. Many males also transfer out.

We should look at progression rate data. We can potentially answer many of these questions. Can we also look at problems for registering for classes? Student finances? We would like to see data from year to year why students leak away, and where the holes are?

Question: How do you look in a department to ascertain if you have the right combination of courses to get students to matriculate, and to graduate? We don't know enough to know when they change, and why they do so. Students are harder to track within a program, than as an institution.

We don't know why students leave, and we need to find a way to get hard data. While they are here, we can collect data on problems students have while they are here, and use that data to try to make conclusions. Many students decide to leave in summer. However, we can at least make tentative conclusions that we can try to act on.

Question: What *should* our graduation rate be?

Lisa Shaw replied: We do have some data. A survey is administered when they drop all classes via the electronic menu, asking them to tell us why they are leaving, and a staff member follows up. Students tend to leave for financial aid reasons, for medical issues, because their major is not available, for military reasons.

Approved

Often students have more than one reason. If advising finds financial aid issue, they contact the financial aid office.

Comment: Students aren't always good at analyzing their own problems. Reply: But their perspective is still important in understanding why they leave.

People's goals are not what they were 2-3 decades ago. We need to find a way to respect that. A high percentage of students do not have any intent to complete a degree these days.

The committee is looking for an endorsement of these goals: by 2020, 75% retention rate to 2nd year; graduation rate to 36%.

Are there any sub-goals within demographics? Not at this time.

Do you have the data you need? Yes.

Vote: all in favor. No nay, no abstain.

V. Old Business

a. USGFC Representative - Brian Tyo *1 hr 12 min 45 sec time stamp*

Handout attached. We made some adjustments in this document based on last meeting's discussion.

Keep in mind that no matter who is being considered for this position, the Faculty Senate will vote on who will hold this position.

Friendly amendment: reinsert the positions of Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean as those that are not eligible to hold this role. (moved by N.Thomas, seconded by D.Ross)

Vote:18 yes; 00 no; 0 abstain.

Please consider who you would want to nominate. We will move forward with nominations in December.

Question: Where does the promotion of lecturers policy stand? We can be prepared to bring that forward next month.

Motion to adjourn at 4:40 pm.