

Senators present: Clint Barineau, Becky Becker, Phil Bryant, Dana Eckart, Lisa Frander, Katey Hughes, Mariko Izumi, Patrick Jackson, Michelle Jones, Linda Jones, Krystal Kennel, Dan Ross, Brian Schwartz, Kimberly Shaw, Nehal Shukla, Neal Thomson, Alan Tidwell, Brian Tyo, Aimee Vael

Alternate Senators present: Jeanine Fittipaldi-Wert, Troy Keller, Chris McCullough

Guests included: Stephanie Speer, John McElveen, Wayne VanEllis, Alicia Bryan, Linda Hadley, Ellen Roberts, Eliot Rendleman, Tina Butcher, Tom Hackett, Amy Thornton, Annette Brown, Mary Covington, Dee Spivey, Mark Flynn, Laurie Jones, John Finley, Dennis Rome

- I. **Call to order at 3:02pm**
- II. **Executive Officer's comments and announcements**
 - a. Dr. Tyo attended a new learning model symposium at USG with Dr. Rome, Dr. Flynn and a few others. The symposium focused on new learning models, particularly focusing on adult learners. Also focused on competency based learning. A big push for online learning, which can be a bit concerning, was also a prominent strand.
- III. **Standing Committees Report**
 - a. Committee on Committees (audio timestamp 02:11)- Krystal Kennel
The committee has filled administrative and shared governance committees at this point. If other committees need members, please notify the committee of that need. Next, they will look at institutional committees. The committee has distributed mission of committee on committees, and are hoping to move forward with that. Motion from committee to formally adopt is approved.
 - b. General Education (audio timestamp 04:20)- Eliot Rendleman
Camille Hassenplug is working with ETS on a new instrument to be used for general education assessment. Half of graduating seniors will do this instrument, and half will do the senior survey. 174 total students have applied for graduation.
 - c. Student Research and Creative Endeavors (audio timestamp 5:15)- Alicia Bryan
There are two rounds of grant applications each year. For Fall 2014, proposals funded totaled \$7952 from 32 initial submissions. Of those, 24 were sent to chair, and the committee reviewed 20. In Spring,

Faculty Senate meeting

approximately \$12,048 of grants were funded, with 53 reviewed submissions.

For fall 2015/2016, SRACE was allotted \$20,000. There were 69 submissions, of which 56 went to chair, and 55 were reviewed. There is a tight budget, and after fall awards, approximately \$4000 is left for spring grants. The committee is looking at revising the review criteria, to divide it between research, creative expression, and travel requests. Other revisions include working out kinks of 100% online submission.

For this round, 40 awards were from COLS, 7 in Turner College of Business and Computer Science, 1 in Honors College, 3 in COEHP.

Proposals are due on the first Friday in September and first Friday in February. Award notifications are sent to applicants on the last Monday of the same months.

The committee is also considering offering a workshop for faculty and students looking to apply for SRACE funds, to address possible changes to application process. The committee is also creating a step by step guide as well.

In past, sometimes the committee has awarded over the \$300 stated in the award call, but they are looking to pull back to stated limits. The committee is also considering holding travel award competitions more frequently.

If the committee is awarding travel funds, should the abstract be already accepted? They will approve funds pending acceptance to conference.

d. Faculty Handbook Advisory Committee (audio timestamp 12:10)-
Nick Norwood

We now have rules for amending handbook in place. This will ordinarily occur one time in year, in Spring semester. The committee will compile and review all suggested changes, proofread the handbook again, and bring suggestions to change the handbook to the Senate. Last year, as it was the first year of the procedure, there were two rounds. They brought recommendations to the Senate in January of last year. The second round were mostly changes to do with SACS accreditation issues, and were approved in May.

This year, the committee is hoping that bugs are worked out so that changes review will only occur in spring, but they will accept any requests for review at any time. They intend to bring recommendations for changes to the Senate in April 2016.

Currently, there is one small change proposed with the Department of Theater and accreditation – the section reads “Department of Theater is an accredited associate member of National Association of Schools of Theater”, but it should read “institutional member”. Can we approve this change? B. Schwartz moved, and N.Thomson seconded the motion. 20 yes votes. Motion passes.

IV. Old Business

a. Alternate Senator Protocol (audio timestamp 16:30)- Brian Tyo – handout provided

We have discussed this policy at prior Senate meetings. Provided handout has current policy on page one, and page two highlights proposed changes. The policy is divided into electing alternate senators for short term, and as interim senators. D.Ross moves, and N.Thomson seconds approval. 20 vote to approve. Motion passes.

b. Absentee voting system (audio timestamp 19:00) Brian Tyo - handout provided

We discussed proposed changes in establishing online voting system only. There is a concern in making votes less anonymous if both paper ballots and online voting is possible on the same ballot issue.

This is not really an absentee voting system, but rather a voting system. It was suggested that we replace the title with Electronic Voting System.

The Executive Officer is accountable for the results, and UITS is responsible for disseminating ballots, and for counting votes. The Executive Officer is responsible for wording on ballot issues.

It was suggested that “with the oversight of the Executive Officer of the Faculty Senate” be added, and to omit the phrase “being accountable for results”. BSchwartz moved and DRoss seconds.

NThomson moved that the word “absentee” be removed from the title, replaced with “electronic”. BSchwartz seconds.

The phrase “Accountable for results” is perhaps too vague.

Oversight can be defined as being responsible, making sure that no one person is solely responsible for tabulation.

Motion to approve as amended – NThomson moves, PBryant seconds. 20 approve the motion.

c. USGFC Representative (audio timestamp 29:50)- Brian Tyo – handout provided.

i. Meeting Location: Armstrong State University

ii. Meeting Date/Time: October 24, 9:30AM-5PM (Tentative)

Many USG representatives elect a faculty member to serve for multiple years. This is proposing a model with eligibility criteria for CSU representative.

Question: Would an assistant chair be eligible?

Comment: We talked last month about having a “primary” representative, and a “secondary” representative in case the original representative cannot attend. That was implemented as an ex officio model for the newly elected person, plus the elected alternate for the year.

Faculty Senate meeting

Question: What is the thinking behind not having a person in an administrative role in this position? USGFC is trying to move this group to have a faculty focus, where representatives are centrally faculty. In many Faculty Senates, you cannot serve if you are a chair or higher. There is no such rule at CSU. But Assistant Chair – perhaps this gets to the percentage commitment to the faculty role instead of administrative (using course releases as a measure). And the Assistant Chair is not typically evaluating faculty, so that evaluative/supervisory role is not in place.

Question: For a faculty member's protection, they should be tenured? That was the thinking for that criteria. However, having a fresh voice (in an untenured role) can be valuable. It could be argued that an untenured person has a bigger stake in discussions, and have more incentive to speak up. But if the administrative climate changes, an untenured person is suddenly at risk.

Motion to amend: replace ie with "role requiring the evaluation of another faculty employee" Moved by D.Eckart, seconded by D.Ross.

Question: Do Associate Deans evaluate faculty? Can't we just say those at Chair or higher level?

Alternatively, we could look at it as a minimum teaching load definition. Or by stating that if someone is more than 50% administrative duties, they are not eligible.

Senate bylaws do not currently keep administrators from being elected to Faculty Senate. USG policy does not currently limit membership to USGFC. The mindset of a typical Associate Dean is different from that of faculty.

Question: What is the main concern of wording as written? This is not a comprehensive list, we may inadvertently forbid some from participating. We can add upper administrators, and change wording to reflect this is a comprehensive list.

D. Eckart moves to table.

Request: Ask for several options in wording on eligibility when this policy is brought back to Senate next time, so that we can avoid rehashing the same discussion.

d. Salaries Report (audio timestamp 50:55)- Human Resources – Laurie Jones

Data provided by L.Jones will be attached in the Appendix.

For FY16, were able to provide merit salary increases to 304 staff, 228 faculty. Those who did not get one were typically relatively new, had gotten equity increases or promotion, or staff promoted earlier. Equity increases for 91 employees (21 faculty, 70 staff). 17 employees (11 faculty, 6 staff) promoted.

Average increase 1.04%

Compares to prior year.

Faculty Senate meeting

In academic year 14-15, we had 13% of faculty below 83% of median salary, 62% between 83 - 99%, 25% at 100% or above. The data broken down by rank in the handout.

For FY 15-16. Decreased to 11% of faculty below 83% of median salary, 59% between 83 - 99%, 30% of faculty now at or above 100%.

Have information for staff salaries in the handouts as well.

Comment: Those medians are from the salary study conducted in 2012, not adjusted for inflation. The improvement is based on an old standard, but less progress is measured when based on current mean values. Will talk about this when salary study committee meets again.

Comment: The data published in AAUP study suggests we are getting much larger raises than this data implies. Response: That data likely comes from changes in classification, new hires.

Question: Do these numbers include online teaching incentives? Response: No, this is just base salary.

Question: What is CSU reporting to the AAUP study? Response: It comes from the general report, which is a state salaries accounting report, not just base salaries (perhaps). Comment: Perhaps in future those numbers should come from HR instead.

Chronicle of Higher Education also reported a 3% average salary increase for CSU last year. Back in 2012, we knew it would be a 5 year plan. It would have required \$4.2M to get everyone to 100% of the mean in 2012. \$3M will still be needed to get everyone to 100% of median from the salary study. Funds utilized so far were predominantly identified internally.

Question: What are the priorities for the current year? We have not met this year.

Question: What would be needed for new data? We would need a new study. Perhaps we could just "age the data" looking at recent trends. We do need to do another study. L.Jones suggested that it would be better if a new study were performed 1-2 years in the future instead of this year. Jones feels we should continue to work with current targets, not move them, in order to get further progress.

Question: What would the \$3M represent of total operating budget? She was unsure what the answer is. We need to make arguments to the state that increases in state funds are needed at this point.

According to VPBF website, FY 16 budget is \$124M.

L.Jones will be happy to report back again after committee meets.

V. New Business

- a. Online Course Accessibility (audio timestamp 1:07:00)- Amy Thornton – handout available

Faculty Senate meeting

There are federal regulations that we have to comply with. All web content must be accessible. Currently, the onus is on faculty. But COOL is trying to provide more resources to make this possible – long term goal is that we will be 100% ADA compliant.

Services have been added and information on the COOL website
COOL will be starting captioning services – there is a captioning request form on the website. Faculty will submit video via google drive, and a student worker will caption it and return it for you.

Question: When you say “online accessibility” who does this apply to?

Response: Everyone. It should be accessible at the point of creation, according to US law. Links to this law as well are on the website.

Question: Do we need a raw file? What if it is on YouTube? If COOL can download and edit the file (not owned by someone else) – it can be captioned for you. If someone else owns the video, and you cannot get permissions – can write up a transcript to it.

COOL will be emailing information about this later this week. Currently it is unclear what the demand will be. Other than accommodation needs, it will be first come first served.

A template was developed by COOL – the QM Accessibility template. It has to be requested, but you can usually be granted access within an hour b. Enrollment Update (audio timestamp 1:19:00) - John McElveen

We are within one week of the data collection period ending. This will be the midterm census – the official number, quoted by the System office.

Last year, the Fall census was 8192. Our record was in Fall 2011 – 8307. As of this morning, we are at 8434 this year, which is 2.95% up. The numbers will probably change slightly, but we are expecting record enrollment for Fall 2015.

In terms of quality of newly admitted students, test score data is indistinguishable from last year.

Summer enrollment was up slightly as well. This is the sixth semester in a row that we have had increased enrollment. Preliminary retention data shows freshman to sophomore conversion is up another 1%. Our target is to increase 1% per year for 5 years.

Currently this retention rate is 71%. Last year's retention rate was 70.1% freshman to sophomore retention. This number is based on the number of all first time freshmen, retained to sophomore year.

We have approximately 100 more on-campus students this year. Online courses show that enrollment for upper level and grad students is up.

Face-to-face enrollment is up for lower level classes.

Dual enrollment students show a significant increase of approximately 20%. New dual enrollment is up over 30% so far this year.

Faculty Senate meeting

We do expect “Move On When Ready” to impact this number of dual enrollment students. (This program provides that tuition is covered and fees are waived; we provide the textbook at no cost to the student - \$25/hr text reimbursement to CSU)

There is an opportunity at the core course level with dual enrollment students, because they can take summer courses, and CSU gets tuition for their courses.

Honors college enrollment is up slightly.

Question: Is dual enrollment in the retention data? It is not included in that retention

Those students that take dual enrollment classes should not be counted in retention data until they graduate from high school, not until they arrive on a campus as solely a college student.

Move On When Ready legislation says we can take 9th and 10th grade, but CSU will only take juniors and seniors. There is a “prodigy rule” that permits an exception if the university feels student is ready, but enrollment is not encouraging it.

If these students are allowed to enroll in summer courses, will they not contribute to University finances? We get some funding for these students for baseline tuition up to 15 credit hours. The student’s high school also gets their FTE funding. We only get small amounts of funding for textbooks, but there will likely be changes next year. We currently keep 55% of those students into college.

c. Faculty/Staff Spirit Day (audio timestamp 1:32:00)- Annette Brown Staff Council is partnering with Student Affairs and the Alumni Association. On the Thursday of Homecoming Week – CSU Day. All are encouraged to wear CSU colors. They have bought 100 t-shirts, and have sent out at random (70) plus some for those riding the float. They are asking for volunteers to do so.

There will be a Tailgate Party for the Doughboy Game. Staff are asking for support from faculty.

Spirit Day will be Thursday in conjunction with this game.

There will be a door decoration contest through Staff Council.

d. Long term disability insurance age limit – Annette Brown
There are policies thru Met Life for both long term and short term disability benefits. There is an 11 day waiting period for the short term policy; the long term policy starts at 90 days. Sick leave pays 100% of employee salary, where these policies only cover 60%. Payments are offset by retirement (after age 60) and by Social Security. It is not necessarily worth it to keep these policy after these ages since benefits decrease.

Faculty Senate meeting

Open enrollment for benefits is from November 2 – 13. Information meetings will occur in the third week of October through the end of the month.

Employees will still make choices in the ADP platform. If one wished to make no changes, it is a passive enrollment system this year.

There are many changes on retirement side, however.

At age 70, for a person getting full retirement, with social security, social security and retirement would cover any disability payments, and so no benefits would be paid out from disability insurance policies. Human Resources tries to be proactive and encourage employees to cancel these policies when this applies.

e. Senior Lecturer rank (audio timestamp 1:41:00)- Provost – handout provided

There are some lecturers who would like to move to higher rank, and USG regulations permit this. Under USG regulation, we can promote them *if* we have a policy that governs that process. We should also have a vote of the faculty in order to enact one, in Dr Hackett's opinion, and it should be based on P&T vote standards.

There is at least one senior lecturer on campus, promoted under a prior VPAA. Deans' Council looked at this premise, and was concerned about pay change implications. *However, Dr. Hackett stated he felt that we cannot discuss pay change implications if we do not decide whether the position can be possible first.*

He asks that this proposed policy receive consideration at the next Senate meeting.

There would be an opportunity for those interested to be promoted later this year if this is approved. It would take quick work, but is doable.

Since non tenure-track lecturers are on annual contract, what is to stop a College from just rehiring them at that rank next year? We don't currently have the position at CSU, so it is not presently possible. We must have an enabling policy to hire at, or promote to, the rank.

Can they bring experience from other institutions, or should this just be CSU experience? For full professor, must have 5 years promoted to full professor from associate – but can have credit in promotion to associate. No clear trend.

Would it be clear that if you serve at Assistant Professor, and didn't get tenure, that you cannot shift to this rank? It appears pretty clear.

For the years of experience before promotion, is it six years because of BOR policy? Yes, this ties to BOR policy.

What about instructors? We have not discussed that at this time. Are there other positions mentioned in BOR policy that we should include here?

Perhaps, but we are dealing with a current need first.

Approved by vote
Faculty Senate meeting

5 October 2015

Motion to adjourn 4:54 pm.