Agenda for 22 March 2010   *Meeting Time 3:00 pm*
Faculty Senate Meeting

Location: 130 Schuster Center

Members Present: Susan Hrach (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Paula Adams (Lib), Nick Norwood (COLS), Neal Rogers (COBCS), David Schwimmer (COLS), John Studstill (COLS), John Theis (COBCS), Paul Vaillancourt (COA), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS), Becky Becker (COA), Rita Jones (COBCS), Sandra Stratford (Lib), Dan VanKley (COLS), Greg Blalock (COEHP), Pat Hogan (COBCS), Troy Vidal (COLS)

Guests present included: Tina Butcher, Tim Howard, Brian Schwartz, Ron Linton, Dan Ross, Carole Burke, Nicole DeVries, Ellen Roberts

1. Report from the Provost's Office
Dr. Levi is out of town. No report.

2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer
- We are continuing to have problems with the "facsen" email list. We found out recently that there were others besides Senator Hrach not getting email from list. We now also need to add Pat Hogan as interim senator from COBCS (replacing Venable).
- Our meeting scheduled last Monday the 15th with Dr. Portch was cancelled. When we asked for confirmation of time and location during Spring Break, we were told he was only meeting with the President and the Provost. We have no other information about that meeting at this time.
- Comment: There will be an open forum with President and Provost from 2-4 on Wednesday the 24th, which appears to be a result of this meeting. Meeting is scheduled for Schuster 130.
- Comment: Under the umbrella of shared governance – our resolutions about the library, and about promotion and tenure have not yet been addressed by the administration.
- Comment: there is a list of issues that faulty wishes us to bring up again, including the promotion and tenure items that we have informed BOR about. At least about Promotion & Tenure issues (where certainly policies were violated, if in fact laws were not broken) we need to address this again. Should we at least try to get the Chancellor's office to address this? We have already had open forums, and the President has not addressed this. However, he uses the fact that there have been forums to claim that he has settled it. Whenever we bring it up, President Mescon is not addressing the violation of policy, except to say that the policy will be changed in the future. This does not repair the policy violations that have already occurred.
- Comment: Issue of Library problems is up there, too, in terms of policy violations.
- Comment: Every time he breaks a policy, he breaks our contract. Those denied tenure could have a monetary case for damages based on potential earnings lost.
- Comment: Why don't we ask President Mescon what he thinks his job is here at CSU, at the Open Forum on Wednesday?
- Comment: Many constituents have been asking for a formal vote of confidence/no confidence, but we had all been counseling patience. With no feedback coming from BOR, it's time to do so. We could use the Evaluation of Administrators as a vehicle to do so.

- Comment: We should serve the BOR notice that we have been waiting for responses. There have been efforts made to help the President with matters of shared governance, but we have seen no response on these issues at all. These could be the top reasons why we take further steps.
  - As another announcement, let me remind you of the process for bringing something to the agenda for the Senate. Next meeting is April 5th. The week prior to the meeting, the Executive Committee gathers to discuss items brought to our attention by anyone, and constructs the agenda. At the end of meeting today, we can address other items if time permits and we still have a quorum, or we can put other items on the agenda for the next meeting.
- Comment: Since we met last, the central administration has moved a department (Basic Studies) from COLS with no consultation at all from Senate, or the Dean of COLS. This strikes me as arrogance at best.
- Comment: Would it be appropriate to call Dr. Herbst and state our concerns before the next Executive Committee meeting? It seems that she was aware that we had been considering a vote of no confidence. We could cite this movement of Basic Studies as yet another example of our problems. The Dean of COLS was not informed of the move.
- Comment: You were obviously given to understand that we would meet with Dr. Portch.
  - Comment from Exec Committee members: Provost Levi asked us for groups to meet with him, when we met for the Feb 22nd Executive Committee meeting. Then Dr. Portch didn't meet with anyone other than the President and Provost – that we know of.
- Comment: Dr. Levi talked to Terry Irvin, (chair of Basic Studies) before moving the department – but no one could attest to the Provost's talking to Dean Stokes about the issue before moving the department, or to inform him of a decision.
- Comment: Public Relations for departments reporting to new dean, as read in the Ledger-Enquirer, listed the departments that would report to the new dean, and Basic Studies was not listed.   And new dean will be coming in with tenure.
- Comment: This was raised as an issue in forums on Promotion and Tenure.
- Comment: CSU statutes cite BOR policy on tenure on appointment, but CSU Statutes cite an outdated policy. Under current BOR policy, that authority is solely in the hands of the president.

3. Old Business
   a.   Student Evaluations in Digital Measures - Nicole DeVries
   It has been a learning process for me. Last time, we changed the College names, and that unlinked the questions that had been designated before for college evaluation questions. We had very low response rates for student evaluations in Fall. No Deans have responded with new questions to be input into the system, which are needed by the end of the month in order to do evaluations for the end of semester.
   Digital Measures CV information also had to be reorganized in order to keep information available from when Colleges are reorganized. By summer, both sides of Digital Measures should be organized.
   Question: Can we get evaluation summaries for each College and Department? Response: COB organized differently, hasn't been merged with the rest of the University yet. There are contract issues to work out. We had wanted to finish reorganization before merging these.

The Dean has the access to run summary reports, as does the Digital Measures manager for each college. But Ms. DeVries doesn't have authority to run reports like these for faculty without permission.

If there's a report you want to run regularly, those reports can be created. For example, Pat McHenry (COLS Digital Measures manager) can submit a work order request for a custom report for COLS, or for a department . They are trying to formulate organization of reports available, so that different colleges are't reinventing the wheel. Have talked to Abraham George about getting more hands-on training – might occur, but it's expensive.

Question: Two years ago, we were told we migrated because we bought the system. We are in a 5 year contract, in the 3rd year of it. BOR looking at a system wide contract. Given the proper attention, it may be what we need.

Question: What is the value of Digital Measures to the departments, and to the faculty?

Response: With evaluations, it is in not doing scantrons and manually scanning them. You and the Dean can see evaluations easily.

Question: But will students do it?

Response: Do you want an evaluation from students forced to do it?

The CV – replaced needs for SACS accreditation. But how do you replace a portfolio? Won't really manage this for promotion and tenure. Would like for this to become a searchable database.

Comment: If it is possible, if you could supply commentary that reflects faculty opinion…

For the record, please establish that there was no dialog with faculty about Digital Measures coming on board. As an interim chair, I feel Digital Measures is a failure in terms of getting reliable student feedback for faculty towards P&T, promotion, post-tenure review. In my department, we will be going back to paper unless the Dean insists. We would like to make sure that you are informed about faculty views – no one in my department has anything positive to say about Digital Measures. If the state is asking you about your experience, please be aware that faculty think it is a miserable failure. Maybe we could save money by not renewing it.

Response: My charge is to send out evaluations to everyone, anyway. So perhaps you will have two sets of evaluations.

Comment: Digital Measures doesn't really lend itself to comments in writing the way that class time does. It isn't just a question of response rate. What is better for student evaluations about Digital Measures than RateMyProfessor.com?

Response: We have standard questions.

Question: But is that better? RateMyProfessor will mostly get students who want to complain. Digital Measures mostly just got the complaints, too.

Response: Technologies are changing – unless you can say the benefits outweigh the costs, we need to change. I don't think we have given Digital Measures enough time yet to say if it is good enough.

Comment: You are being asked to defend a system that you didn't implement. For many of us, this is just another situation that we have had something crammed down our throats.

I know there's a lot of frustration, and no faith that it will progress.

Comment: We all have suppositions about how things will go. Let's look at the research between online vs traditional course evaluations so that we can be more informed.

Question: Currently we are very unfamiliar with any research base that exists. There's no

better time than now to make this study. <u>Response:</u> has done some research, made slide for presentation. She has shared it, and will re-send it.

<u>Question:</u> Have others used Digital Measures successfully? <u>Response:</u> Yes, but the company won't give out customer database info.

<u>Comment:</u> I like having CV on Digital Measures, but not the student evaluations.

<u>Response:</u> Really excited to see where students go. Is it catching on? What trends will develop? Evaluations will go out two weeks before finals start, close the day finals start. Typically give Digital Measures two weeks in order to process them. So results should be available in the middle of May

<u>Question</u> about confidentiality last summer – last time, we discussed that this would be subject to open records. Certain users are set up to see entire department, college, but most faculty can only see themselves.

<u>Comment:</u> If somebody really wanted to get records, part of open records – just like paper files are. Easier access to electronic records, but that's all.

<u>Response:</u> All of the sections people have taught have been loaded in – this is not tied to course evaluations. If they don't see it, can email N. DeVries.

<u>Comment:</u> If colleges want to develop extra questions, contact Pat McHenry (COLS), ND – COA, Brynn Dillon (COBCS), Sallie Miller (COEHS).

b.   Evaluation of Administrators instrument - John Theis

Comments from committee? Resolution distributed is the one we had last week.   The committee is planning to load it into Survey Monkey in early April. Faculty can also pick up a paper copy, will have to sign for it. We will evaluate all administrators, and this will build a base for next year.

<u>Question:</u> Could you say anything about why using Survey Monkey? <u>Response:</u> For $20/month, it will allow us to collect 1000 responses, which allows evaluation of four administrators. It is also not run by CSU's IT department, and it would be completely controlled by our committee. It will report out details for us.

<u>Exec Officer:</u> Major issues for all to weigh in on:

- <u>Question:</u> Include chairs? Because some chairs are currently evaluated and others aren't, perhaps we leave chairs out till next year.
  - <u>Comment:</u> Stay focused on upper administration for this spring – stick with deans and above, allow chairs to evaluate upper admin this spring.
  - <u>Comment:</u> Why not make it uniform to all? Fill out the ones you want to fill out, get the results and see what happens.
  - <u>Question:</u> What about the library, since it reports to Abraham George? Evaluate him, too. However, you might not get to evaluate Provost, since she is not in the direct line of command.
  - <u>Comment:</u> I think chairs should be a part of the evaluation of upper administration. I really don't want chairs to be excluded.
  - <u>Comment:</u> To modify this, the people below the level evaluated should be eligible to evaluate: Chairs can evaluate Deans, Deans can evaluate Provost, Provost can evaluate President.
  - <u>Question:</u> I have received a Chair evaluation separate from this – is everyone doing this? Not everyone. The problem is that it is uneven.

- Comment: The colleges reconstituted without faculty input, so involvement of chairs very important. Chairs might be a valuable control group.
  - Comment: As with shared governance survey, questions with positive answers may attract even more attention, due to their rarity.
- Suggestion: "no person holding administrative position at equal or above level to administrator rank being evaluated shall be permitted to take part in annual evaluation of that administrator." Amendment offered by Schwimmer.
- Comment: Disagree – Library faculty have been affected by Provost's actions, and should be able to evaluate her performance.
- Question: How to handle program directors? Are they faculty or administrators? Shall we stick to these (Chairs, Deans, Provost, President) only, before addressing other program directors this year?
- Question: Does it read that evaluation will be conducted by the committee or its agent? Survey monkey will be its' agent. Evaluation is the instrument.
- Question: Another important issue is dealing with the results. Currently the motion reads that a summary report will be provided to the President, Provost, and Senate in September of every year. Results would be provided to all faculty for the President and Provost; for the Deans and Asst Deans, just to the faculty of their college; for chairs, just to their departments. Is that the appropriate place for feedback to come?
- Question: How would Associate/Assistant Deans be evaluated? Are we limiting that this year? If Associate dean is not a faculty related position, it is not our purview. We should keep our evaluations to those we work with and understand. Associate Deans only have effect through the authority of the Deans. Should eliminate Associate/Assistant Deans as well as program directors.
- Question about timeline? How fast do we want it? Response: Can give 2 weeks to implement, shut it off at end of April. If we could get it 2nd, 3rd week of April, we can get results published by end of finals. Otherwise, the administration goes nuts again over the summer with no input from us. Question: Could we do deans at a later time? Response: Might make it more complicated. Can process the ones we are most concerned with, first.
- Suggestion: A summary report could be submitted in April. Can have preliminary results in a week after closure of the surveys. Will be conducted, concluded in April and May now. Individual evaluation results provided in writing in May of each year. Summary report in September.

Senator Zuiderveen moves, and Senator Jones seconds, that we accept all changes suggested as amendments in above discussion. Motion passes.
Motion to pass resolution as amended made by Senator Schwimmer, and seconded by Senator Norwood. Motion passes.

Question: Committee that formed the instrument to do it? Senator Theis moves, and Senator Zuiderveen seconds, that it be done this way.
Discussion – the people on the committee may find themselves in a "shoot the messenger" position. However, some on the committee do not currently have tenure.
Suggestion: Amend it – tenured members from original committee to evaluate it. Need to find a representative from COEHP. No librarians have tenure anymore. Library faculty may choose to participate or abstain.

Motion passes as amended.

c. Membership for Special Designation Task Force

Executive officer: Charge for the task force should be clear, provost confirmed it. Should we seek designation, and what should it be?

Each college asked to go through selection process. Roll call for task force representatives:
- COLS representatives: Dan Ross and Kim Shaw
- COBCS representatives: Ed Bosworth and Ron Kettering
- COA representatives: no names at this time. Spoke with Dean, and he is uncomfortable supplying names. It is felt there that no one wants a University of the Arts. Are we doing this to find something to be, or to examine being a University of the Arts? Sense is that they understand why some don't want an Arts designation, since there's a lot of resentment to Arts.

Comment – that's why Arts needs to supply representatives to the Task Force, to ensure that Arts interests are well represented and this is considered to their satisfaction.

Comment - University of Liberal Arts idea was brilliant. But can we come up with something that won't be exclusionary?

Comment – No one wants to waste their time on a committee that won't do anything. It is no one's intent to do this, just to dismiss unpopular ideas.

Comment: My sense is that it isn't their top priority anymore. But the issue of branding isn't going to go away. We can discuss our institutional identity in this way.

Question: Do you think your Dean feels this way because he isn't faculty and doesn't know us? Is the task force going to look at all possibilities? The task force isn't even fully formed yet – seems to be unfair to predetermine at this point.
- COEHP representatives: Jim Brewbaker and Ellen Martin
- Library representative: Tom Ganzevoort – (arts liaison)

Comment: Regardless of what happens, this is our exercise in shared governance. It gives us some control over presentation to students, and our presentation to BOR.

Executive Officer: At this point, COA will supply names ASAP, and will need one at large member from Senate. Do we ask Provost to supply 3 administrators relevant to the task for the task force, for example, John Lester and Chip Reese?

Nomination: Senator Zuiderveen as at large member.

Nomination: Paul Vaillancourt.

Senator Zuiderveen withdraws name.

Motion to accept by acclamation (Moved by Senator Theis, seconded by Senator Norwood).

Motion Passes.

Senator Norwood moved, and Senator Jones seconded that we ask provost for 3 names of administrators for the task force.

4. Reports

a. Core Curriculum Task Force – Tina Butcher and Ellen Roberts

At the end of February, Dr. Butcher and Dr. Roberts were asked to attend the Regents Administrators Committee on Academic Affairs presentation on implementation of core curriculum process. Interesting day – formal and informal info.

At least one institution was completely unaware of changes, one had already done revisions. All were concerned about timeline for changes. Question raised about changing timeline, but deadline will hold. Good consensus that it is better to have fewer learning outcomes, rather than more, due to need to assess them. Meeting informed the approach to this work.

Dr. Levi convened the committee back in December 2009. First step in process looking at student learning outcomes, as General Education committee is doing. Dr. Tom Dolan is serving as interim chair of that committee, which is preparing a draft. When ready, will go through appropriate campus channels – Senate and Academic councils, University curriculum committee, and Provost. Big piece is then that learning outcomes have to go to USG and their counsel. Target date for this is June 1st. We would like to be ready by then, to present in July. We were told to expect that they will be sent back to us for revision. Because matching courses to learning outcomes is critical, we don't want to undo things along the way. We did talk with Robert Vaughan (Vice Chancellor). Dates are tentative but likely.

Faculty performance and engagement committee, and core curriculum have links on Provost's website. Resources will take you to USG policies, documents we are supposed to use to submit our changes. Task force plans to meet in next couple of weeks, and to set additional meeting times. Need to redefine project plan, talk about # hours in each area, etc. How do we include people, gather input about these issues? Course currently in core – they don't have to be reapproved. If we add new courses, those do need to be sent to Atlanta for approval. Once we develop student learning outcomes, we have to develop an assessment for those. Built into this process will be how we are obtaining input along the way? Website, forums…. What does senate want? <u>Response:</u> At least both of these. Task force needs to have representation from all colleges.

We already have a curriculum committee structure – perhaps utilize that to encourage feedback as well. It won't be the role of the task force – but since the core changes, that means that programs change too. There is a lot to be accomplished here, very quickly.

Learning outcomes guidelines were established, but each campus will come up with actual learning goals for that campus. <u>Question:</u> How can they transfer? <u>Response:</u> Still must fit into broad topic for each area. Other piece of this – if there is an area F change, still must be approved by state committee. <u>Question:</u> Will there be a link between what outcomes state and class size? <u>Response:</u> Outcomes that are on table came from General Education committee. Once we approve outcomes, can then tie class size to specific learning outcomes based on assessment needs. Learning Goals from system by area (A through F), and the link on task force website. Examples were given in that set of documentation. All of the changes must be made no later than fall.

<u>Question:</u> Is there a trend to make things more rigorous, dumb things down? Add more math or take it away? <u>Response:</u> The answer is that it has been about 10 years since we examined the core, so it is time to review. There is a new movement, however, that whatever we develop will be assessed. We don't know what's wrong with it, *or* what's right with it. New overlays state that we must have global perspectives, us history, and critical thinking. Learning outcomes must be measurable. In the recent discussion, at least in science this is a chance for science faculty to change current learning outcomes. Will enable meaningful assessment, we hope.

No quorum at this point:
Questions discussed:
Chair for Designation Task Force not yet determined – let committee decide.

Evaluation of Administrators – who will see the reports for Chairs? Sense was that the department and supervisor will see it. Should entire college see it? Sounded like all reports would be seen by the senate. Will revisit at next meeting.

Other business
Faculty engagement task force – keeping electronic comments available and open through Friday March 26, or can get in touch with task force members. Will meet this week, and next week after comments closed.

▪▪

Will post digital measures presentation from Ms. Devries as separate powerpoint document.