

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

**Senators present:** Paula Adams, Becky Becker, Greg Blalock, Tammy Condrey, Pat Duttera, Josh Eyer, Rita Jones, Teresa Lang, Ellen Martin, Jacqueline Radebaugh, Neal Rogers, Dan Ross, Kimberly Shaw, Melody Shumaker, Gary Sprayberry, Glenn Stokes, John Studstill, Dan VanKley, Troy Vidal, Jeff Zuiderveen

**Guests present included:** President Tim Mescon, Acting Provost Tom Hackett, Brian Schwartz, Iris Saltiel, Bill Frazier, Laurie Jones, Jean Bittinger, Dee Spivey, Gary Wortley, Abraham George.

### **1. Report from the President and/or Provost**

Acting Provost Hackett: My briefing will be mercifully brief. I wanted to update you on a field trip some of us took, up to USG. I went with Tara Redmond and others, regarding our program proposals. Our goal was to get them unstuck. We have had multiple proposals, many in graduate studies. We thought it went very well. We have been asked to use a three-year forecast format, tell each program when first initiated, how we would implement it; what state resources are needed and how we would implement them (most of ours don't need new state resources). If we believe that we will get the needed resources from future tuition, that's not clear currently, and should be made clear. The Graduate Council and Deans are meeting this Friday, working through this process. Again, I thought it was a good visit, and things undergoing subtle changes with changes at state level.

The Salary Study Committee had its first meeting last Friday, and had a lot of good substantive discussion on the process to do this to make sure we are in line with, or competitive with, our peer and aspirational institutions. We discussed what a consultant would cost, and the committee decided to bid for consultant, to find out what the real cost is. They also discussed the need to find out what other institutions are doing. This work had been done once before by George Stanton. The committee will ask George to come talk to us at our next meeting. We will be finding out what other institutions are involved in this now, and will discuss who we define as peer institutions.

The College Of The Arts and Library Dean Searches have placed ads, with applications due in January, anticipating a February interview process. The College Of Education and Health Professions has applications in, and is reviewing those now and setting up initial interviews in video format.

President Mescon: I begin on a sad note. One of our students, Trent Harris, passed away in car accident this weekend. (He was a marketing major from Phenix City.)

Last week, 14 of our colleagues joined Dr. Mescon at the USG Diversity Summit at Georgia Tech. It was inspirational. We currently have only an office of diversity and inclusion in student affairs. For diversity issues involving faculty and staff, we mostly have volunteers, and those doing committee work. He has asked the team who attended to think about working with the Faculty Senate, and the Staff Council to formalize what we do in the inclusiveness arena. This Summit had great participation, and we had largest contingent at the summit.

Finally, an issue that I have raised anecdotally before – data from system office (handout attached at the end) FY1980-2011 for Capital outlay/state appropriations. Only one of our peers has received smaller amounts, but only if you do not include the allocation they received after rebuilding after their campus was flooded out. If you look at state college/TYC sector, many have had allocations greater than ours. My communication with legislative delegation has invited them to tour campus. If you look at aggregate square footage, we seem well positioned.

## APPROVED Minutes

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

But the space is not competitive, not contemporary. If you compare us to peers and TYC, we are horribly positioned. We need to provide appropriate lab and classroom space for you to teach in. These are system data, not compiled by us.

Laurie Jones : I don't know how many of you saw the posting about the planned December closing. It was intended to be a morale booster. We are hearing it might not have been well received, but we are not sure if that's the true sentiment. If it's not a benefit, it is something we may revisit.

Comment: We have heard staff talking about it, and the impression is that staff were not in on this decision. Vacation time is being taken from them. Including people in conversation is always a good thing. If you don't have that transparency, it causes problems.

Question: Have you taken it to staff council? Response: Will talk to them on Thursday. But if they don't save that vacation time, it would be problematic.

Comment: Not just managing vacation, but also staff who might be planning their workload to use that time. EG – enrollment services.

Response: Some departments will be staying open, such as enrollment, continuing ed, police. Perhaps some others would also stay open.

Comment: I appreciated the reminder to save vacation days.

Comment: Many feel the “you will take the vacation” sense of it was the problem.

Response: There are a lot of employees who lose vacation time at the end of the year.

Comment: It's really hard to plan with only 2 months notice.

Question: Is there some advantage to making it optional this year, have staff vote for next year?

Response: It is possible it would not be a cost savings if we had enough people working. There are pros and cons, including sending a mixed message if some are working and some not. If only one or two buildings open, then would save \$.

Question: Is the plan to not completely shut down (Lenoir has been completely off on weekends before), but just to turn things down so that it is not comfortable? Are we taking care of buildings with living organisms? Response: Yes, the plan is to turn the temperature down rather than turn off power completely.

Question: Can someone borrow time ahead? Response: Yes, they can. We are trying to accommodate those who don't have the time, and some would prefer to be uncompensated. Some need to build up comp time. There are a number of ways to deal with this.

Feel free to email Laurie Jones later with further questions.

### 2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer – none

### 3. Old Business

#### a. UITS report on administrative privileges and access to software manuals

Mr. George wanted to share how current processes are working. Local administrative privilege requests are submitted by faculty through the Chair/Dean, and send eQuest requesting privilege. Normally this request goes to information security officer. Then, when approved, a tech will come set up local administrative account.

Approximately 60 faculty currently have local admin privileges, primarily to aid in their research. Software manuals and user guides are available in .pdf format for campus and department software (others on request) thru CougarNet - My Tech tab. We hope to have this available by Jan 2011.

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

Current campus software licenses include Autodesk (AutoCAD), Maple, Mathematica, Matlab, MS Office, Respondus, SPSS, Studymate Author, Tegrity, Wimba  
Cougarnet “myTech” tab has step by step technology tutorials for 130 software titles, plus assistive learning technology. You can search for an answer or view by topic.

Question: How many requests have been turned down? Response: Haven’t kept stats on this, but maybe 1 in 5? Just guessing the number. Some just want it for the sake of installing software. Those we normally don’t approve. But if a part of research – such as CS faculty, or even data processing, so that every day they need access, then they are approved.

Mr. George: I want to share one personal experience – I have personal netbook, and I use it when I travel. There are several open networks you have access to. If you access through open network, the chance is you are infected in the first hour. It happened to me personally last month. Malware gets into your system without you even knowing it. From that point, it can disseminate to other machines. University has a solid firewall, and about 97% of time detects malware.

Two weeks ago, went to Georgia Tech to a conference, and they demonstrated how this happens. Administrative requests can be sent in, and when we understand scope of needs, then we can then make it happen.

We have 2 tech committees – academic tech committee (senate) and administrative tech committee (institutional). UITS requests that the Senate combine these into one committee, so that it can be more productive.

Dr. Stokes: I don’t think this would be a lot of extra work. I am going to ask the Committee on Committees to take up this issue. Anything they should consider? Ask both committees what they think. Isn’t distance learning committee doing a lot of this work as well? Revisit this issue in December.

### **4. New Business**

#### **a. Student evaluation of teaching task force report**

Dr. Frazier: Distributed recommendation from task force (attached). Thank you for the chance to present this to you. Last month Chairs Assembly decided they would like some input in process. A group from Faculty Senate and from Chairs Assembly met. Chairs group had met previously with Nicole DeVries. There was a fairly long discussion about this matter. The group basically discussed this, voted for recommendations on the handout. They considered that one of biggest problems of Digital Measures was low student input to the process. Typical for 2 out of 30 students to submit evaluations when using Digital Measures. Some discussions had centered on perhaps rewarding students for submitting evaluations, or mild punitive matters if they didn’t. Committee members felt teaching evaluations should be done 3-4 weeks before end of term, in order to not have evaluations based on grade rather than on performance of instructor. Reward measures like allowing student to see grade would not then be relevant. Punitive measures (not seeing grade, etc) are similarly irrelevant, or leave a bad taste, which might impact evaluations as well. It has been demonstrated a number of times that the principle benefit of evaluations is to gain student opinion, but they are not necessarily a measure of good teaching. Good teachers who are tough get bad evaluations, easy teachers who are bad get good ones. The committee discussed going back to previous system – paper evaluation forms. We know that these are expensive. Our perspective was we were asked to evaluate the merit of several systems, but not in terms of cost. Online evaluation measures are expensive too, even if through Banner (which will have the same problem as Digital Measures).

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

Question: Was your committee asked to consider content of evaluations? Response: Yes. There was significant feeling that because teaching varies from department to department, that a single form used for even an entire college really wouldn't be as valuable. Should each department frame their own? Perhaps use core questions which may be commonly applicable? The committee recommended the use of 10 common questions, with a departmental option to add more.

Comment: I agree with much of this, but some of the rationale is problematic. Number 1: 3-4 weeks before end because of how we might be evaluated. But if a student is going to get a bad grade, they will usually know by then. Pedagogically, you get better info at end. If a good course which has a narrative arc to it, this is too soon.

Response: Speaking for myself, I agree with that, but this was the groups' decision.

Comment: There are a couple of options – endorse this recommendation or not? Or go back, take it to faculty, then vote on it in December. We are still using Digital Measures for this year.

Question: Are you saying DM will be used this semester?

Response: The contract runs through end of Academic Year – through May. We have a contractual obligation. College of Business and CS will still use it in some fashion afterward.

Motion: Move that we take this back to our faculty and revisit the issue in December. (motion by J.Eyler, seconded by B.Becker)

Question: Will our chairs be informed of this?

Response: You (as senators) should be the point person. I had a message from Dr Baxter that Chairs have approved it – so they are aware of the recommendation. This doesn't mean they discussed with faculty. Not all departments have a senator.

Dr. Stokes: We don't traditionally work through chairs. The motion on the floor is to work with faculty as a whole. We will pass this on to chairs assembly, but these comments need to come back to senate.

Motion passes unanimously.

### b. Faculty Performance and Engagement task force report

The Department Chairs group met, and developed document. Another document based on faculty senate edit exists. We still need to meld those together. Hopefully we will have something by the end of next week. Dr. Stokes will accept responsibility for this timeline. Dr. Alice Pate chairing the group.

### c. Administrator Evaluation task force report

This committee was charged to report back this month. Co-chairs have been identified – Senators Becker and VanKley. In last year's evaluations, there were concerns raised about return rates, which are believed to be a result of other issues and overlap with finals. They are looking at ways to restrict results to appropriate faculty community. The committee still would like to use Survey Monkey and paper evaluations. They should be working with Chairs group, but have not been contacted. Dr. Stokes will contact the Chairs group about this.

One other issue: what should we do with info collected from last year? The Executive Committee discussed response rates (0 – 100%), which indicate an incredible lack of consistency. What we are recommending is that the information be distributed to administrators as a formative tool, along with information on the response rate. Not disseminate this in a public format, as information can be terribly skewed if only 1 responds.

Motion to do so by Senator Zuiderveen, seconded by Senator Jones.

Seems like if department had one or two responses, it might be easy to identify that person. Would that be appropriate to share that info? Is there a critical number or percentage? Discussed 40% as a

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

working number. It is unclear if that is a sufficient protection. Dissenters may say something that others may not, but it may still be a valid critique. Administrator should know this information – yet how to protect responders from being identified? The expectation was that results would be available generally. It doesn't seem necessarily fair to those who went out on a limb.

Question: What would someone do if surveying as a part of research, and plan changes after the fact? If you can't abide by that plan, you should do nothing with it.

Comment: The original plan was that results be given to administration and all those under them, as well as to senate.

Comment: But objection is still valid.

Response: We didn't expect privacy would be an issue.

Comment: Not fair to publish a low rating if only via one person.

Withdraw motion by Senator Zuiderveen. Accepted by Senator Jones.

Comment: Replace with motion that the data be discarded, that the committee come up with better system this year.

Comment: Consider it a pilot study?

Comment: For informational purposes, some of this was already distributed. The College of Business and Computer Science had all of it disseminated according to original plan. Everyone saw Dean's report, all in department saw report for Chair. One business department had no responses. We just assumed that everyone got these, then were surprised that this was not the case. This was part of the discussion.

Senator Condrey seconds the motion.

Comment: Just as a discussion of that – I am not sure that discarding is the way to go. But can we use it – keep it on file as a pilot study, but not discarded (suggested as friendly amendment).

Response: If it is kept, it is open records, and can be used later.

Comment: Then how will you learn from the results, in terms of participation? Disagreement over whether we have learned from this. When we throw the data away, aren't those people being betrayed in terms of that effort to produce changes in their departments? Any time we fill out an evaluation, the results could make you feel good or bad – but the purpose is to give feedback. It is easy to be callous and say they knew what they were getting into. But there was a promise that information would be distributed to the people in each unit.

Comment: Worries about anonymity are legitimate worries. There are ways to address that. Or no one will do it next time.

Comment: People participated with certain expectations.

Comment: Major contention was over department chair evaluations. How about if we provide for deans and above, until we can build protections in for small departments, low participation? We could protect administration for small response rates, too.

Comment: Same problem.

Question: Could you put "provisional data" in the language? And say "attempt at the survey".

Response: Won't allay fears.

Comment: There's one other approach. Is there a percentage cutoff, at the get-go?

Response: No.

Comment: But could we now decide a threshold?

Response: We had talked about that in committee, shied away from results being official. Email lists we had were defective. Some lists had part-time, some did not. That also affects reliability of data. This is a concern we can't just ignore.

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

Comment: I don't think we can pick and choose – it feels wrong. Discarding data feels disingenuous and strange. Let's hold onto it, learn from it, but don't disseminate it.

Comment: If it's a small dept with low percentage, how will that ever change? We already talked about teacher evaluations students do on us. Low returns on our student evaluations still have to be submitted.

Response: However, students are not in a supervisory position.

Comment: Most chairs are going to know who responds with something, like we do with our students in small classes.

*Motion fails unanimously.*

Senator Studstill moves that we keep the data, make rules about when it is disseminated or not. In this data set, this would be if 50% of dept has responded, and there has to be a minimum of 3 respondents in that department.

Comment: If it meets those criteria, it would be disseminated.

Comment: And response to the objection – how do you determine if 50% did respond – full time/part time? Won't add anything.

Comment: Is there a second?

Comment: It is arbitrary to set a number. We have an election tomorrow, doesn't matter how many turn out. Whoever wins, wins, regardless of the size of the turnout.

Comment: I don't think these attempts to protect identity are needed. Reality is that people know. Senator Zuiderveen moves to send it back to committee, have them propose a rule. Senator Duttera seconds motion.

Comment: We can always rethink this.

Comment: Didn't we decide last year? Why are we trying to decide the same thing again? Just stick to it and do it.

*Motion fails.*

Senator Jones – move we go with original decision disseminate as decided in spring. Senator Vidal seconds.

Motion – hand vote. 11 – 1 – 4. *Motion Passes.*

Comment: We have no way to definitively know who said what.

### d. Charge to Distance Learning Committee

Dr. Stokes: I got an email asking questions about current policies in distance/online education. Is it ok if committee is charged with this? Issues like assessing workload, limit on money for a certain number of students, limit on number of students in online classes.

Question: Is there a request for number of students served in this manner?

Response: Dr. Hackett was going to take that question to committee – so that should be added to the charge. I'm sure that Sri would be able to help you with that.

### e. Diversity, Programs, and Services Advisory Committee report

Report distributed on handout (attached).

Dr. Wakoko: I will share our mandate with you, then highlight what we have done and what remains undone. Over time we find we keep repeating ourselves as we get new committee members. Mandates are based on USG expectations, and give suggestions on programs for minority students at CSU, paying particular attention for African Americans through the Minority Advising Program (MAP). Right now there is a big movement to bring forth diversity initiatives

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

and structures in the system to show inclusion. Since last year there has been a summit by USG (last year at UGA, last week at Georgia Tech). We were represented by 12 faculty and staff (chosen by deans) and led by Dr. Mescon. Mostly university presidents, provosts, some faculty and staff. System is encouraging us to rethink how we talk about and deal with diversity, with the growing realization that race is not an issue per se, that it intersects other issues like sexuality, gender, ability/disability, age. Bring this to Senate's attention that we start thinking about a recommendation to BOR to redesign our policy, include faculty staff and other community members in policy, not just students.

We have created Safe Zone programs on campus, to provide attention and recognition for LGBT students. Yet rarely do we talk about faculty/staff diversity issues. Mandate doesn't currently extend to this.

There is a program related to religion: leaders of different religious affiliations to discuss their faiths on campus.

We are promoting African heritage, Latin American heritage.

Question: Is there a Safe Zone for Hispanic Students, or is this just for sexual behavior? I wasn't aware that we had a problem with abuse regarding sexual behavior. Why set this up for one small group of students, but not for other groups that may be larger?

Response: We feel that even small numbers here cannot be ignored.

Question: What does it mean?

Response: I was an adviser elsewhere – can give students a safe person to talk to. It is very timely, given the young man committed who committed suicide recently after his sexual orientation was streamed live on Facebook.

Comment: So this is about giving them a place to talk.

Comment: No resources needed other than my time, a little bit of training.

Comment: To me, we need something a little more for single mothers.

Comment: Then perhaps you could start that organize that.

Comment: Are they being discriminated against?

Comment: To me, it's a life choice thing.

Comment: To me, a single mother may or may not be ostracized. But as a lesbian, I might not talk to you about that. It is important. Do we need to wait until there is a hate crime in order to help these students? An academic environment is a place to educate students, create spaces and programs to be inclusive.

Comment: Sounds like a good idea, but are you suggesting we create a program of that type? Maybe they need some training.

Response: This is already done by Student Affairs.

Question: Are you asking for approval?

Comment: We don't have a recommendation, but appeal to you to buy in and give support. Acknowledge this, share with students, faculty. This is information sharing. Perhaps you could put out wider dissemination. Would like to do training, others might too if they knew about it.

The committee has also worked to analyze effectiveness of retention efforts for minority services. This is in progress. The last report was in 2006-07-08. Results on website. At that time, we examined African American rates (same or better than average) and Hispanic student rates. African American rates also showed no gender difference. For 2002 data, males decreased. This was a

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

small group of people, and we haven't looked at that since 2006. Look back in a more comprehensive way now.

The committee works to promote and address diversity issues through workshops, forums, and support administrative functions. Have participated in 2 summits, and we should have a conference here. With students, faculty, local community. Partner with One Columbus.

Have developed a Facebook page, and request that this info be disseminated to faculty, staff, students. Engage in dialog about diversity. We invite you, request senate promote participation. UITS office is going to link this page in strategic place on CSU page.

Study circles are another effort of the committee. Since 2004, training of facilitators about "difficult dialogs". If you teach a class with close relationship with these issues, can embed this in your class. We request that senate contribute to promote dialogs.

Comment: We formed a task force late in spring, did some preliminary work. Maybe we reconstitute task force with larger group – task force on diversity – to look at bylaws, etc, to compare to other institutions. Since the handbook being revised, we should save this for next time.

Comment: Everyone has a right to an environment in which they can live and work productively.

Response: Because we are planning a conference, we appeal to Senate to encourage faculty to be members of planning committee. We would like representation from different colleges. Did you want senators, or just representatives? Bringing awareness, so when we approach deans they will be aware of it.

Motion from committee – one member from each college, to be supplied by Deans. (seconded by Becker)

*Motion passes.*

- f. Academic Technology Utilization Committee report – not presented.
- g. Retention, Progression, and Graduation Committee report – deferred to next time – will be first under old business.

### **Attachments and Appendices: Handouts and presentations**

- History of BOR Capital Outlay/State Appropriations, FY1980-FY2011 (attached separately)
- UITS report on administrative privileges and access to software manuals (powerpoint, attached separately)
- Student Evaluation of Faculty report and recommendations (attached below)
- Charge for the Distance Education Committee (attached below)
- Report by Diversity, Programs and Services Advisory Committee (attached below)

.....  
**Faculty Senate and Chairs Assembly**  
**Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Faculty**  
October 22, 2010

Present: Michael Baltimore; Baiqiao Deng; Bill Frazier (chair); Barbara Hunt; Ellen Martin; Jacqueline Radebaugh; Gary Sprayberry.

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

In light of the termination of Digital Measures as an instrument for student evaluation of faculty, the abovementioned representatives from the Chairs Assembly and the Faculty Senate discussed recommendations for substitute means of evaluation. Several points were made:

- 1) Whatever method is adopted, we recommend that evaluation take place prior to the end of the semester. Ideally evaluation should take place three to four weeks before the last day of class. This is recommended in order to lessen the students' evaluations being based mainly on the grade they earn.
- 2) One substitution for the Digital Measures instrument proposed by the administration is an on-line instrument delivered through the campus Banner system. A significant problem with the Digital Measures instrument was the very small rate of student participation. Two to three responses from a class of 25 or more is insufficient for any kind of meaningful analysis. We suggest that the proposed Banner system would suffer the same problem.
- 3) Means of insuring greater student participation by allowing students to see their course grades as soon as they are posted would be meaningless if evaluation were conducted three to four weeks prior to the end of the semester, as we recommended above. The subcommittee discussed several rewards and punishment to motivate students to complete online evaluations and concluded that either they were insufficient to motivate or were likely to result in transferring hostility to the evaluation instrument and the person being evaluated.
- 4) The principal purpose of student evaluation of teaching is improvement of teaching. It is not a reliable means of judging the quality of instruction (see Selden, 1993; Selden, 1999; Langbein, 2008). For this reason, use of evaluation for administrative purposes should be limited to those courses provided by faculty as part of their annual evaluations or as parts of packages submitted for tenure/promotion reviews. The ability of administrative officers to access electronically student evaluations of all courses is therefore problematic and potentially subject to abuse.
- 5) Different disciplines utilize different means of instruction and cannot be evaluated in the same manner across campus. Even within a given College, differences in disciplines require different evaluations. We recommend that evaluation instruments have a common core of ten questions but allow additional questions based on department preferences.
- 6) For all of the reasons presented above, we recommend use of paper evaluation forms rather than on-line evaluation instruments. We recognize that on-line courses already have evaluation methods in place and our recommendations refer only to in-class instruction.
- 7) We understand that paper forms are expensive in terms both of the purchase price as well as time spent processing the data. But on-line evaluation methods are also costly and suffer from all of the problems detailed above, problems which paper instruments avoid.

## **References Cited**

**APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

Seldin P(1993) The use and abuse of student ratings of professors. Chronicle of Higher Education 39:A40.

Seldin P(1999) in Current practices in evaluating teaching: A practical guide to improved faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions, Current practices—good and bad—nationally, ed Seldin P (Anker, Bolton, MA), pp 1–24.

Laura Langbein 2008), Management by results: Student evaluation of faculty teaching and the mis-measurement of performance, Economics of Education Review, Volume 27, Issue 4, Pages 417-428, ISSN 0272-7757, DOI: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2006.12.003.

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6VB9-4P0086S-1/2/e139912e7ab065877dd28b73678c755a>

\*\*\*\*\*

Issues for consideration by the Distance Education Committee.

1. If it is assumed that teaching online courses take extra time and preparation, is there any plan to compensate faculty teaching hybrid courses (50% online)?
2. Can the Senate examine the range of extra money earned by teaching these online courses? What is the highest amount of extra money given to faculty in an academic year? Do we really want to pay \$8K or \$10K more per year for teaching online?
3. If it is assumed that teaching online courses takes extra time and preparation, are there tools in place to ensure that this is truly the case? In other words, is it feasible that faculty teaching 100% online courses may actually be working the same (or less) than those teaching in face-to-face courses (yet be compensated more)?
4. What message is conveyed by giving extra compensation to those teaching online?
5. If the extra compensation for teaching online courses is to continue, can we assist (financially) the hard-working faculty teaching courses that don't lend themselves to being taught online?
6. If it is assumed that teaching online courses takes extra time and preparation, it is possible that faculty teaching two to four of those courses may not have as many additional responsibilities (committees, department duties, etc....)? Is it then possible that other faculty may have the same (if not higher) workload?
7. If the extra compensation for teaching online courses is to continue, should there be a ceiling or highest amount one can earn during the semester or academic year? If a department chair/administrator determines that traditional (face-to-face) faculty are working just as much (or more) than faculty teaching online courses can some of the money generated be dispersed to all members of the department?

.....

**APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

**Diversity Initiative at CSU  
Report to the Senate  
November 1, 2010**

---

Diversity Programs & Services Advisory Committee

USG Mandate

A. To give suggestions on programs for minority students at Columbus State University. Particular attention is given to African-American students through the Minority Advising Program (MAP). MAP was established (by the Board of Regents) in 1983 to enhance the academic welfare of African-American students in the University System of Georgia.

Among other things, the following program is in place to address the needs of the emerging complex issues of diversity:

**The Safe Zone program** at Columbus State University exists as a voluntary support system for Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual, or Transgendered (GLBT) students. This program seeks to actively engage and educate students, faculty, and staff about the issues facing this under-represented population on our campus. Furthermore, the program allows participants to become allies to those in need. The Safe Zone is an innovative approach to meeting the needs of a diverse student population at Columbus State University. More information can be found : <http://minority.colstate.edu/>

**B. To analyze/review the effectiveness of programs on the retention rate for minority students.**

In progress. A 4 member Task force was formed in September to examine the status of minority students in RPG. The analysis will compare the students' current status that of the previous study done in 2006 (see attached summary of results).

**C. To promote and address issues regarding diversity in all areas of the campus through faculty/student workshops and forums, and program development to support administrative functions.**

- USG Diversity Summits have been held twice and CSU has participated summit was organized on the campus of Georgia Tech on October 27-28, 2010. President Mescon lead a team of 12 faculty and amembers of staff representing various colleges/units. The summit is part of the system-wide movement to promote diversity inclusiveness in the curriculum and university-wide programs and activities. Participants to this 300 summit attendees included university Presidents, Provosts, Chairs of departments, Directors, faculty and staff.
- Diversity Conference  
As a follow up on the two summits, the committee plans to:

**APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

- Creat a planning committee to organize and implement a diversity conference in February. The committee be spearheaded by the Office of Diversity Programs & Services, and it will include members from various univesity units including: faculty, student organizations, staff council, chairs council, and program directors.

*Recommendation:*

Senate request Deans/Chairs Council to nominate faculty to the Diversity Conference Planing committee.

- **Diversity Initiative Facebook** page at: <http://www.facebook.com/pages/Columbus-GA/Diversity-Initiative-at-Columbus-State-University/197495477147?ref=ts> The purpose of this web page is to provide a supportive environment for faculty, students, and staff to engage in scholarly dialogue on diversity to augment face-to-face discussions that will be organized on campus starting in March. The committee plans to use information from these discussions to develop benchmarks for diversity that can be used by the university to assess excellence in all departments and programs.

In the long run diversity data from colleges/departments/programs with the best diversity records can be used as a yardstick by which to measure our diversity efforts.

N.B. There needs to be funding for research on diversity. This would also generate more interest among faculty and students.

- **Study Circles**

The training of facilitators was conducted over the summer, and a second one in September, to prepare for courageous dialogues in spring 2011.

*Recommendation:*

- 1) Request Faculty Senate to contribute in promoting these dialogues (Faculty buy-in).



**MAAC Meeting – October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2006.**

**Minority Students Enrollment and Retention Data: An Analysis**

[Note: AA = African-American; H = Hispanic.]

**Regular admissions - returning for 4th year**

AA - 97 + 98 below the 'all' by 3-4%

- 99 - above by 5%

**APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

- 00 + 01 - below by 2%

- 02 just about average

So - was slightly below for the past - in last year of data available is at the average.

H - Significantly below in years 98 + 99, by 10-12% - all other years above the average.

**All students: Returning for 4th year**

No discernible pattern as such.

A-A returning was below earlier (97 + 98) - since then has been about close to average except 01; last year of data 2002 at 42.64% (43.32 average)

H - way below in 1999 - little below in other years - last year of data 2002 at 51.85% (43.32 average) so above average.

**Graduating in 6 years (regular admissions group):**

	ALL	AA	Hispanic
97	27.68%	30.00%	33.33%
98	30.77%	29.2 %	23.53%
99	31.32%	34.69%	15.79%

This shows that while all students + AA students graduation rates are improving - with Hispanic students there has been a precipitous drop off in graduating rates.

**Graduating in 6 years (all students):**

	ALL	AA	Hispanic
97	24.2 %	22.22 %	27.27 %
98	26.70 %	22.03 %	18.18 %
99	27.59 %	26.81 %	17.86 %

**APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

The "All Students" data reflects a similar trend - overall graduation rate is improving, AA is up but graduation rate for all H students is still way down.

**AA – Males versus Females: A Comparison**

Year	Returning for 4 <sup>th</sup> Year		Graduating in 6 years	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
1997	40.35%	32.18%	22.81%	21.84%
1998	15.56%	39.39%	13.33%	25.00%
1999	54.84%	42.99%	32.26%	25.23%
2000	45.76%	50.00%		
2001	44.07%	41.98%		
2002	37.66%	44.68%		

In the last year of data available (1999), Males graduating in 6 years is higher than the Females; however the fact that a significantly lower percentage of Males graduated the previous year may be driving this statistic.

In comparing the percentages of Males versus Females returning for the 4<sup>th</sup> year, while there is some shifting between the genders year-on-year, there seems to be no discernible pattern. In the last year of data available (2002), the Males percentage has slipped and would bear watching to determine whether that was an anomaly or the start of a trend. The drop and surge in returning rates for Males between 1998 and 1999 seems to have been an anomaly and it is possible that 2002 would be the same.

## **APPROVED Minutes**

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Center for International Education, Sara Spencer Event Hall

1 November 2010  
Called to 3:03 pm

### **Conclusion:**

Data was examined to determine any trends in the retention and graduation rates of two minority student groups – African-American (AA) and Hispanic (H).

### **AA**

Graduating in 6 yrs and returning for the 4th year rates are currently about the same or better than average.

In comparing Male versus Female AA students, no discernible pattern for either group emerges.

In the last year of data (2002), AA Males returning for 4<sup>th</sup> year percentage has decreased; this statistic needs to be monitored further.

### **H**

Returning for the 4th year for this group seems to be holding/improving but graduating in 6 years has halved from 1997 to 1999. However, this statistic needs to be qualified on two counts:

1. The total number of students is so small that there is definitely “small sample bias” present.
2. Also, three years is a relatively small time frame, so the study needs more years of data to determine if this was happenstance or a continuing pattern.
3. Another study be conducted in 2010.