

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

**Members present:** Becky Becker (COA), Susan Hrach (COLS), Rita Jones (COBCS), Stephanie Lewis (COEHP), Brenda May Ito (COA), Nick Norwood (COLS), Lisa Oberlander (COA), Neal Rogers (COBCS), David Schwimmer (COLS), Kimberly Shaw (COLS), Gary Sprayberry (COLS), Sandra Stratford (Library), John Studstill (COLS), John Theis (COBCS), Dan VanKley (COLS), Troy Vidal (COLS), Elizabeth Wurz (COLS), Jeff Zuiderveen (COLS)

Guests present, including: Provost Inessa Levi, Ellen Martin, Erma Banks, Carole Burke, Amanda Rees, Alicia Tatum, Florence Wakoko, Alice Pate, Brian Schwartz, Dan Ross, Pat McHenry, Dee Spivey, Nicole DeVries and others.

**Meeting called to order at 3:06 pm**

***Location: Center for International Education - Sara Spencer Event Hall***

### 1. Report from the Provost

The Provost began her report by distributing the article “Top 10 Higher Education State Policy Issues for 2010” (from American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Higher Education Policy Brief, January 2010). There are a number of issues within that are important to us.

- The number one issue is the fiscal issue. We are still not sure that budgets will not be cut further this year.
- Issue #2 is graduation/retention issues. The Admission Standards committee has been looking at our admissions standards. The committee recommended bringing up the deadline to June 30 for undergrads, except military and their families. They further recommended that we maintain a 2.3 high school gpa, SAT of 440/410 (combined total of 2000 freshman index). They further recommended the goal of bringing high school GPA standards to 2.5 in the future and freshman index to 2200. This was very careful work, based on increasing retention rate from 1<sup>st</sup> year to 2<sup>nd</sup> year. Levi thanks the committee for their work on this.
  - Also a question is being asked of the BOR: How do our basic studies classes count toward retention and graduation rates? We are working with the state on this issue.
- Issues of distance education are extremely important, particularly in terms of enrollment capacity. As we talk about quality of education, bring to attention the following numbers: (Wired Campus Jan 26) 17% increase in online enrollment, last year 12% increase. The question isn't whether we should do it, but how to do it well.
- We have hired a new director of institutional research (new handout). He presented a report on where students who left CSU have gone, if they are attending other schools. Notice that 20% of those leaving us went to Columbus Technical College. There are another 800 or so students who have left that we cannot track, that we believe are not currently in school.
- First Year Experience is designed to provide sense of community to 1<sup>st</sup> year students, and an opportunity to form support groups. Undergrad research grants to help students find mentors. The deadline to apply for Spring 2010 is February 2<sup>nd</sup>. Last semester we had 41 submissions, and 32 were funded. (The committee worked with some students to revise and resubmit – originally funded 25). These small grants fund travel, equipment, books, software, for student research. The Provost's office is working with the Foundation to try to get funding for stipends for the students. A recipient of one of these grants in Fall 2009 will be presenting at the Board of Trustees meeting on Thursday.

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

- We are continuing work with McAlister and Quinn to lobby for CSU. Five projects selected for focused efforts (includes STEM equipment, Computer Science development, forensic development, outreach and Space Science Center). Hopefully we will be able to secure funds for these projects. Last round we were able to secure approx \$2M

At this point, the Provost consented to answer questions from those present. Questions, responses and comments are recorded here.

Question: Only 1% of students who have left us have subsequently earned a degree (in 2007 – 2009). Are we spending a lot of effort needlessly? Response: No. Look at the time frame – these students have not had a full chance to complete those degrees yet. We will be sending fliers to those who dropped out, and those at 2 year institutions, to encourage them to come back and complete their degrees here.

Question: What percentage of these people are “our academic casualties”? on probation, etc here? Response: Will get the information, but doesn’t know.

Question: On the grapevine, we have heard that the President has/is planning to have us designated as the USG Arts institution. Response: The proposal was already submitted, capitalizing on our strengths. We are forming a special task force to work on “if this designation gets approved, how do we ensure that everyone benefits from it?” A different level of tuition is one of the benefits this designation would bring. Most of the differential tuition would be covered by Hope scholarships. It is difficult to know what tuition increase we could expect. Additional funds could then be used to address shortages of faculty, and recruitment issues, among other things. Our position in Columbus regarding the arts is very important. Many studies indicate that quality of life in a city is a determining factor of highly qualified/engaged workforce.

Question: Do you realize tuition at Georgia College and State University (with Liberal Arts designation) is also based on small class sizes, not on its’ special designation? Also, how does this impact the rest of us, and shouldn’t this have been considered before submitting the request, rather than after the fact by a task force? Many of the young faculty who are the best researchers would not even apply here if this goes through. Response: I understand that. However, like schools with high powered sports teams, students who do not want to be in such programs will still want to go to a school that has these strong programs. A number of mathematicians have a music background, and this can be used to recruit some faculty as well. In terms of recruitment, we can talk about majoring in your choice, and still participating in a world class art and music program. We have high quality of living here, partly due to the Arts.

Question: Without agreeing or disagreeing, what bothers me is the procedural issue. That this would go forward without consulting the faculty is frustrating. If we have any semblance of shared governance, it should be discussed with faculty to build faculty buy-in and to work out problems. Response: The task force has been assembled to address those issues. Questioner responded that the task force is backward. The task force should have been assembled to address these issues, along with whether to request this status, *before* the proposal was submitted.

Question: Economically, this is backwards. Arts classes are very labor intensive, and need small classes. Each music student may cost 2x as much as math/science students in faculty expense. Market forces are not such that we will be flooded with aspirants. Have you done market research to see if this designation is economically viable? Not sure how much expansion in the majors is possible. Response: College of Arts is doing an analysis.

Question: Could you supply Senate with those results? Response: Will look into it.

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Comment: Not the 1<sup>st</sup> time the idea (Arts designation) has been brought up, and it was shot down for that reason – it was not economically feasible. This seems like an enormous transformation of our institution, and I just found out about it.

Question: What was the date of the request to the BOR? Response: The Provost did not know.

Question: President Mescon said he is encouraging larger class sizes, and that this can reduce teaching loads. How will this affect retention rates, do you expect? Response: No direct correlation between class size and retention. There is research in quality of teaching and different modes. Different class formats can be successful. One can have unsuccessful small classes, and successful large classes. The key is student engagement. The Provost stated that she has taught classes of 150 on a regular basis, collected a piece of written work each lecture from each student. Each student submitted a minute question, which was graded on binary basis. Whether they were here or not was visible. Everyone knew attending was important. Recitation sections by TA provided 1-on-1 time more than classes of 40 or 50. Recording work is still labor intensive unless using clickers. Difficult to do open response with clickers, however. Many different models can be explored for offering effective classes. We intend to expand webinars offered to support novel teaching modes. There are many wonderful models of teaching, which should be implemented responding to the needs of students, as it makes sense for the discipline. The Provost stated that she does not want to insist on any particular teaching load. High quality instruction is first and foremost. Must support student credit hours as we have now, and coming increases, and offer courses with sufficient frequency for students to graduate.

Question: This reminds me of focus on online courses. This was mandated, but there was no apparent effort at thinking about best practices, just playing with gizmos. It has been very frustrating for faculty. We need to build best practices in early. We still don't see any structural support systems for best practices. My hope had been this would come from the Center for Quality Teaching and Learning, but now we don't even have a director for that. No one has been taking responsibility early on. In the dept alone is not enough. A front end investment is needed. Sandra Stratford responds – there has been a small effort on best practices, but most has had to be on tool changes so far. Distance Learning has just added another instructional designer. They were limited in resources till now. You are right. Provost thanks Distance learning committee for developing a rubric for evaluating proposals, and criteria for assessing courses. We do not have director for CQTL currently, as Jim Owen went back to classroom, for issues related to his family. CSU has advertised the position internally, but there are no applications at present. Please encourage colleagues to apply. Position requires a faculty member that is tenured, and at least an associate professor. Plan B is to continue with webinars, etc, for faculty development. If you know of other sources of professional development, please let us know. Administration is tracking attendance at these events to try to maximize attendance. If we were not in such tough budget times, we could have continued as usual. But we have serious competition these days from community colleges, and those schools are looking to offer 4 year programs. So what do we offer that makes us different? Engaged faculty. Opportunities to do research with faculty. Sports, arts events. This is not business as usual anymore.

Question: If it would be your department/disciplinary judgment that class sizes should not be large, are there other ways you can negotiate teaching load? Response: With a load of 4 courses per semester, you can be involved in research. Where do we get the resources to decrease teaching loads when we have 21% budget cut? Suggestions are welcome. We must have high quality teaching; and we must offer as many credit hours as demanded, and we must allow students to graduate in a timely manner.

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Question: We've heard you and Dr. Mescon reference models for larger classes, and studies show they can be successful. Can you provide a list of references to us? If there are good models, we'd like to see them. Response: Of course you realize I don't keep them, but I do read extensively, and I'm sure the President is the same. It would be really useful to set up a website to deposit models for successful teaching practices, including large lectures and more. "If you worry about butts in the seats, you worry about the wrong part of their anatomy."

Question: I understand we are encouraging online learning, and that it is valued, and there are incentives for it. If you have a lot of labs, there is a disincentive to teach online. Why can't students pay more for face to face classtime, and show that we value that? How long do we continue to pay more to faculty for students in online classes? Response: We are honoring demands from students. Last year showed a 17% increase in online enrollment (cites Chronicle of Higher Ed). If you work full time, don't have time to go to school, but might be able to take a class or two. A full time mom has similar issues. It is easier to take course online for many. Students also communicate electronically much more readily these days.

Question: Doesn't an emphasis on online courses oppose the arts/music focus? Sounds like a two tiered approach. Giant and online classes, and then small arts classes. No matter what you say, online engagement is less than face to face.

Comment: Arts faculty were told nothing official either. However, most of the high school students haven't heard of CSU at all – so maybe CSU would be known for *something*.

Comment: That these conversations take place after the proposal has been submitted is the biggest issue.

Provost response: There are times in life when you have the opportunity to help yourself. The special designation can help us in terms of standing in the state, recruitment, budget. The work of task force will be to determine how to make it work.

Provost Levi left to attend another meeting.

## 2. Committee Reports

- a. Update from Academic Council by Susan Hrach. The Provost told you that the recommended Admissions Policy changes were approved. A presentation was made by Institutional Research, mainly about productivity by department. There were announcements about Core Curriculum Task force, and recommendations are expected in September. CSU might ask to be waived from Regents test. There was also a report from director of UITS about where tech fee money being spent.
- b. Personnel Evaluation Task Force, presented by Lisa Oberlander. Charge: "Recommend changes in the CSU Faculty Handbook regarding promotion, tenure, merit, workload, and considerations of time in the promotion and tenure process. The changes should reflect principles and practices that are transparent, aspirational, and commensurate with the university's vision, mission, and goals." <https://sites.google.com/a/colstate.edu/faculty-performance-and-engagement-task-force/?AuthEventSource=SSO> The Task Force Website is under construction. The task force is looking at documents from other institutions. The recommendations will be made public. Currently, there are lots of ideas, but little consensus. No one wants to put tentative ideas on "paper" at this point. There will be space for comments, and there should be a public forum. Have met 3 times already, 3 meetings scheduled soon. When the task force makes its' recommendations, it then goes to Provost.

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Question: What do we tell people going through pre-tenure review? Is the group looking at college statutes currently? Response: Not yet. Question: What about standards of excellence supplied by departments last year? If the task force addresses promotion as well as tenure, then shouldn't library faculty be represented? The senate requested that two faculty instead of one per college on the task force last month, and the issue has yet to be addressed.

Discussion then moved to the proposed Resolution on Promotion and Tenure.

Zuiderveen moved, and Schwimmer seconded, that we accept the resolution as proposed. A minor wording change in point number three was proposed. Jones moved, and Theis seconded, the wording change and the acceptance of the resolution.

Motion passed unanimously.

Text of the resolution is as follows:

While embracing academic excellence, the Faculty Senate of CSU, finds that...

1. Application of unpublished and unannounced criteria for the 2009-2010 promotion and tenure applicants is unconscionable. Furthermore, this may be in violation of BOR policy and SACS guidelines.
2. Failure to consult in advance with the faculty regarding changes to promotion and tenure policy or to communicate intended changes to the faculty or review committees is not in compliance with accepted standards of conduct.
3. The claim that the announcement of a new Strategic Plan's mission and vision is an indication of a change in criteria for promotion or tenure is invalid. Strategic Plans do not address specific criteria for tenure and promotion.
4. Neither the use of new criteria, nor the realignment of departments within colleges, justifies an unannounced change in the criteria for an individual's promotion or tenure from that criteria which has been established through his/her pre-tenure or pre-promotion reviews and annual evaluations and which was used for submission of the promotion or tenure documentation.
5. Inauguration of a new, non-specific, promotion policy for Non-tenure track faculty without notice to those submitting their documents, along with exclusion of such faculty from grant opportunities, demonstrates unjust treatment of those faculty.
6. The senior administration's disregard for faculty input and for recommendations submitted by faculty continues to emerge as a trend.

Recommendations:

Promotion & Tenure.

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

Faculty are to be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure on the Standards of Excellence submitted by their units in January-February 2009 or as agreed upon as they progressed through the pre-tenure and evaluation process until the Faculty of CSU approve new standards or process.

Faculty in departments that have been relocated should continue to be evaluated for promotion and/or tenure under their department's Standards of 2009 or as agreed upon by the Faculty member and his/her chair/dean during the pre-tenure and evaluation process prior to the relocation.

Changes in promotion and tenure criteria should be openly discussed and implemented only when approved by both the Faculty and Administration of CSU.

CSU administrators are responsible for providing leadership and support during transitional periods when standards and criteria for promotion and tenure are changing. This includes establishing reasonable timelines for the implementation of such changes.

.....

Discussion next moved to a proposed resolution on the status of the library. Grammar and wording changes were made.

Norwood moved, and Van Kley seconded, that the revised resolution be accepted. Motion passed unanimously.

Text of the resolution is as follows:

1. The Faculty Senate requests that the President provide the BOR-specified contracts to the Library Faculty of CSU immediately, and provide written explanation regarding the delay in provision of the 2009-2010 contracts for these faculty. The Senate requests information as to whether other non-tenure track faculty were, or were not, provided their contracts last fall.

2. The Faculty Senate requests reconsideration of the reporting structure for the Libraries, formerly a unit under Academic Affairs, now moved to University Information and Technology Services. As specified in the CSU Statutes, the CSU Libraries are an integral part of the institution's academic role and mission.

The Senate requests written documentation specifically addressing why, despite the Statutes, the CSU Libraries should not be part of Academics in the same manner as the colleges, with representation on the Academic Council and other academic groups, and with appropriate funding. The documentation should include successful examples of institutions where the

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

library is outside the academic structure as well as those where the library is within the academic structure.

### **Statutes of Columbus State University: Article 3, Section 4**

<http://faculty.colstate.edu/handbooks/ftfac/appendixie.asp> refers to reporting structure for the Library.

3. The Faculty Senate requests reconsideration of the faculty status of newly-hired librarians. The increased emphasis on undergraduate, graduate and faculty research at CSU strengthens the rationale for faculty status for librarians.

4. The Faculty Senate requests that the search for a new Director/Dean of the CSU Libraries shall be conducted in the manner described in the CSU Statutes. The Library Faculty and the Library Advisory Committee shall be involved in establishment of the position qualifications and responsibilities. It is noted that Librarians at Regional Universities, to which level CSU aspires, are identified as Faculty in the BOR policy. For State Universities, the faculty shall consist of full-time administrative officers and teaching faculty both. Therefore, the Senate recommends that the new leader of CSU libraries be a faculty member with the appropriate disciplinary credentials to hold academic rank.

### **CSU Statutes: Article 3, Section 4**

<http://faculty.colstate.edu/handbooks/ftfac/appendixie.asp>

### **Board of Regents Policy Manual: Section 3.2.1**

[http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/policy/3.2\\_faculties/#p3.2.1\\_faculty\\_membership](http://www.usg.edu/policymanual/section3/policy/3.2_faculties/#p3.2.1_faculty_membership)

### **Association of College and Research Libraries Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians**

<http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/acrl/standards/jointstatementfaculty.cfm>

.....  
Handbook Revisions Committee, report by Alicia Tatum.

Committee is just now moving forward with revisions without it seeming like a chore. They are tasked with making handbook the concise, straight to the point. Many parts of it are already cut and paste from BOR policy. Dr. Levi wants numbering of the handbook to be arranged so that it parallels BOR policy, and Dr. Howard is coordinating that effort. For sections directly quoted, the handbook will have a summary statement, and an active link to BOR policy. This will cut out time, and effort for the faculty. However, the deadline is in March for completing this work

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

and submitting it to the Provost. Handbook committee leaving Promotion & Tenure policy to task force. The committee is working in teams on different sections. Revisions after compilation will then be given to Senate before publication.

Comment: Handbook is separate from the University Statutes. We can't change statutes without vote from whole faculty. Response: Only changing the handbook through section 136, which does not include the statutes. At next month's meeting, may be able to show everything they have been working on. Committee working electronically, using strikeouts and highlighting to show old wording and new.

Question: Are you looking at conflicts between statutes and new policy? Senate will need to do some oversight at this point.

Diversity Issues, report by John Studstill:

The Task Force has only met once. They were tasked with selections/recommendations for faculty committees, to ensure committee formation was appropriate for diversity needs. Tasks dealt with defining diversity; review existing committees to ascertain diversity characteristics in place; review programs of other universities with successful programs, and reviewing the current BOR statutes and policies, those of comparable USG institutions and CSU by-laws relating to diversity issues. The task force will report back when they have results. Report attached below.

Shared Governance Task Force – report on forums by Dan Van Kley :

Nearly 40 people attended 3 forums. Faculty attending felt that the data from the surveys indicate very serious shared governance problems. The participants viewed data as a damning characterization of upper administration. The committee has not met since forums to compare notes. Suggestions from faculty at the forums on future approaches included approaching the BOR for a mediator, and request vote of no confidence.

The Shared Governance Task Force has a non-university email address:

[csugovernance@gmail.com](mailto:csugovernance@gmail.com).

Comments from attendees were extremely negative, and harsh about administration. Van Kley stressed: *If you do not think this harsh verdict is appropriate, the committee particularly needs to hear from you.*

Comment: Survey was completed before P&T decisions, and before the announcement today about seeking a special Arts designation. No further survey needed, as faculty attitudes will not have improved.

Comment: BOR does not advertise any mediation service for this process. Has the Faculty Senate Executive Officer talked to BOR? Response: If it is the general will, she is willing to place a phone call to request mediation, and to ask policy questions. Zuiderveen moves that Susan call Linda Noble. Wurz seconds.

Comment: We also haven't discussed these actions with Board of Trustees at this point – perhaps we should involve them.

If you want to organize similar actions to the resolution about COLS Dean Search, called on to do so.

Vote on the motion: Eleven yes, three abstain. Motion passes.

### 3. New Business

Review of online teaching evaluations through Digital Measures: report by Nicole DeVries.

# CORRECTED MINUTES

1 February 2010

## Faculty Senate Meeting

At the one year mark, where do we stand? Technical issues in fall due to new IP addresses on new servers, so things were sent to student spam folders. There were security concerns about sending student password and usernames via email. Now students instructed to go into cougarnet and click on evaluations.

Response rates a lot lower due to multiple issues.

Also, university reorganization affects digital measures for faculty as well. On evaluations, questions were sent to Deans today as adjusted for reorganization.

Statistics for response rates.

Summer 09 36.77%

May 09 42.85%

Spring 09 38.96%

Fall 09 23.42%

Ms. Devries believes the previous year's response rates were around 70-80%, but can't find much data.

Thoughts – we can customize evaluations on a department level. Response rate dropped; this may be correlated to student grades. University of New Haven did study, found that students with higher grades are more likely to reply to online evaluations. As a personal counterpoint – forced evaluations are often not as thoughtful.

Dr. Levi wants students to participate in online – paper and processing costs make online more appealing. Can use Digital Measures to have students indicated which students responded, without indicating who gave which evaluation – give extra credit? This can be an option.

**Adjourn 5:11 pm.**

.....  
Report to Senate - Task Force on Diversity Feb 1, 2010

1. Task Force formed at the request of the Diversity Programs and Services Advisory Committee (Standing Committee) [senator co-chairs: Elizabeth Wurz, Paula Adams, John Studstill]
2. Tasked with reviewing procedures and making recommendations for selections/elections for faculty committees in order to insure equitable selection and membership from diverse groups
3. Meeting in January to divide tasks into three areas,
  - A) review policies on diversity of the BOR, CSU and comparable USG institutions (to include definitions of diversity)
  - B) review existing committees to ascertain current membership characteristics
  - C) review programs of other universities that have existing and successful diversity initiatives with identification of problematic areas.

Submitted by John Studstill for the committee