Senate meeting

11 January 2010

Approved on 27 January 2010

Location: Center for International Education - Sara Spencer Event Hall

Members present: Paula Adams (Library), Becky Becker (COA), Greg Blalock (COEHP), Jan Burcham (COEHP), Bonita Fluornoy (COEHP), Rita Jones (COBCS), Susan Hrach (COLS), Nick Norwood (COLS), Lisa Oberlander (COA), 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 President Mescon.

Meeting called to order at 3:05 pm

1. Report from the President Mescon
   - Tonight is our first ever class in our first doctoral program – a momentous day!
   - First item that was reported was regarding the core curriculum revisions. The University System office has asked the 35 colleges/universities to respond to revisions, so we have created a Core Curriculum Task Force, to be co-chaired by Ellen Roberts and Tina Butcher. They will consider changes to the number of semester hours in core, formulate a plan to address 3 new learning goals included in the revised core. Members of task force encouraged to seek lots of faculty input. Changes made by September 2010. There will be a new website and an open blog for comment on decisions and activities in this process, similar to the system wide efforts.
   - Second item reported on, is that another task force has been created. For now, it is called the "Personnel Evaluations Task Force" – a working title, as it is tasked with considering faculty performance and development. It is being chaired by Linda Hadley, staffed by one administrator and one faculty member from each college. Tim Howard is an ex officio member for Academic Affairs.   The Task Force will "review and (make) recommendations on expectations in terms of faculty personnel evaluations, including flexible work load agreements that would allow the faculty to contribute to the Columbus State University mission and vision in variety of areas." (quoted from Letter to the Campus Community from President, Provost dated 1/5/2010). Changes will be made to the faculty handbook at that point. There will be a working website and blog for this task force as well, in order to facilitate faculty input. To complete by late February if possible.

   Discussion and Questions follow.
   - Shouldn't faculty be more actively involved (have more faculty members on the committee than administrators), rather than having a smaller faculty representation? President Mescon will relay this concern to committee.
   - Can we have a Faculty Senate representative on the task force? (Senator Lisa Oberlander is already on the Task Force).
   - Some of the items the committee will review include section 106.4 in faculty handbook, guidelines for tenure, and 107.1 criteria referencing promotions.
   - Do these criteria apply to post-tenure review? President Mescon expects that they will.

- Third item of discussion, brought up by President Mescon, focused on his distribution of recently updated spreadsheet on P&T summary (attached at end of minutes). Dr Levi previously shared concerns about breaking this data down further, due to small numbers. In almost every case, decisions were by USG guidelines. In almost all cases, colleagues declined in this year's promotion and tenure process will have an opportunity to resubmit next year. Discussion followed.
    - <u>Question</u> about the number receiving positive reviews from department, which looked low to the questioner.
    - <u>Question</u>: President Mescon was asked for the number of faculty who received a favorable review at department/chair level, who also had favorable review at provost/president level? Are these the same groups? A casual look at the data might indicate that this is the case, but we cannot conclude this.
    - <u>Response:</u> The Provost and President are trying to respect faculty privacy by responding with only the data we have so far.
    - <u>Question</u> Are the numbers as reported accurate?
    - <u>Comment by Senator:</u> College of Business and Computer Science doesn't have a department committee for Promotion and Tenure but School of Computer Science might. Some of the data may be skewed this way.
    - <u>Response:</u> President Mescon encouraged Senators to talk to "anyone they like" about the process, and allow individuals to decide if they wished to share information or not.
    - <u>Comment</u> There was a tremendous drop in numbers approved when moving from College/Dean review to Provost. The biggest problem wasn't the numbers, but that criteria were uncertain, and had been changed without informing the faculty. This needs to be addressed.
    - <u>Response:</u> Those shifts occur in the academy all the time. For almost all faculty declined in this years decisions, there is another opportunity. "History always has an upward trend"
    - <u>Comment:</u> Most of the faculty don't want to be seen as resisting change. But at the same time, we want to feel that things are fair. Changing evaluation criteria is blatantly unfair.
    - <u>Response:</u> In 32 years and 5 institutions, President Mescon has seen this many more than 5 times. It is the nature of the profession.
    - <u>Comment:</u> There was no preparation for the change in standards for the faculty.
    - <u>Response:</u> President Mescon cited the Vision and Mission Statement, and Values and Goals (from the Strategic Plan) implemented last year. Based on these, there must be any evidence of progress toward publishing in a peer reviewed publication. To demonstrate the ability to do so over 5 years (or in some cases more) - that was the intent of the changes. This is germane for most disciplines, except the arts (which are more nuanced).
    - <u>Comment</u>: When was this made the criteria?
    - <u>Response:</u> To provide any evidence of ability to produce a peer reviewed publication – is that standard too high?
    - <u>Comment:</u> Not is it too high, but when should we have known this?

- o <u>Response:</u> This is normal for academia to require peer reviewed work. Is there any evidence while employed at CSU that you published in peer review publication? This is the standard.
- o <u>Comment:</u> in some fields, this is simpler than others. The Mission Statement was generated in the last academic year, and is being used to justify changes. The timing of the change is <u>the</u> issue.
- o <u>Response:</u> I accept that. It's amazing it was <u>*just*</u> 25% of the applicants who were "caught" by this.
- o <u>Comment:</u> Change in standards should not come in fiat from above.
- o <u>Response:</u> CSU has a history of creating a humane path for its faculty. The majority of the rejected P&T applications are 2 years early, according to USG guidelines. Some disciplines are more complicated to publish in than others, true. How many peer institutions would tenure someone who could not demonstrate that level of scholarship?
- o <u>Comment:</u> I think we need to be pushed to more scholarship, but we have been perceived as a teaching institution. I'm for it (a push for more scholarship) in a gradual sort of way, not a sudden change.
- o <u>Comment:</u> In your experience, how many years does it generally take for faculty to get to the point where they aren't "caught" by the changes?
- o <u>Response:</u> Teaching oriented publications are out there. We currently have no definition of journal quality to abide by. We are not asking for publication in top tier, middle tier, or even the worst tier in your discipline. We don't define the acceptability of journals in print vs. online either. Options in most disciplines can be opened up this way.
- o <u>Comment:</u> As we are pushed to do this, we need the resources as well.
- o <u>Response:</u> The Provost is coming out with programs to aid in this. As more grants come in, colleges will receive more overhead funds to support this work. We have to orchestrate an investment that provides the appropriate forum to do this. The Provost has also said, let the Dean and Department Chair determine appropriate teaching loads. That determination should be credit hour neutral for the University. We have all kinds of lecture space on both campuses – check these out.

2. Committee Reports
   a. Distance Learning (Tom Hackett)
Several initiatives were reported on.
- Project - The committee looked into means of proctoring exams for online classes that isn't tough on students finances, or on funding for faculty.
  - o They looked at onsite proctoring. Those options are expensive for students.
  - o Andrew Jackson University (in Hoover) – online school – system to hire proctors to proctor exams online. This system – Proctor U – is now independent of its' original school. In this system, the student is scheduled on a server site. At that time, the student navigates via web browser to the server and the only thing the student can do with the computer is take that exam, all else is locked out. Student uses webcam to show id, the room, that no one is hiding under desk. Questions are asked of student by proctor (work with a credit check group to find info)

Pictures of our students will all be in Banner for additional ID check. This system may be piloted in summer. Cost will be $17/test/student.   Please let students know up front (in syllabus) to expect this cost. Abraham George is working to implement this.

- Question: Will webcam be on student all the time? Can they check to see if student is taking exam as open note exam? Response: Yes. If proctors notice anomaly, they report to professor. Proctors can stop students at any time, request additional room scan. It does not require synchronous exam.

- Ad Hoc sub-committee meeting this week to determine the feasibility for a distance learning conference to be held at CSU. Nationally recognized speakers (using tech), training initiatives, etc. will be invited.

- Another round of distance learning grants will be announced at the end of the week. RFP has been modified to show how to use Quality Management rubric to prepare online courses, and to answer how proposal meets those standards. Committee is asking for department chairs to stipulate that this course is intended to be in schedule, to enable funding up front for grant.

3. Faculty Recognition (Becky Becker)

Met Dec 11. They are proposing eight new awards, not yet discussed with Provost. These are: External Funding/Grants Award; Undergraduate Student Research Award; Graduate Student Research Award; Innovation in Teaching and Learning Award; Community Involvement & Professional Service Award; Global Connection Award; Individual Contribution to Field in Research/Scholarly Activity Award; Individual Contribution to Field in Creative Activity Award. The committee has also created nomination forms. Regarding the older awards, the committee has worked to clean up language in handbook, make descriptions of awards/criteria parallel, and clarify process. Hopefully these awards will be celebrated during Honors Day.

    a. Shared Governance (Dan VanKley)

Will have forums at the end of the month to discuss last semester's Shared Governance Survey responses (preliminary summary posted to Senate Minutes website). These discussions will lay the groundwork then to try to improve climate on campus. Forums are scheduled for

- Tuesday Jan 26th at 12:30 in the CCT Auditorium
- Wednesday Jan 27th at 326 Arsenal Place at 10:00 am
- Friday January 29th at 1:00 pm in the CCT Auditorium.

The intent of the committee is to let those who show up set the agenda, and tell the committee how to interpret results and say how the university should move forward.

4. Old Business

    a. Executive Committee report on meeting re: Library: Senate response

Review to date: Faculty status of librarians will not continue with new hires. Administration feels that this is appropriate, as librarians were not tenure track. Work of librarians on faculty committees should be maintained, if beneficial to the committee – committee chairs should determine makeup of the committee. Senate library committee should now play more important advisory role to UITS Director. Senate has voiced concern about violation of university statute about dean of library reporting to VPAA – provost's response that the handbook was being re-written.

Comment: When there is a change in policy, current administration tends to comment that "we are changing that, so don't worry." But this process violates faculty contracts. Let's follow

current policy about changing our policies as the university changes its policies. Faculty are running in a world of chaos. It is difficult to know how to do one's job, when one does not know which policies are current and which will be changed, or when.

<u>Comment</u>: Is there a "university counsel"?

<u>Response:</u> Not here. USG has counsel that faculty can consult.

<u>Question:</u> What is the obligation/rights of the senate?

<u>Response:</u> Some other USG institutions have counsel on campus, but we do not.

<u>Question:</u> Is it the will of the senate to do something? Some would like to see Executive Committee find the USG counsel, discuss the issues with them and report back.

<u>Clarification:</u> Are we asking about grievable offenses, or how to move on from here? Does senate/shared governance have a voice in this issue? Should we talk about violations of policy?

<u>Comment:</u> It seems strange to remove faculty status from librarians while we are moving to be more research focused institution. Are librarians contract employees? If so, they have certain rights. Contract staff have different rules, and we will have stripped Librarians of their rights. Someone should investigate what are legal opportunities, etc for senate. Library faculty were originally tenure-track, then was changed (several times) over CSU history. Has anyone investigated the standard at other universities? Perhaps that should be documented as well.

      b.   Promotion and Tenure Process: Senate response

Presented three draft resolutions (attached as appendix)

<u>Comment:</u> May need to include – while new criteria are being developed, all pre-tenure review should be seen by provost office at a minimum.

<u>Question:</u> Should there be something that addresses changes in expectation that was not communicated to faculty? What happens to faculty who are in the pipeline now?

<u>Comment:</u> SACS says criteria must be published. Does resolution it reference USG manual section?

<u>Comment:</u> As far as post-tenure review goes, it is supposed to stop at Dean's level, unless you are contesting review. We'll see if this continues. What instructions does each group get?

<u>Comment:</u> In Resolution 1, suggest changing to "the faculty and their chairs and deans" instead of just "the faculty". Provost should only intervene when there is a difference between review levels.

<u>Comment:</u> AAUP states guidelines as "faculty". Chairs are ambiguous status, Deans are not. Tenure denial only officially occurs at Provost/Presidential level, not lower. Chairs are now on 12 month contract, have they turned the corner into administration?

<u>Comment:</u> If we have administrators that we have confidence in, we should trust them to make those judgement calls. Administrators have oversight for overall all divisions, not just one. The Senate is advisory, so it can only communicate the sense of the members.

<u>Comment:</u> 3rd resolution discusses imposition of new standards.   Should we look at BOR policy that is current that applies?

<u>Comment:</u> We have no comparison data from prior year, to be able to determine if these numbers are customary or unusual. We will not be able to mine the data. Withdrawn applications are not included in data presented.

<u>Comment:</u> The main issue is how the policy was enacted, not the overall numbers from this year.

<u>Comment:</u> There is an overall issue which is more than a lack of respect in Resolution 3; it is the retroactive imposition of standards.   This should include something about published/department criteria.

Comment: We could rephrase Resolution 1 so that faculty committees have strongest voice in who is tenured or not, or greatest influence. Those committees are best able to evaluate a candidate in their own discipline.

Question: Should we ask for Personnel Evaluation task force to communicate directly with pre-tenure review, post tenure review faculty? It was suggested that the Provost conduct all pre-tenure reviews, since this is the only office that can give an accurate prediction of what a sufficient standard of research will be.

Comment: Resolution 1 is a matter of trust that decisions were made appropriately. In Resolution 2, we need to check the last statement with a lawyer.

Comment: Suggests a revision of the resolutions, then an email vote.

Susan Hrach will make revisions and distribute.

Question: Has there been discussion about making this stronger?

Comment: What about looking for an education attorney?

Motion to set up a fund to retain an education attorney? No second.

Comment: This is an issue of ethical and collegial behavior.

Lost quorum at 4:58pm.

5. New Business
    a. Tower Day and Honors Program (Cindy Henning)

Distributed handout.

Undergrad Research Day is April 13, now called Tower Day. 11:00-1:30

Trying to encourage all students to come out, mix disciplines on both campuses.

Feb 1st – undergraduate research grants due.

Tower Day – please encourage students to attend. How can the committee help inform students?

Program updates – scholarships due Jan 31. Honors courses hitting cap problems. If you have a student with a GPA of 3.0 or better, they are eligible to apply.

Deferred until next meeting:
    b. Tobacco-Free Campus (Dana Larkin and Gina Sheeks
    c. Review of online teaching evaluations through Digital Measures

▪▪▪

Data provided by President
2009 Tenure and Promotion Summary
Updated report prepared 1/8/2010

	COA	TCOBCS	COEHP	COLS	Totals
Applications for tenure/promotion	6	5	5	13	29
Favorable – dept.	4	2	5	8	19
Favorable – chair	4	4	5	11	24

Favorable – college	5	3	5	12	25
Favorable – dean	5	4	5	12	26
Favorable – provost	3	4	4	8	19
Favorable - president	3	4	4	8	19

Percent Favorable

Promotion/Tenure cases, Fall 2009	COA	TCOBCS	COEHP	COLS	Totals
Favorable – dept.	67%	40%	100%	62%	66%
Favorable – chair	67%	80%	100%	85%	83%
Favorable – college	83%	60%	100%	92%	86%
Favorable – dean	83%	80%	100%	92%	90%
Favorable – provost	50%	80%	80%	62%	66%
Favorable - president	50%	80%	80%	62%	66%

Note: Tables reproduced from handout distributed by the Provost.

DRAFT RESOLUTIONS (in original form – discussed, but sent back to Executive committee for further crafting)

Faculty Senate Meeting, January 11, 2010

1. As matters of instruction are the primary responsibility of the Faculty, the qualifications of instructional faculty are likewise a primary responsibility of the Faculty. As the Faculty are the best informed about the state of their disciplines and what counts as adequate standards for both teaching and research, the Faculty should have the primary responsibility for decisions regarding which faculty members are deserving of promotion and/or tenure, as well as the dismissal of faculty. Except in unusual circumstances, and then only for compelling reason which should be clearly stated, the Administration ought to accept the recommendations of the Department and College Faculty for all matters regarding the status of individual faculty members. Failing to respect the recommendations produced by department and college personal committees implies a failure to respect the Faculty.

2. In its most recent edition of *The Principles of Accreditation*, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges in Section 3.7.2 (Comprehensive Standards: Governance and Administration) states that an institution in compliance with SACS guidelines "regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status." Whereas the published criteria for promotion and tenure have not been revised to include new standards specifying "academic excellence" as per the 2009 CSU Strategic Plan, the Administration's imposition of unpublished standards on faculty evaluation risks rendering CSU out of SACS compliance and jeopardizes the reaffirmation of the university's accreditation.

3. The Faculty Senate affirms the Administration's embrace of academic excellence in the most universal sense, and acknowledges that publication in peer-reviewed journals constitutes one measure of academic excellence. The resources and time necessary to produce peer-reviewed journal articles, however, vary widely across disciplines. Among a faculty whose teaching loads are heavy, and for whom service has heretofore played a significant role in performance evaluations, the immediate imposition of a new standard which demands peer-reviewed publication as a criterion for promotion and/or tenure suggests a fundamental lack of respect for faculty as well as for the requirements of scholarly activity.