

October 03, 2016

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

**Members Present:** Alison Cook, Rajeev Dabke, Michael Dentzau, Sherika Derico, Lisa Frander, Katey Hughes, Patrick Jackson, Michelle Jones, Krystal Kennel, Tesa Leonce, Chris Markwood, Ellen Martin, Chris McCollough, Clay Nicks, Laurence Marsh, Carolina Pelaez-Morales, Yesem Peker, Andrew Puckett, Amanda Rees, Diana Riser, Brian Schwartz, Kim Shaw, Richard Stephens, Joy Thomas, Neal Thomson, Alan Tidwell, Kevin Whalen

**Guests Present:** Richard Baxter, Zane Everitt, John Finley, Mark Flynn, Frank Hardyman, Tim Howard, Mariko Izumi, Laurie Jones, John Lester, Eliot Rendleman, Ellen Roberts, Dennis Rome, Stephanie Speer, Uma Sridharan, Glenn Stokes, Amy Thornton, Brian Tyo, Tara Underwood, Wayne Van Ellis

### **I. Call to order at 3:01 PM**

### **II. President's and Provost's comments and announcements (1:02 time stamp)**

#### **A. President Markwood remarks**

1. Budget for next year being put together; increased transparency

#### **B. Glenn Stokes remarks on behalf of the Provost**

1. Distributed Office of Provost September remarks (newsletter)
2. Moving forward with changing location of graduation ceremonies beginning May 2017
3. Strategic planning is in the works; presentation on study day
4. Redesign of Scholastic Honors Convocation, including presentation of faculty awards and department/college-specific awards at different ceremonies
5. Midterm grade date for core courses reminder
6. Reference to upcoming and important dates on Provost's newsletter
7. After consulting legal affairs at BOR office: A CSU dean is coming up for promotion, which is unusual. Standard review process raises questions of appropriateness; therefore, a temporary fix includes a new committee of
  - a. Elected members from the departments from that college
  - b. Glenn Stokes serving as Dean ad litem (will receive recommendation from the committee)
  - c. Two committee members as well as chair of that committee appointed by Glenn Stokes
  - d. The big issue that they had in Atlanta—they said the process we're going through was perfectly appropriate. We just wanted to make sure there was transparency, and they recommended presenting it to the Senate just so you were aware that there is no policy covering the review and promotion of a dean. They said as long as we presented it and made everyone aware of it, it should be okay. Any questions?

October 03, 2016

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes

**III. Discussion of Provost Search and Screen Committee formation and membership (8:32 time stamp)**

- A. President Markwood: last week a faculty member sent him a “did you know” email that referenced CSU statutes in regards to the Provost Search and Screen Committee.
1. Began the procedure by contacting various university offices
  2. Did not know about these statutes, and they are not easy to find; contacted
    - a. Kim Shaw (Executive Officer) as soon as he found out
  3. Search committee had identified 14 finalists for video conferencing
    - a. interviews next week
  4. Even though there isn’t proof that this referenced process in statutes is official, we should assume that it is and try to follow it as best as possible
  5. Kim Shaw
    - A. Distributed document that outlines statutes section (Article III, Section 2)
    - B. Proposal for the Provost’s Search Committee distributed (see attachment)
      1. Nominations sent to college senator representative tomorrow (10/4/16)
      2. 10/5/16 and 10/6/16 full-time faculty vote for up to 3 nominees in college by 5 PM
      3. Executive Officer will send list of elected faculty nominees to President and Secretary of the Senate
      4. President will choose 3 members from elected faculty nominees as added members of Provost and Screen Committee and added by 10/20/16
    - C. Glenn Stokes read list of members on current Provost and Screen Committee and college distributions after question from Neal Thomson.
    - D. Discussion of stated policy and the state of faculty currently on the committee by Brian Schwartz, Neal Thomson, and Kim Shaw. Ellen Martin: Are the deans considered faculty in this process? Kim Shaw: No. Brian Schwartz: statement includes that majority of committee shall be appointed from this pool. Does this proposal satisfy that? Discussion included whether nominations should include current members and whether members could be eliminated from committee if not in the top 3 nominees from the respective college.
    - E. Brian Tyo: Was the Board of Regents consulted at all? Chris Markwood responded that there is a question of the origin of statutes. Kim Shaw added that she had difficulty finding where the

October 03, 2016

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

21-page document was approved. She agrees that this needs to be treated as though these are the statutes.

- F. Amanda Rees, Kim Shaw, and Brian Schwartz clarified previous points and discussed best means to nominate faculty members on committee.
- G. Diana Riser: Is there a problem with/consideration that those members are in the minority (only 3) and won't have as much of a voice since they are late to the table?
- H. Brian Schwartz: If we assume that this is a policy that was approved by faculty in a vote, then I don't think the Senate has the power to override that.
- I. Neal Thomson: We will need to explain to all faculty why they are nominating/voting at this point. We should include an explanation of who is already on the committee before voting. Those committee members should remain unless there is a strong feeling amongst their college members to not include them. It's highly unlikely that all 5 will change.
- J. Tim Howard: What have the interactions between search committee and applicants been? Kim Shaw: The Skype interviews are next week. People augmented will have access to the candidate files.
- K. Tesa Leonce: Are we going to ensure at least one faculty representative from COEHP? Kim Shaw: that is the intent of that policy in regard to nominations, but there is no guarantee that the ones chosen by the President will include all colleges.
- L. Discussion ensued on what might be included in a motion.
- M. Motion by Neal Thomson (second by Alan Tidwell): All 8 faculty members be selected using this process, and the ballot include who current members are, and for continuity's sake, that they might be included back on the committee.
  - 1. Diana Riser: I think including a continuity statement is problematic because it might lead people to vote in a certain way. I think either leaving the names with nothing on there or just saying current acting member at most.
  - 2. Ellen Martin: These members were appointed—not nominated nor elected.
  - 3. Joy Thomas: I like the stay or remove option.
  - 4. Brian Schwartz: I don't mind the language of explaining what happened. I think people would still feel free to vote. Diana Riser: You don't do psychological survey research.
  - 5. Neal Thomson: I am willing to accept a friendly amendment to remove the following portion of the motion "and for

October 03, 2016

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

- continuities sake, that they might be included back on the committee" (later accepted by Alan Tidwell)
6. Laurence Marsh: Is that something where we let schools decide how to word the ballot? Kim Shaw: Currently, senators will run the process, so uniformity is preferable.
  7. Dennis Rome: If you were to remove the 5 faculty members now, they have invested a lot of time and energy in this search, so please take that fairness into account. The existing committee, although it doesn't have majority faculty, has 3 deans and is one of the most diverse committees he has seen in a long time.
  8. Clay Nicks: We don't have faculty from our college on it. I recommend, if this motion passes, we go to the BOR for their approval in this. Chris Markwood: What I've asked for is advice so that I can go the system and explain what happened and the advice from the Senate. If we agree, we move forward. We need to be transparent. Glenn Stokes: And I think you move forward assuming that is the policy, because if you wait to hear from the BOR, that would delay the process.
  9. Yesem Peker: I recommend keeping the faculty currently serving and adding additional faculty. Clarification from Kim Shaw. Neal Thomson: Are you saying that there might be fewer than 8 faculty total? The goal is to get to 8 faculty. Yesem Peker: Yes, but it can be more than that. If we go with this process and the colleges select other faculty nominees, then there could be more than eight. Keep the 5 and add more. Neal Thomson: If we go strictly by majority faculty, then 12-13 of the 14 would be selected, all but one from the pool would end up on the committee, which would be a very large committee. Diana Riser clarified Yesem Peker's position that the number of faculty added could be variable depending on the current committee members remaining.
  10. Patrick Jackson: The authority of this policy still seems a little bit gray. I don't see a problem with keeping faculty members already on the committee. The email to the faculty would be confusing. I think most of us agree that keeping the current faculty members would be practical. If this was in place from the beginning, it would be a different story, but

- we're not even clear if this policy is valid.
11. Brian Schwartz: I disagree. This is the official policy, and the intent of it is clear that the members need to be chosen from the pool selected. Then it would be wrong for us not to operate that way.
  12. Yesem Peker: It doesn't say committee faculty membership can't be selected outside the pool. The majority needs to be from the pool, but there can be faculty members from outside the pool.
  13. Amanda Rees: It seems like the more complicated it is, the less likely faculty will respond. I like the idea of augmentation.
  14. Katey Hughes read motion with friendly amendment. Tesa Leonce: I think it's important to include statement on consistency.
  15. Vote: 14 approve, 7 oppose, 1 abstention; motion passes
  16. Kim Shaw: We need a volunteer from each college
    - a) Michelle Jones (Library)
    - b) Ellen Martin (COEHP)
    - c) Chris McCollough (COA)
    - d) Laurence Marsh (TCOSCS)
    - e) Andrew Puckett (COLS)Amanda Rees: Is there a policy for the number of votes needed for voting on nominations? Kim Shaw: No, there isn't a stated policy on a minimum threshold.
  17. Chris Markwood: Thank you for that advice. I will be bringing this to the system later today or tomorrow morning. This highlights the problem with finding policies and procedures. This one was buried, and we will be working diligently to make sure these policies and procedures are documented correctly and centralized, with regular review to make sure they are not in conflict. Thank you for your collective wisdom and input. I will get with senate officers with what we hear from the system.

**IV. Standing Committees (49:53 time stamp)**

- A. General Education Committee (Eliot Rendleman)
  1. 3 meetings in the Spring semester, including a half-day retreat in May
  2. Redefining goals, including moving forward with LEAP, and to open up support of those goals with more than one program or class. That process did stall, and we will revisit that in the fall.

October 03, 2016

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

3. Direct assessment of core courses (piloted last fall to meet SACS requirement) Currently, ETS assesses our core classes, but we needed faculty input. How do we implement it on a regular basis? Do we work with UITS having grades going to one part and LEAP criteria going to another?
  4. Committee will move forward this semester with these questions
  5. Rajeev Dabke: Will we continue with course-embedded assessment? Eliot Rendleman: The committee will discuss that issue.
- B. Mariko Izumi (presentation attached)
1. 2015-2016 awarded \$44,765.28 plus one sabbatical. Number of grants received and awarded presented by semester.
  2. Yuichiro Komatsu is the committee chair (currently on sabbatical)
  3. Clay Nicks: Eddie Obleton is now retired (listed as a committee member).
- V. Old Business (56:00 time stamp)**
- A. Business Intelligence and eProcurement systems – Frank Hardymon, Jr. (presentation attached)
1. Financial Reporting Initiatives: In meeting with deans, we realized we need to improve budget communication as well as transparency and automation.
  2. Staff members in the business office have a lot of experience and are very committed to duties. This is a busy time of the year due to budget proposal creation. We have the budget online (one of the first initiatives we did).
  3. A bigger issue is the monthly budget report that budget managers have access to. It's a difficult process for people to access these, and we're trying to find ways to make them easier to use. Current process involves going into CougarNet → People Soft → BOR menus → ledger reports → budget activity report (that is in pdf and therefore hard to deal with). There are many steps to get here, so it's understandable why people don't often go there.
  4. Hoping to have a modified system up by this winter (easier access and easier to find what you need) to send out links to all department chairs. The challenge is with one click, you can get to the departmental budget you need.
  5. USG has a couple of programs in place that link to PeopleSoft. Once we get people trained, that should cut down on the 2-3 week lag time.
  6. E-Procurement description and training schedule provided
  7. Travel Expense Module changes: no longer use a hard copy; will introduce it online rather than department by department.
  8. Open position in Business and Finance office—will aid in training departments to use these new programs.
  9. Laurie Jones: I thought I saw direct deposit on there (Travel Expense Module)? FH: We're working on that right now. Yes, should be able to do direct deposit.

October 03, 2016

Faculty Senate Meeting  
Minutes

10. Amanda Rees: Will you want scanned documents for travel expense? FH:  
Yes, you will need the capability to scan documents.

**VI. New Business (1:13:03 time stamp)**

A. Human Resources – Discussion of salary increases (Laurie Jones)

Presentation is attached

1. Graph 1: Most increases were 3%, but range was 0-5% (as per BOR policy). BOR also wanted to make sure we had a reasonable distribution in this process. While most landed at 3%, there was a range. Columbus State had a pool of 3%, and we passed on how these were distributed. For example, a new hire might be at 0% or a few employees whose performance might not warrant a merit increase. Employees receiving a promotion increase were also eligible for merit increases, but a promotion increase could also override the merit increase. Instructions that HR passed on included that it is critical to work with department heads/chairs in determining these increases. We had a short turnaround as designated by legislative schedule and our systems (late April – early May). Outcome: Overall average increase (including promotions, merit, equity): 3.9%; 3.7% faculty, 4% staff. Average staff merit was 2.9%; average faculty merit was 2.9%. Average staff equity increase was 4.4%; average faculty equity increase was 6.9%. Average staff promotion increase was 8.39%; average faculty promotion increase 9.05%. Deans and above, average increase was 4%. (The complete breakdown is found on the attachment).
2. Heads up: Fair Labor Act changes – we may have some staff increases (~20) as related to that in December, which is when Department of Labor requires we comply.
3. Clay Nicks: What were the total number of faculty equity increases? LJ: I don't have that; I will get that for you. Most faculty did receive increases. Zero percent increases included new hires and unique/temporary positions. This was a good year, and we need to continue on this path.
4. LJ: Announcement—Columbus State is conducting a diversity and inclusion climate survey mid-October. All students, faculty, and staff will be surveyed. Please participate, and there are prizes.

**VII. Other Business (1:22:15 time stamp)**

A. Chris Markwood

1. Information about calendar and courses/fees proposal for the summer. We are looking at proposing (to USG) lower fees in the summer. There are mandatory fees approved by the board; we are looking at setting a price point below \$1000, which would lower cost by over \$300 from \$1350.



October 03, 2016

## Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

2. In talking about potential for January term courses, January revenue would be new. Expenses associated with January term courses would be for faculty compensation. Therefore, we would look at no additional fees for January term, which would be substantial savings for students who take a course then. Therefore, for courses that would be appropriate for this term (including study abroad and others pedagogically appropriate), this fee structure would be advantageous for students. We will see their reaction. Kim Shaw: We will discuss the calendar changes proposal in November and then decide whether or not to vote to approve in December.

B. Neal Thomson: Found email from Kim Shaw on August 11, 2015 that has the document referred to as well as email from August 25, 2015 that has minutes from August Senate meeting. In section 4B, it says the votes of statutes and bylaws and vote approval results. Kim Shaw: Yes, my question was whether what we voted on included the statutes or just the bylaws and statutes. The two you sent before the vote—one was called Bylaws, and the other was called Statutes of Columbus State University. I've forwarded both of these to you and Dr. Markwood.

C. Diana Riser: Can you send out the average percentages from Human Resources? Kim Shaw: Yes, we will include that.

D. Question from the audience: When would the fees question in Summer/January be decided? Frank Hardyman: There isn't really a deadline regarding BOR/USG approval, but October 21 report includes question about how we are reducing cost for students. Clarification of original question: I work at Recreation Center, and we need to know when/how it would be implemented. FH: This wouldn't be until next academic year.

Amanda Rees: My impression was that January would just be part of the longer Spring semester. Chris Markwood: The Provost is developing, with the deans, FAQs that include those type of questions for the November meeting. Please forward those questions to the Provost's Office.

Brian Schwartz: Is the Google Documents still open? Kim Shaw: Yes, it is. You can either add it or send directly to senate leadership.

E. Ellen Martin: Have I missed any updates on SACS process? Glenn Stokes: No, I don't have any updates. Brian Schwartz: Do we know when to expect to hear? Chris Markwood: They vote in December.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35 PM