

Approved @ APRIL 1, 2019, Faculty Senate Meeting

Audio found @ <https://faculty.columbusstate.edu/senate/minutes.php>

Faculty Senate Meeting
Monday, March 4
President's Room, Lumpkin Center, 2nd Floor
3:00 - 5:00 p.m.

Members Present

COLS (9)	COA (5)	COBCS (4)	COEHP (5)	Library (2)
Samuel Abegaz (20) Rajeev Dabke (19) Ryan Lynch (21) Eliot Rendleman (21) Diana Riser (19) Alternate Senator: Eugen Ionascu	Joseph Girard (21) Natalie Higgins (20) Chris McCollough (19) James Ogburn (19) Stephanie Patterson (21)	Phillip Bryant (21) Rania Hodhod (21) Tesa Leonce (19) Laurence Marsh (19)	Sherika Derico (19) Vanessa Hicks (21) Saoussan Maarouf (21) Ellen Martin (19) Heather McKeen (21) Alternate Senator: Alicia Bryan	Paul Luft (20) Alternate Senator: Alison Cook

Ex Officio Members Present: Dr. Bordelon

Members Absent with notice: Dr. Markwood; Jennifer Newbrey (20); Rosa Williams (20); Alternate Senator: Nicholas McMillan; Andrew Puckett (19); David Owings (21)

Members Absent without notice: Richard Stephens (21); Alternate Senator: Lydia Ray

- I. Call to order 3pm
- II. President's comments and announcements - Chris Markwood absent
- III. Provost's comments and announcements – Deborah Bordelon 00:03:23: COA dean search; interviewing; will review search committee material. AVP faculty affairs and innovation, open and faculty forums still occurring. CIEO failed search; review position description and see if revision needed. Sallie McMullin introduction; greeting; invited questions. Update about request to engage in outside activity form; working on revisions of the form;
- IV. Executive Officer's comments and announcements – Chris McCollough 00:11:40
 - A. Committee Bylaws - Update and What Lies Ahead: spending month of March to review bylaws; dividing up the review labor.
 - B. Keep an eye out for April Location: planning on RiverPark, Dillingham or Frank Brown
 - C. Names and affiliation please - Adapting to Skype: Identify yourself for the benefit of the records and for the viewers in Zoom.
 - D. Presenters, come on up. Come up when you give your presentation or report.

- E. RE: Distance Engagement From Senators: Senators need to be physically present at meetings until we get policy and procedure.
- V. Approval of Faculty Senate February Meeting Minutes - Eliot Rendleman Ryan and Tesa motion 1 and motion 2; vote 19-0-2
- VI. Staff Council Report – Lashica Thomas: 00:19:30: Sent dean's request for staff nominations for council; developing staff development; reminder about USG initiative about well being; nutrition month;
- VII. Student Government Association Report – Winston Black (Christopher Oswald, VP): working on constitutional amendments for student government; educator of the year nominations; how can we help downtown; working on tornado relief; missing senators for college of the arts and grad school; election apps for student government close today, March 4.
- VIII. Standing Committee Reports*: 00:23:00
 - A. National Scholarship - Sarah Bowman & Ben Blair: written report that may not have been distributed
 - B. Admissions Policy - Laurence Marsh: nothing to report
 - C. Readmissions Appeal - Steve Graver - Written
 - D. Information Technology Advisory - Ryan Todt
 - E. Honors Education - Andrea Frazier/Natalia Temesgen: investigated through interviews of 15 students and found underrepresentation in the honors college; cost is a problem; concern the members are too homogenous; Ogburn asked about how many students were interviewed; Ryan Lynch asked about interviews of those in the program; Ogburn asked about student perceptions of the amount of work;
- IX. Action Item(s) for the Senate: 00:30:00
 - A. Teaching Evaluation Update - Dr. Megan Hallisey, COEHP:
 - 1. The committee likes the idea of developing a video (or powerpoint) to educate students about the importance of student evaluations; the evaluation instrument has been reviewed; Ellen Roberts brought forward the problems of not allowing a separate evaluation instrument for online learning; Ellen Martin brings up objections to the Not Applicable answer option; Ryan Lynch takes issue with #8 about advocating respect; Hallisey reminds everyone about how the document has been reviewed,

and this is the document the committee puts forth; Stephanie Patterson asked if there is a student rep to give feedback; Hallisey shared how student feedback was and was not incorporated; Rajeev Dabke asked about open ended questions; Phil Bryant, asked why we are changing the old evaluation; Lynch, celebrated what he and his constituents support,, esp. Open ended questions, asked how long they've worked on this; Ellen Martin clarified it is the scale to which she objects; Diana Riser shares a comment from Tim Howard who is joining remotely— wants to emphasize how the instrument can get information from students to improve courses; Hallisey reminded senators that faculty can create their own addition questions; Vanessa Hicks, asked how concerns were brought to the committee; Hallisey reports from faculty or students; Rania Hodhod, how is mean score value calculated with using Not Applicable; Hallisey explains Not Applicable simply does not count in calculations; Alicia Bryan, question for point of clarification: what role or part are we playing in the procedure for approval or endorsement; is the provost's office allowed to make changes or do they have to bring it back to senate; Lynch, asked provost to comment on this discussion and procedure; Bordelon, agrees with open ended questions and allows for meaningful feedback; nothing jumps out as objectionable; even if there are concerns, we can still pilot it to receive results for further revision; Lynch elaborates his concern is about how long to run the pilot; Lynch elaborates concerns about how the few words will have such a big impact; XO explains what our options are to move forward; Hallisey, recommends we pilot for one semester, shared what students think about evaluation, the importance is not being conveyed to students; Ellen Martin asked about the pilot. Megan indicated students seemed to not understand the process or use of student evaluations and I said that was different from the content of the evaluation. I did ask if there were any questions the students didn't understand. Megan said yes and I asked for an example which Megan responded the "conducive to learning" question.; Brian Schwartz, reminds us that it's up to faculty to promote and discuss importance of evaluations, and the promote with administering the evaluation; Phil Bryant, move to

thank the committee for their hard work and continue going forward with the evaluation we currently have, and Hodhod seconded the motion; Tesa Leonce, proposes a description before the evaluation or introduction; 1-20-1. Larry Dooley isn't this a motion from the committee? Lynch, no; Friendly amendment proposed by Lynch to change advocate to promotes; Ellen Martin moved to remove Not applicable. Vote to change advocate to promote 15- 3- 3; 4-14-5 move fails to remove Not Applicable. Vote to support video, 15-0-2. Motions to recommending adoption of proposed evaluations with amendment, 17-4-2. Passes.

2. Request for clarification of usage of evaluation from provost; practices is inconsistent across colleges; Lynch celebrates committees request for how evals are used; Provost supports the idea of using evals as one element of overall teaching and not the sole metric; Ellen Martin, the problem isn't with the promotion and tenure document as written (meaning University), the problem is in the Standards of Excellence; Ellen Roberts asks for clarification of where the problem is, says the work needs to be done at the college and department level; Motions to call for provost's office to review standards of excellence from colleges to departments 20-0-2, motion passes.

- B. Sabbatical Policy Change - Faculty Development Committee - Roberts/Nixon 01:29:00 : explains current policy, and policy to allow non-tenured track faculty to be eligible; motion in support of item called, Lynch and Martin 20-0-1.

X. Updates and New Items for Discussion

- A. Policy RE: CougarVIEW & Online Teaching - Ellen Roberts: proposed changes in training for faculty in f2f or online instruction as they relate to CougarVIEW; highlights that f2f or online faculty are required to do specific things in CougarVIEW; feels that many of the proposed training may not need senate approval on any of the items because the items relate to BOR business continuity; requesting motion to require online faculty to take best practices in instructional media, 1 hour training; Riser asked questions of clarification for what accessibility training is (SIP, DIP), for what an "experienced" instructor is (Roberts, self-identify); Luft from library, questions practice of self-identification of accessibility training, Rajeev Dabke, asked about GradeBook requirements;

Higgins, Marsh motions for the training, 15-0-3. Knotts, explains developments in more online faculty development for online teaching;

B. Meet our AVP for Enrollment Management - Sallie McMullin (Completed during Provost's comments.)

XI. 01:55:00 Provost: Green Zone training; Please attend. Ogburn asked for

A. Motion to adjourn.

*Senate Committees are asked to present a report on a schedule each month. Unless noted as a presentation to Senate, each chair has submitted a report for advanced review, and will be in attendance for questions from the Senate and others in attendance. All reports and materials will be submitted 3 business days prior to meeting to allow for substantive review.