

**Senators Present:** Paula Adams, Becky Becker, Josh Eyler, Rita Jones, Pat Hogan, Mike McFalls, Brenda May Ito, Jacqueline Radebaugh, Neal Rogers, Dan Ross, Kimberly Shaw, Melody Shumaker, Gary Sprayberry, Glenn Stokes, John Studstill, Paul Vaillancourt, Dan VanKley, Troy Vidal, Jeff Zuiderveen

**Guests Present:** Nicole DeVries, Clay Nicks, John Lester, Laurie Jones, Maggie Miller, Iris Saltiel, Dee Spivey, Kayron Laska, Tom Hackett

1. Report from Provost Hackett:

President Mescon is at a Capital Planning Meeting, and unable to attend.

We have 6 students and 2 faculty members in Tokyo, awaiting flights home. We had a flight for them on Monday, got our folks a flight out, but then they could not get to the airport. They are about 125 miles from the nuclear reactor, which is experiencing a lot of problems. We have been working again to get them another flight. Neil McCrillis (International House) has successfully booked flights for them for Wednesday. Neil and his staff have been in communication with their families as well.

Question – I know one of the professors was going to stay longer. Answer –All of them are coming home on Wednesday. Neil McCrillis and American Airlines have worked hard to get them home.

I want to express my personal appreciation for making the faculty vote about the promotion and tenure policy happen last month. I'm an advocate for faculty governance issues, and for that many faculty to show up and participate in the process on a Friday afternoon was wonderful.

A couple of issues need to be addressed now that P&T policies have been approved. Work on updating the faculty handbook is now in progress, and we hope to have that to the Senate next month for approval. Two other issues that we need to take a look at – one has to do with bylaws, the other has to do with statutes. We would like to have a broad-based group look at them, and do basic housekeeping tasks (like remove references to quarters instead of semesters). Faculty governance changes need to be codified as we change them, as well as making sure they are in accordance with BOR policy. Question: Can we put all of this together for this term?

Response: We will have to roll into next fall. It would be efficient to have just one vote to approve changes to other documents. Comment: On handbook revisions, AAUP will go through handbooks during this process. Response: We hadn't talked about it, but we certainly can take a look at doing that. I don't know how long that would take.

I will relinquish the rest of my time to Nicole DeVries, who made a quick plug for course evaluations (to occur next month April 18 – May 2). There will be a campaign, including table tents in the cafeteria. When you log in at computer labs, the backsplash on computers will remind students to log in to student evaluations and do this. We need faculty support to make this happen. This is the system we have, and last time we had a 10% improvement (up to 32%) in response rates.

2. Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer

I am still collecting money for the Servant Leadership service activity. I am prepared to collect this.

3. Old Business

- a. Confidence vote link on Senate home page – Glenn Stokes

It has been requested that we discuss whether the link to the confidence vote last year should be taken down. Does anyone want to make a motion?

Comment: I'd like to see the vote re-done. Response: That is a separate issue.

Comment: Does it mean anything or not? Do we care?

Comment: One of the disturbing things – the USG Chancellor came and talked to the faculty. He committed to send information, like improvement plans – and never did so. We're about to change administrations in Atlanta – but there's an issue of non-reponsiveness from Atlanta. We need clarity from Atlanta, on what this means to them. Response: Former President Portch did meet with the President's Cabinet for a few days over the summer.

Comment: Is posting this a way to hold Atlanta hostage? Cause I think they don't care. We need to be thinking about local issues. We need to think in terms of what is good for us here, in terms of local dynamics and whether it serves any local function. I agree – having it posted for a year – anyone who cares, knows. Some changes have been made that I think are very positive, and I don't see any useful purpose in keeping it.

Senator Jones moves and Senator VanKley seconds, that we take down the link on the main faculty senate page.

Comment: Can we link to this if we take the notice down?

Comment: Maybe it is getting a little old. But we need to keep it on the stove. Is there a way to do that?

Comment: It has its own listing in the minutes archive.

Comment: Reasoning to do this is that when people go to the Senate web page, it may be interpreted as a negative. Are having the results of a year old vote posted doing anything for us? It might be doing things against us.

Comment: It could be alerting people who are currently hiring these individuals.

Comment: If you Google Inessa Levi's name, you quickly get the *Ledger* story on the no confidence vote.

Motion passes unanimously.

b. Issues for consideration by the senate in a new governance structure Dan VanKley  
One of the issues raised in the forums: What issues would go in front of Faculty Senate? So the committee chose to ask the Faculty Senate.

Comment: Anything to do with academics and academic freedom. Faculty personnel issues. In the proposed structure, there would be a University Senate, with Faculty Senate, Staff Senate and Student Government reporting to it. There will be overlap – that's the point of the council. But if there is something only involving faculty, perhaps it only goes to Faculty Senate.

Comment: I understand the need to create broad general categories to send to the Faculty Senate. Academics, programs, ... Mull it over, and if you come up with other ideas, send it directly to Dan VanKley.

c. Formation of a Student Evaluation Senate Committee – Glenn Stokes

At one of the previous meetings, we voted to going back to doing paper evaluations. In the new Promotion & Tenure policy, student evaluations play a prominent role. We should have an official committee to do the initial form, perhaps periodically review the official document/policy. We need to vote to form a committee, then charge Senator Studstill (chair, committee on committees)

with creating the committee. Senator Zuiderveen so moved, and Senator Hogan seconded. Motion passes unanimously.

Senator Studstill: I usually send out email for volunteers to participate on committee – and note that it does not have to be senators. Members of this committee do not have to be tenured, but should be full time faculty. How many? Suggested two per college, plus Basic Studies and Library (1 each). Should staff council have a member? The Manager of Academic Data (Nicole DeVries) will be Ex Officio, as will the Director of the Center for Quality Teaching and Learning (Iris Saltiel).

d. Administration Evaluation Task Force report – Dan VanKley

We have a couple things, with a **handout, to be attached below**. We want to make some changes to the survey instrument, which was distributed via email. We want the Senate to approve it. On the back side, it summarizes the changes. The biggest change is to change from a 4 point Likert scale to a 5 point scale. It has been reworded for consistency check, so that you can't just award 1 or 5 for everything. Other changes were wanted, in terms of procedures. We don't feel good about reporting results to supervisors, and to faculty, if only 1 or 2 responses – wanted a 45% reporting threshold.

Question: What's the threshold for reporting student evaluations? Isn't that 30%? Shouldn't they be treated like we are? 45% is kind of high.

Response: Request for senate approval, but if the Senate wants to change this, the Senate can move to change it. 45% was sent out based on numbers from Dept of Psychology. It seemed strange to report responses if only 2 members of 5 respond. Senator Zuiderveen moved, and Senator Adams seconded to change threshold to 30%, and to approve the rest of the changes proposed. Motion passes.

4. New Business

a. Open Records Law and Faculty Files – Laurie Jones

A student made an Open Records request for all faculty evaluations in one academic department recently. The faculty were surprised to learn this, and to learn that such requests were permissible. (**handout – scan posted separately**). Dee Spivey is the Open Records Officer. We make sure we absolutely have to comply when requests are submitted. This law exists, and is a good law, but it has some unintended consequences. Yes, personnel records *are* subject to this, as are student and performance evaluations. However, they will be redacted so that personal information is not distributed. In almost 14 years, CSU has seen 2 such requests. We did not have to release the records in those two cases. In the recent case, we have made the first pass at deflecting the request. We do what we can to legally avoid releasing the records. Question: If someone requested information about someone else, would that person be notified? Response: It is not required, but we would do so. If there is an ongoing investigation, no, but for an ongoing disciplinary action we probably would. Question: What about after an investigation is dismissed? Response: That would be subject to Open Records, but not necessarily kept in a personnel file. We have separate file for dismissed cases and one would have to ask for that file. If inappropriate conduct found, it might be in personnel file. Question: Can they make a broad request – any file with professor x? Response: They can but we charge them for this (over a certain amount). Question: On that list of things exempted – lists confidential evaluations – can you give an example? Response: I don't think this would apply to us – maybe state agency head.

When we hire faculty members, I would imagine recommendation letters would be confidential. (would have to explore that). If there is any doubt, we raise the question. Comment: I guess when reading this on the paranoid side of life... if a faculty says as part of their PDP that they want to improve teaching techniques in a certain course. What if a student flunks, and requests this file – could a student use the PDP against the faculty member? Response: Well, nobody asks because they are happy about something – but it's a huge stretch to think they'd be successful.

Question: Is it published when it is on the web? Response: The general rule is that when exchanged between two public entities, it is public and published. Open records include emails.

Ms. Jones: The reality is that it doesn't happen often, and they are asking for so much stuff we can reasonably charge them, and then they get more reasonable. The question was, should we tell new faculty members about this? Should we educate current faculty about this? During hiring, or orientation? There are pros and cons to both. It's good to know this exists. It is shared during orientation at HR. That does accomplish what we want – education that you don't send emails you don't want the whole world to see. But it could be seen as negative if shared during hiring. This kind of Open Records law is not uncommon – but stressing it to someone just out of grad school might have a dampening effect. She recommended the low key approach.

- b. Report on University Advancement financials – Kayron Laska (distributed several handouts – scanned and posted separately)

First, I want to say how grateful I am for what you do and who you are. Every year, I have the honor of introducing the National Teacher of the Year to the Rotary Club. It is a great opportunity for those people to meet a great teacher. Next to being a good parent, being a good teacher is probably the most important job in the world, so thank you.

Green document handout. This is the CSU foundation balance sheet. We have 4 foundations: CSU Foundation; Foundation Properties, which owns titles; Athletic Fund and the Alumni Association. When people talk about our total assets of \$57,000,000, look in the second column from the right. It sounds like a lot of money. But if you look at the unrestricted funds, you see the \$669,000 that we have for Foundation operations. Unrestricted reserve is where we put money raised this year, and then next year we transfer that to unrestricted operating funds. Last year we went to hard budgeting. Prior to that, we spent what we *thought* we would raise. Temporarily Restricted holds a lot of things – restricted in how we can spend them. Sometimes we put funds in there that have not reached endowment size. Next is endowment - \$33,000,000. That was probably less than \$27,000,000 a year ago, but there are new additions, plus market increases. Capital campaign is mostly pledges – not yet received. Most of that is in planned gifts, so we don't know when we will get that. Faculty, endowed chairs, scholarships are where we get most support, and we have a set spending rate based on previous year's market results. In fall (November) of every year, we look back at previous June 30<sup>th</sup>, and see overall endowment return rate. Average should be 4%, but recently it has been 3%. Before that, we had been down 10%, but still allocated 3% for programs. You can't recruit if you say "now it's gone". In academic circles, if you spend 4% a year, good and bad years, it balances out.

Question: What is the cycle over? Response: We never stop. Question: When is the deadline?

Response: Anytime. We have a goal – and we never get there early. The percentage of faculty giving is a little below last year. Question: This is just a sidebar question. If there is a faculty member that just doesn't give, can someone do so on their behalf? Response: Not a problem from our point of view, but that person might object. BOR has managed to keep the legislature from

being too intrusive into donor records. Question: Is there a term limit on endowed chairs? They are in perpetuity -the endowment is. To the purpose of that chair, which could be moved to another dept, if academically appropriate, unless the university quit teaching that discipline. We would need permission from donor or the courts to change it otherwise. Big places don't like to give to endowments any longer – they lose control of the money, and have to trust university to be a good steward.

Next page is the University Foundation operating budget. It does not include endowed funds. Last year we probably allocated \$1.2 million from endowments. A third to faculty, to programs, to students. Doesn't include restricted giving. A lot of annual scholarship money is here that we have to raise every year not included here. You can see that it has gone down. We take a 1% charge from endowments, etc. Cost sharing is a small charge. This year we pulled \$43,000 out of reserve, and the budget is still lower than previous year. This lowered program support. Academic support is also down, although it had been up from previous year.

University support is down – inauguration paid for in last year's budget. Development support is down. For most other schools in Georgia, fundraising expenses paid by state budget. That is not true here – foundation budget pays them. If the state paid for it, there would be less money for you to do what you do. But we'd like for all of the \$ we raise to go to the donor's cause. Several salaries moved to Foundation lines recently. Accounting staff has always been there. In each of these areas – more detail can be provided if requested.

We can also talk about benchmarking. You might like to know how we stack up with other schools in GA. This data comes from the VSE report (voluntary support of education). Deadline to turn in data for this is December, and we get the report in March – so we don't have March '10 numbers (national report). Until recently, many GA schools didn't do this. For a 3 year average, CSU raised more than most other state, regional Georgia schools and MCG, but not more than UGa, Georgia Tech, GSU. This is a testament to the community, the university, and to faculty support. If you are in a capital campaign, you will have years that spike, but can be misleading. A three year average is a more useful comparator. Endowment market value is below Ga Southern, and endowment per FTE is third among our group.

Our fundraising is efficient and effective, but we always looking for ways to improve. Stewardship, including reporting back to donors about how their money is used, is important. We have students write to thank donors for their scholarships, for example.

Last, a report from this morning's cabinet meeting. The goal for the annual fund this year is \$2,000,050. We are a little behind last year, but we have always exceeded our goal. Total gifts this year are \$2,000,009. We have had two half million dollar gifts in the current capital campaign – both scholarship endowments, from people we didn't know about before. We encourage people to leave something in their will or to create a trust. A good many of your operations have what we call constituent development officers, who also do other things. We meet with those folks, train them on our software, and so on. We have re-established a planned giving council. And we have a new wealth search engine that will help us focus better. I hope you will consider coming for president's recognition banquet. The art walk coming up on 3/24, at the end of CSU day at Ilges Gallery (work by Bo Bartlett).

We get gifts of \$25, \$50, \$100 from small businesses, that feel some connection to CSU. We have a whole lot of volunteers, who are willing to take their time to go out and ask for these donations. This gives us very broad support.

c. Undergraduate Research and Experiential Learning Comm. report – Shamim Khan  
Distribute **handouts – scanned and posted separately.**

This committee formed Fall 2009. Purpose is not listed on Senate Committee page. Due to the way it was formed, two weeks before the deadline for the first round of grants. Committee has administered these grants since then, which involves a bit more than just giving out money.

- Determined grant criteria.
- Support research and scholarly activities by undergraduates under supervision of faculty mentor, limit to \$300/student/semester. Students can team up if they choose.
- Inform campus community about latest rounds, publicize in email and CougarNet. Usually have 2 weeks to submit applications, then evaluate using established rubric.
- Also set out conditions in award letters. (books remain property of dept, not std); students present work at Tower Day, and prepare a final report.
- Receive and archive reports.

Currently have 13 members, evenly distributed by college, and we meet about twice/semester. So far, funds awarded in 2009-2010 \$17462. The budget this year is \$18719. We are having a second round now, since there are funds left.

The deadline for 2<sup>nd</sup> round is this Friday.

We would like to mention that we do occasionally receive applications from grad students. Now they are trying to fund some of these as well – considering broadening the scope to support all student research.

Question: When you say archive – can we view them? Response: They are archived in a filing cabinet, and on hard disk on Dr. Khan's computer. It would be good to publish them... at least hard copy of abstracts.

Question: Can these funds carry over from year to year? Response: No, they have to be expended in the current fiscal year. Comment: There is a list of awardees on Provost web site. It has names, amounts, but not abstracts. Comment: This is being worked on in conjunction with Momentum. Comment: – all students should be included in competition. Since a goal is to increase graduate enrollments, this would support that.

Question: I do wonder – do you get requests from Public Relations office? This is significant, might support Ms. Laska's efforts.

Response: There is a workshop this Friday, organized by USG – a number of us are going to present what we are doing in promoting undergraduate research.

Comment: Work of Cindy Henning and Kim Shaw on Momentum, the undergraduate research journal that is being founded this semester and run by students, and on abstract book.

Comment: These efforts are incredibly modest. Dr. Khan gets 41 applications, puts in a lot of work. We are being spotlighted by USG for our work with undergraduate research, and will be developing a podcast. This is mentioned on the Academic Affairs webpage, sent to John Lester this AM. USG will send out podcast of workshop.

Adjourned 4:37pm

**Columbus State University Faculty Senate Administrator Evaluation**

Please respond to the below statements by marking a number from 1 to 5 indicating how the strength of your agreement or disagreement, 1 being strongly agree and 5 being strongly disagree, with the statement.

**Communications-- This administrator:**

1. Shares information in an open manner

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	D

2. Listens actively; seeking information from students

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	D

3. Listens actively; seeking information from faculty

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	D

4. Listens actively; seeking information from staff

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	D

5. Has difficulty communicating effectively

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	D

6. Regularly discusses with unit personnel and shares minutes and announcements of meetings in a timely fashion

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
1	2	3	4	5	D

**Professional Behavior-- This administrator:**

7. Is current and active in teaching and research

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------



8. Always conducts him/herself in an ethical manner fully compliant with the BOR Ethics Policies

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

9. Treats faculty with respect and courtesy

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

10. Treats staff with respect and courtesy

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

11. Treats students with respect and courtesy

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

12. Supports development of quality teaching, research

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

13. Supports MY development as a faculty member

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

**Decision making/problem solving—This administrator**

14. Applies all policies consistently, fairly, and in compliance with institutional regulations

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

15. Puts forth effort to solicit faculty input for decisions and in communicating the basis for decisions which are made.

Strongly Agree	Agree	No Opinion	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Don't Know
----------------	-------	------------	----------	-------------------	------------

Agree 1	2	3	4	Disagree 5	D
------------	---	---	---	---------------	---

16. Utilizes collaborative decision making whenever possible.

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
------------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------

17. Frequently makes decisions in a unilateral fashion

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
------------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------

**Interpersonal Skills—This administrator:**

18. Promotes scholarship in the university, his/her college, or department

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
------------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------

19. Has difficulty handling conflict effectively

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
------------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------

20. Receptive to ideas of others and gives credit for their contributions

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
------------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------

**Planning and Vision—This administrator:**

21. Is an open, effective, financial manager who uses funds appropriately

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
------------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	---------------------------	-----------------

22. Uses resources to foster creative inquiry and student engagement

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

23. Balances distribution of resources in alignment with strategic plan and strategic goals

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

24. Remains current, is consistently forward looking and creative in approaching present and future academic and economic demands

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

25. Identifies forces in the environment that will affect the academic unit and acts to safeguard and improve the unit

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

26. Communicates long-term vision for department/school/college with those involved and initiates actions to reach those goals

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

**Overall Evaluation**

27. This university/college/department administrator has my confidence in his/her leadership.

Strongly Agree 1	Agree 2	No Opinion 3	Disagree 4	Strongly Disagree 5	Don't Know D
---------------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	------------------------	-----------------

**Any written comments?**