

Faculty Senate Minutes Schuster 130

Members Present: Becky Becker, Phil Bryant, Dana Eckart, Tim Howard, Katey Hughes, Mariko Izumi, Patrick Jackson, Michelle Jones, Allison Sperry (alternate for Linda Jones), Troy Keller (alternate for Clint Barineau), Krystal Kennel, Dell Miller, Amanda Rees, Dan Ross, Brian Schwartz, Kimberly Shaw, Nehal Shukla, Joy Thomas, Alan Tidwell, Brian Tyo, Kevin Whalen

Guests Present: Tom Hackett, Amy Thornton, John Finley, Chris Markwood, John Lester, Gina Sheeks, John McElveen, Kim McElveen, Ellen Roberts, Wayne Van Ellis, Tara Underwood, Eric Pittman, Byron Pitts, Kelly Wilson, Fonda Carter, Stuart Rayfield, Dennis Rome, Linda Hadley, Abraham George, Shamim Khan, Mary Covington, Barbara Hunt

I. Call to order at 3:01pm

II. President's comments and announcements

(recording begins partway through these remarks)

He began with sad news: one of our students was tragically shot on Sunday evening in Phenix City. Please keep her family in your prayers.

President Markwood is continuing campus visits to continue to meet with and speak to both faculty and staff. He estimates that he is 90% done with initial staff meetings, and 50% done with faculty departments.

We are beginning the budgeting process for the coming year. We are not being asked to plan for a cut this year, which is good news. But we have do challenges to address, such as budget holes to fill. The University System of Georgia is cutting down on use of fees for certain items. We can't use them for faculty positions, for example. The second challenge is that some grants and grant funding are coming to an end which also was supplementing salaries for faculty. As policy, units are asked to look at whether salaries, or salary increases, on grants is wise. The third challenge is that new Federal rules are coming for exempt employees (which means certain individuals who are not covered by comp time/overtime rules. The salary value that triggers these rules is currently in the mid \$20k range, but could move as high as the mid \$50k range. This would have significant fiscal impact.) President Markwood has asked Tom Helton to begin the budget planning process with those constraints in mind. Improvements in enrollment, RPG will help with these challenges.

President Markwood will be at BOR meeting in Atlanta Tuesday, then Peachbelt meeting, then alumni reception. A new Post from the President's Ipad will be released in the next day or so, and he announced his first Open Office Hours with the President on 9/22 from 1:30 – 3:30pm. Remember, however, that this is not an opportunity to ask for resources, as those should go through normal chains of leadership.

III. Provost's comments and announcements *(recorder timestamp 04 minutes 27 seconds)*

We received some really good news from John Lester just a little while ago. At the BOR meeting tomorrow (9/15), approval for 2 of CSU's capital requests is on the agenda (\$2M for science lab building, \$5.9M for Schwob Learning Commons project).

The Provost also mentioned the wonderful work being publicized at the Faculty Forums being hosted at the Library: outstanding instructional things going on. Troy Keller (Senate

alternate) recognized for his work, as he took students to D.C. to present their work on using algae to treat wastewater. This is not just learning in the classroom, but applying their work.

Dr. Hackett has also had good discussions with Susan Hrach about ideas the Faculty Center is exploring: for example, revising Faculty Planning Week. We are considering doing some activities that focus on Teaching and Learning – may test things out in January. These would focus on how to do things in classrooms that immerse students in their learning. An article will be shared, by an economics professor: *7 principles to make economics accessible to students*.

The Provost was also asked to introduce the new registrar: Wayne Van Ellis. One of the hiring goals in this process was to hire a registrar with a command of administrative software, to make sense of all the reports we can create. We want to have data from entry to registrar to Institutional Research – related to students – that the academic side of the house can then use to help students. Van Ellis was a consultant in Long Beach, CA, fixing enrollment divisions that had problems. Has a strong and varied resume. We hope to have a game plan on October 1st to fix our issues.

IV. Executive Officer's comments and announcements (*recorder timestamp 12:30*)

- a. AAUP Meeting- October 10th at GSU
 - i. Theme- Shared Governance
 - ii. Larry Gerber- Auburn U. (Emeritus)

V. Standing Committees Report

- a. Distance Learning- Jennifer Pitts (*recorder timestamp 13:45*)

Handout provided with the minutes.

There were many initiatives introduced by the committee last year, but much of the work is funneled through COOL. Briefly: Faculty Senate approved a phaseout of the online tuition differential last year, which started Spring 2016. This is in its 2nd iteration now (max \$1000/course, \$2000 per semester). The phaseout continues through 2018. The committee proposed redirecting those funds to course development and training, increased instructional design work, and enhanced faculty development. Grants to support these were initiated in Spring 2016. The committee awarded 7, and 5 were completed (new course development or revision) based on QM standards. The fall announcement for a second round just went out, primarily for improvement grants.

QM wants to review mature courses (taught at least twice). Almost at 100% certification for QM by faculty. We continue to have a QM stipend and reimbursement of expenses for basic QM training, and for peer reviewer training, and for master reviewers, all funded by Provosts' office. COOL has also hired a new instructional designer, done online exam proctoring, offered webcasts and other courses.

Currently the committee is creating a strategic plan, and looking at student supports, particularly as we examine fully online programs. They are looking at support for enrollment, and accessibility for online students. They will continue with these grants. COOL has also undergone a bit of a facelift: the conference room now has furniture, and the office will soon have more tech for faculty to use.

There is interest in developing an intellectual property policy for these

online course materials.

Question: Please elaborate more on Proctoring. Response: We have a ProctorU partnership with Turner Center. Julia Burnett is the point of contact, and

coordinates for COOL. Question: Any added fees that students pay? Response: Not to us, but they may have to pay site fee. \$30 for Turner Center, or \$19.95 for Proctor U, for example. There are locations (such as some public libraries) that proctor for free.

There is a template – on web – which conveys this proctoring information for use in a syllabus. COOL can also have Julia email your students directly, with your permission. But it has to be listed in Banner if you are going to have fees.

Question: Has all the money been redirected to this project from the instructor stipend phaseout? Response: All of it, plus anything we can get from the Provost's office. We promised an audit trail for this last year, so the funds should have its' own budget line.

This year's grant is fairly robust for courses nearing QM certification, and reimbursement is \$750.

Comment: I thought we discussed reducing student fees. Response: that's a whole different matter. Only the part of those fees directed to faculty initially are now being redirected.

Question: Do we have a policy that if we teach a 100% online class that we are required to use a Proctor service? Response: Not required at this time. COOL is putting out literature about alternative assessments better suited for online environment.

Grants are for hybrid and 100% online – due Tuesday 9/15.

- b. Academic Advising- Fonda Carter (recorder timestamp 20:40)

This committee meets as needed, and is tasked with identifying issues related to academic advising. They have received many complaints recently about how advisors are assigned. They are also trying to take back to colleges how important that advising is, encourage all advisors to go to advising training sessions for periodic retraining and refresh of knowledge. They are supporting professional development related to advising (but with no budget). Some departments do their own advising, some use the advising centers. They are developing an academic handbook online.

Comment – can't always find that handbook.

- c. Faculty Development- Mariko Izumi (recorder timestamp 33:00)

Presented powerpoint. Highlights include:

Last year the committee had a \$52,418 budget, but \$146k requested in faculty grants. 25 proposals were funded.

This year, the committee has a \$45,000 budget for faculty grants. The deadline this semester to apply is Friday. Can apply in Fall, or in Spring.

- d. Student Course Evaluation- Greg Blalock (recorder timestamp 36:25)

The committee deals with maintaining/updating the student course evaluation process. Ten members, at least one from each college. They will meet in the next month – please encourage committee members to show up, as they will look at gross level results, and also look at ways to improve overall use and utility. Faculty are encouraged to promote their use, and use them as formative

pieces of information to improve student learning.

Question: Can we have students complete evaluations on their phones? Response: They should be able to do so now.

Question: The current system has 10 basic questions. Can we add additional questions? For hybrid/online classes, is the committee looking to see whether these questions are the most appropriate? Response: Perhaps a different set of questions for online; perhaps revising by college as well? Committee meetings are open to all, and all are encouraged to attend in order to have input in this process.

Question: Are aggregate numbers ever published? Response: I don't know, but I don't know why not.

e. Sustainability- Byron Harris (recorder timestamp 41:50)

In 2008, CSU received a grant to do some initiatives. We did lighting upgrades, added 2 solar panels, and LED lighting outside. We can track all utility costs, and examine high costs in order to lower them. We have been using electrical carts instead of gas; there are 3 charging stations around campus (parking deck, University Hall, Cunningham Center). The Zipcar program to rent cars costs students \$8/hr. The custodial staff is now using "green chemicals". CSU Shuttle busses carried over 10,000 students in the first week, an increase over last fall's first week. We are trying now to get students engaged, especially with recycling and grant writing. From Oct 2014 to now, 15 tons of cardboard were baled and recycled; 10 tons, paper, plastic and aluminum were recycled; 1500 pounds of batteries were recycled. The Staff Council has recycled over 2500 toner cartridges, which funds their book scholarship program. CSU replaced windows in Lenoir and Jordan in order to improve efficiency. The committee met last week, and discussed trees around campus. There will be an inventory, and assessment of tree health. They are also in the process of putting these accomplishments on the sustainability website.

Question: Where are batteries collected? Response: Custodians will collect boxes and bring them in.

Question: For new construction, are we looking into LEED or other certifications?

Response: LEED was decertified in Georgia this year. We are not required to do so, and it costs more to do so. Question: But wouldn't it cost less in the long run?

Response: Most studies suggest that it does save in the long run. The extra expense is 5% on average (for silver, gold, platinum). Comment: Some students came, asked questions about recycling in our building: are there materials, a map for where recycling can occur? Response: Recycling bins are \$2300 each, but always glad to collect recycling, even without a bin.

Question: Now that Columbus is not recycling glass, is there a plan for CSU to continue to do so in other ways? Response: We need another vendor to take glass, since Pratt recycling does not take glass any longer.

VI. Old Business

a. Gina Sheeks- After-Action Parking Report (recorder timestamp 51:30)

In Feb/March, there was established a campus transition task force to include construction, parking, etc. That group is still very active. Shuttle rides are up, police were directing traffic the first week. There was a huge communication

campaign. Staff and administration tents staffed “ask me” tents as well. Now looking forward to next fall. We need additional signage to have folks turn into main entrance instead of other entry points on campus. They may identify a couple lots for first year students, since so many students do work, and put up signs that can guide them there. They will identify a few areas that need paving for sidewalks. They want to continue the synergy of this task force, but also look at class schedules as fall to make comprehensive schedules for students.

On August 14, prepared peak traffic time data (handout) – identified 2 peak times. More opportunities on MWF to find parking.

The committee would appreciate further feedback.

Comment: Suggested tiered parking fees, or perhaps mobile apps to cut down on traffic (as folks circle the parking lots for “good” spots). Response: There will be some exploration of this as we go forward. However, apps work based on human interaction, and would need to have someone identify spots as they open. We are probably the last institution to charge for parking in USG. Consulting group (Lanier Parking solutions) had recommendations along these lines. Comment: It seems like there’s always spots at the soccer field. Has there been discussion about shuttles from that lot every 10 minutes? Response: Buses circle campus every 20 minutes, but most students would rather walk than ride the shuttle.

Soccer field is not a scheduled stop, currently, but they loop through that lot and stop on demand. Question: Any serious consideration for charging for parking?

Response: This was part of consultant’s report, but not on the table at present.

Question: Why did we go back to parking stickers, instead of hang tags (one per family)? Response: I don’t know, but will find out further information.

For students, stickers have colors to indicate commuters or on-campus housing.

- b. *Eric Pittman- Arnold Hall Renovation* (recorder timestamp 1hr 5:15)

Handout distributed

We have completed Howard Hall. We are now getting the feedback loop online, and have gotten good feedback so far.

On the Arnold Hall Renovations, we are waiting for 2 review processes – Historic Preservation in Atlanta, then Facilities Office at BOR. 95% done. After those approvals, we will send out construction solicitation process. We are looking for synergy with Howard renovations. Arnold has multiple entry points. Worked well for its’ original purpose, but we need to repurpose it now.

Everything except lecture hall will be gutted. Columns are structural, and must stay in place. The lecture hall will become handicap accessible and fitted with new technology. The building will now have an interior stair, opening up a thoroughfare. There will be three dedicated classrooms, & the Writing center will be relocated here. The MSLC will move there as well, next to Writing Center.

Once funding for library is approved, we will have learning commons at library with tutoring centers.

Upstairs Arnold is a honeycomb of offices. English prefers open, flowing access, where Psychology prefers students check in with an administrator and be scheduled. The floor design will reflect this. It will use a clerestory window, raise roof to allow exterior light in stairwell. Elevator is deliberately slow, and we want to encourage walking – elevator should be for accessibility and for heavy things.

Not changing much of the façade, except to infill glass where doors were. The tile in better shape than Howard was.

Dr Rome comments: It seems contradictory to student centeredness to have students go through an administrator to have access to faculty. Students can easily be intimidated out of going to a faculty member's office. Response: Design is not finalized, but it is close. Comment: Is there any effort to improve energy efficiency? It is the current intent to replace windows. We are gutting the concrete block building (has some insulation already), and upgrade HVAC. It is not feasible to do LEED certification (cost wise) on a \$4.95M total renovation, but can meet Peach Point standards – required to do so by meeting certain standards, using local vendors.

The design also includes huddle rooms, which are small rooms – intended for 2-4 people as a small study space for students. You can meet with students in small groups here as well. They can be scheduled by students or by faculty. (experimental)

VII. New Business

- a. Alternate Senator Protocol - Brian Tyo (recorder timestamp 1 hr 24 minutes)
Handout distributed.

The proposed edits inserted old verbiage from the previous rules on how many senators are elected, and inserted wording delineating alternate senator duties and election protocols.

Question: Does this eliminate ambiguity? Response: Yes, that is the intent. It is the responsibility of the absent senator to contact the alternate.

Question: Should larger colleges have more than one alternate? Should we be able to elect replacements for longer term, planned absences? For longer term unplanned replacements? Perhaps “at least one alternate” and wording about interim replacements?

Response: We will work on this, bring it back next month.

- b. Absentee voting system - Brian Tyo (recorder timestamp 1 hr 30 min)

- i. UITS- Abraham George & Mary Covington – have asked UITS to present info in terms of technological alternatives. Powerpoint presented.

There are two options we initially shared: using SmartSheet (survey and project management) and Qualtrics. Other concerns were privacy and security. Derek Olsen developed sample survey tool, demonstrated in meeting. It has both desktop and mobile versions within Qualtrics. Each person gets unique URL, so no ballot box stuffing. Result report does not provide anything but tabulated results. Only the survey administrator can look at how individuals voted. But any technology based system would permit this. Qualtrics will set up a panel, using identifiers by email address. Posting a link at a designated website negates ability to limit number of votes.

Question: When used for camp, we had a survey within a survey – that way, could check for single use, aid with anonymity. Each person gets an IP address trail so that there is always identity information that is

collectible. Response: IT administrators have a duty to protect that information. Could the admin for the system be the overall administrator for UITS?

Question: Would we do all voting this way, or also in person voting in tandem? If both, we need to identify who voted on paper and who voted electronically. Perhaps paper ballot available only upon request?

Response: We could purge email list after sending the ballot out, which would lose ability to resend ballots, but makes it more anonymous. Voting on paper still requires a level of trust.

This is similar to what we ask of students with online course evaluations. It must be approved by over 50% of senate. We should talk to our colleagues outside the senate, get feedback, and then discuss at next meeting.

c. USGFC Representative - Brian Tyo (recorder timestamp 1 hr 46 min)

i. Meeting Location: Armstrong State University

The Executive Officer of Faculty Senate has been default member of this group, which means much institutional memory gets lost from year to year. There are a variety of systems for sending representatives: several universities send several representatives, but are allowed only one vote. There are a variety of things going on at this level – might be wise to consider having someone take on a 2-3 year appointment instead of one year. Brian Schwartz was elected secretary to this body, and has been attending. It is important to have a strong group. Our only input is often through that body.

Another possibility: select a member for a 2 year stint, and have a third year be “ex-officio”. President of AAUP attends as well – they would welcome observers, participation. Question: Does it need to be an existing senator? Response: it should be someone tightly connected to Senate, and committed to attending those Senate meetings. It was suggested to have an elected person with a three year term, have an “alternate” person that also attends. Or some overlap in turnover.

Question: For this year, should we have Executive Officer of Senate and a second person?

Comment: Nominate Brian Schwartz. However, as secretary, his participation is somewhat limited. He declined.

Next meeting is end of October, but next Senate meeting is before then. Will bring mechanism to vote on to that meeting.

ii. USGFC Meeting Date/Time: October 31, 9:30AM-5PM (Tentative)

Senate meeting adjourned at 5:01 pm.