

Call to order 3:03 PM

Senators Present

Greg Blalock, Roger Brown, Radhouane Chouchane, Tammy Condrey, Burhanettin Keskin, Tom Ganzevoort, Pat Hogan, Brenda May Ito, Ellen Martin, Joe McCallus, Mike McFalls, Gisung Moon, Jim Owen, Elizabeth Parker, Jackie Radebaugh, Brian Schwartz, Melody Shumaker, Glenn Stokes, John Studstill, Troy Vidal, Jeff Zuiderveen

Guests Attending Included

Tina Butcher, Kyle Christensen, Abraham George, Laurie Jones, Nick Norwood, Iris Saltiel, Wayne Slabon, Marty Westrick

Executive Officer Stokes: I would like to add something to the agenda. We need to choose someone for the Business Intelligence Steering Committee. Senator Hogan has agreed to serve, however, he is already serving for the College of Business and Computer Science.

Report from the President and Provost

Executive Officer Stokes: The President is in Atlanta and Provost Hackett is not on campus for he is not feeling well. We will skip this report for this month.

Announcements from the Senate Executive Officer

Executive Officer Stoke: The first Monday in March is during Spring Break. Therefore, our meeting is on the second Monday in March. However, the Executive Committee will meet during its normal time on February 27th to discuss the agenda.

Provost Search Update

Senator Brown: All four candidates for the Provost position have been on campus and the search committee is meeting on Wednesday, February 8th to deliberate. It is then meeting on Thursday, February 9th with President Mescon. Please remember to record your thoughts and put them in the boxes to add your input about the selection process before the committee's deliberations.

Senator Studstill: Where are the boxes located?

Senator Brown: There is a box in each of the Dean's Offices and in both libraries.

Old Business

Administrative Rights for Faculty Computers

Executive Officer Stokes: As you know, until recently, only faculty with special needs could get administrative rights to their computers. However, now you can get administrative rights on your computer if you put in an eQuest requesting them.

Senator Studstill: Is this permission to install software for one time only or can I install software on my computer indefinitely?

Executive Officer Stokes: You can install software as long as you have the license rights to do so. UITS has a system in place to log installations on computers to see what you did in the interim to fix any problems

Abraham George: We would like the faculty to submit an eQuest in order to receive administrative rights. We have an inventory monitor system and any non-university license software will show up on its audit.

Senator Studstill: So it may be better for UITS to install my software?

Abraham George: No, if you have licensed software to install, you can do it.

Senator Studstill: I am afraid that I may mess something up if I tried to install software.

Abraham George: We would be happy to do that for you.

Executive Officer Stokes: I will send an e-mail to the faculty about this as a notification.

Presentation of Share Governance Plan, First Beta Edition

Executive Officer Stokes: Dr. Van Kley is not present. We will table this for now.

Consideration of the Chimeric Handbook

Handout

Nick Norwood: The present version is composed of the 1958 original, plus, known errors and editions made since then. The Handbook Task Force met on Friday. Greg Domin is the Chair and because the person who was asked to author it, declined, we went to Plan B. I will be the writer of the new edition. We talked about the timeline. We are going to research and then I will write it over the summer and then we will go from there. We will be tossing the current handbook aside and starting from there.

The “Frankenstein Monster” (current handbook) will serve until we get the new one. Three new additions have been added recently. These are the Promotion and Tenure guidelines, information about grants and new material about the graduate school added to the graduate school bylaws. All of the notes compiled during the last few years are in this document. We are leaving these in to see the progress.

Senator Owen: If we made a motion to approve the Chimeric Handbook, can we put a deadline on when it will be finished?

Nick Norwood: The current handbook will be in effect until the new handbook is ready.

Senator Owen: So moved.

Senator Hogan: Second.

Executive Officer Stokes: This will provide us with a good interim handbook.

Senator McFalls: Should we just have a deadline for when the new handbook is finished?

Senator Schwartz: This may leave us without a handbook.

Senator Brown: Do we have the option to make temporary changes to the current handbook just in case we find a problem?

Nick Norwood: Yes.

Senator Owen: We would have to send it to through the normal process with a Senate vote.

Senator McFalls: If you have an expiration date, you have to review it, regardless. The new handbook may not be approved by the entire faculty as a whole.

Nick Norwood: There is already an advisory committee that can review the handbook if the date passes.

Jeff Zuiderveen: I do not like this idea. If we find a change to make, we should make the change. It is a living document until we come up with a new document to replace it.

Executive Officer Stokes: To make changes to the handbook, you have to bring it to the advisory committee and then to the Senate for a vote.

Senator Schwartz: Are any of the changes incorporated that involve the bylaws?

Nick Norwood: There are no new changes to the bylaws.

A vote was called on the motion to keep the present handbook until the new one is written and approved. The motion passed.

Update on Teaching Evaluations and Current Faculty Assessment Processes

Kyle Christensen: This is just a quick update. We finished scanning the evaluations. We need to process them. The ScanTron machine creates an output file that we need to make look like what you are used to seeing from Digital Measures. We only have one scanner so it took a bit

longer than anticipated. The documents will come to you in an Excel file and the comments will come in a JPEG image. We should be able to process the next evaluations on the fly in the future. We want to make sure that your data is quality and we want to make sure that we are not losing documents.

Senator Studstill: This is not meant to be a criticism. When we were turning in the forms, I saw that there were many ScanTron documents lying on the floor with no one in the office. I asked your assistants to lock the door. Please watch the security in the future.

Kyle Christensen: The evaluations should usually be dropped off at the Dean's office and put in a locked box. We will work on this in the future.

Senator Zuiderveen: Senator Studstill, why were you carrying your own evaluations over? That is the concern that I have. This should not be happening.

Senator Studstill: I walked over with the student to make sure that she went where she should go.

Klye Christensen: We are working on uniformity and security.

Senator Zuiderveen: Who said that we wanted them electronically returned to us?

Kyle Christensen: We always were told that they should be returned using the Digital Measures format. We could give physical copies back to the committee.

Senator Zuiderveen: Electronic copies make them open access with the sunshine laws.

Executive Officer Stokes: This is the same as if they were in paper copies. Print copies are just not easy to find.

Kyle Christensen: We will be getting rid of Digital Measures eventually and this would make the evaluations easy to keep up with and collect.

Senator Owen: Some people are against the wall right now. Can we streamline the process to get their evaluations to them now?

Kyle Christensen: This is not hard. I have had chairs contact me to see when they are coming. We are working very hard to get them out ASAP. We have them sorted by CRN.

New Business

Quality Matters Presentation

Abraham George: Before I introduce Dr. Wayne Slabon to the podium, I would like to explain to you what we have been doing. UITS has been working with Academic Affairs and the Distance Learning Committee to conduct several different workshops about leading-edge

technology. We have also introduced the Distance Learning Liaison Program which consists of twenty-one faculty members from all over campus to bridge connections to UITS and to improve communication with the colleges. During the last few cycles of the Distance Learning grant, we have been able to begin to implement the Five Phase Approach to Quality Distance Learning Programs. We did two Quality Matters workshops before Christmas. Thirty-one faculty members attended. We have shared the idea of expanding the Quality Matters program campus-wide. We would like to speak to you now.

PowerPoint Presentation

Wayne Slabon: This afternoon, I would like to brainstorm with you about how to improve Distance Learning classes at CSU using the Quality Matters rubric. I would like to get your input and figure out what we can do to improve.

It is important to remember that Quality Matters is a process and not a rubric. You can go through Quality Matters formally using the QM training series. You can do it informally using Master Reviewers on campus or from off campus. We recommend the informal process.

This is an interactive process. This means that it is an ongoing process of revision. The Quality Matters rubric will serve on the front end for course design and on the back end for quality improvement.

We have already utilized Quality Matters during this year's Distance Learning Grant Cycle, and thirty-one faculty members have already gone through the workshops.

Executive Officer Stokes: Dr. Slabon made this presentation to the Academic Council. He asked for an endorsement to continue working on this to tighten it up.

Senator Vidal: Was this not put in place before we started? Do we have the time to do the revisions now to all of our online courses?

Senator Owen: The Quality Matters rubric was part of the first grant cycles. The ground work is already there.

Wayne Slabon: Yes. However, the first efforts did not fully meet all of the Quality Matters requirements. Serving on a peer-review team is going to give the reviewer a new set of eyes on her/his own courses.

Senator McCallus: Just to clarify: Every time you introduce a new course, it will be reviewed?

Wayne Slabon: Every time you teach a course, it will be reviewed. On the back end, all courses will go through a formal review process.

Senator Schwartz: I am concerned that this would put a new burden on the instructors. You are saying that this is extra work for this extra pay, but they are already doing this. You say that this is a service expectation. But many of the instructors are part-time and not tied to service.

Senator Martin: Not all of the courses that are online go through the Quality Matters process. You do not need to go through the grant process to get the online course incentive.

Wayne Slabon: We recommend that the faculty forfeit the funds if they do not go through the process.

Senator McFalls: A Master Reviewer is expected to work ninety hours. Is this expected for one year? This is a lot for service.

Wayne Slabon: No. The Master Reviewer is expected to work ninety hours per semester. 50% of our courses may not go through the process during the first time. The Master Reviewer is on the hook during this time. Perhaps this person needs extra compensation?

Executive Officer Stokes: From where would these funds come to pay for this?

Wayne Slabon: This should be deferred to the Provost's Office. We have a few ideas and some people have made some suggestions. If we could entertain going forward, how can we improve?

Senator Zuiderveen: How does Quality Matters define rigor?

Wayne Slabon: In terms of the rubric standards.

Senator Zuiderveen: There are 41 standards and a mission pages worth.

Wayne Slabon: The rubric can come across as being overly nit-picky based on a few things. But for everyone who has gone through the training, they come out with a very different understanding and the requirements are easier to digest.

Senator Condrey: In the training costs, what is involved? Isn't your department doing the training? Why are there separate costs?

Wayne Slabon: The introductory course can be taught internally after an institution has met the criteria. There are online Quality Matters courses offered only online and there is always a cost. A master reviewer must go through special training, as well.

Senator Brown: Is the new system more secure to prevent cheating?

Marty Westrick: This is not applicable for Quality Matters. Security concerns must meet FERPA requirements, for example.

Senator Studstill: Do we have insight into what SACS might do in consideration of the online programs that we have?

Tina Butcher: We have new guidelines related to authentication. When we deal with program quality, they expect us to deal with face-to-face courses, online, student learning outcomes, etc....

Senator Studstill: Is there a list of criteria for online classes? What you say is so general.

Tina Butcher: I will pull it up soon.

Executive Officer Stokes: You said that there are so many unique courses, classes, etc. Will the evaluation be for each instructor? Is it by faculty member delivering a course?

Wayne Slabon: The evaluation will be by section.

Executive Officer Stokes: I will recommend that we pass this on to the Distance Learning Committee to endorse this or not and report out next time.

SACS Update

Tina Butcher: CSU's five-year review is due on March 26th.

There is a Distance and Correspondence Statement for SACS and a best practice document for online courses. Please go to www.sacscoc.org and search for "distance education policy."

SACS wants us to apply the same rigor to our online courses as we do with our face-to-face courses.

Another thing to do with Distance Learning is that if you use any identity service like Proctor-U, you will need to communicate that before the student is enrolled so that the student knows that there are extra costs.

Senator Studstill: Is there any evidence that SACS will look badly at us paying by the head for courses?

Tina Butcher: Not that I know of.

I want to give you an overview of our SACS 5th year review. We are at sacs.columbusstate.edu. Please go there for the latest and greatest.

The SACS report is related to the federal government--the Department of Education. When you see Congress talking to for-profits, it is related to us. As an accrediting agency, the government wants to incorporate the same type of rubric for all. One of the things that happened is that the Department of Education said that ten years is too long an interval for review. SACS therefore instituted a five-year check-point as a mini-review.

To access our site, you will need a username and password. Please contact me for this. It is behind a firewall because there are vitas embedded in the information.

We are working with an editor/consultant who is helping us. The final report is due on March 26th. It will then be reviewed by the review team. Our standing will be determined and then we will get our response.

Human Resources Issues

Update on Faculty Contract Questions

Laurie Jones: I have done research on the faculty contracts and found that it is not unusual for the contracts to go from when faculty come back in August to when they leave before the end of May. This should help new faculty with benefits. I am ready to go.

Senator Schwartz: I move to change the dates in the faculty contract from 8/8 to graduation or to the date when grades are due in May.

Senator Hogan: I have a comment. Returning on 8/8 is for the rest of us, but the new faculty members need to be here on Monday.

Executive Officer Stokes: It is normal for new faculty to come in before the contract begins.

Senator Owen: I second the motion.

Motion passed.

Delay in Application of TIAA-CREF Contributions

Laurie Jones: There was a delay in the January submission for the month of December. So the question is: how are the funds distributed? There are two answers for we are in the process of implementing an automated system. This will be implemented in March. Right now, it is a paper process. We hope that in March things will speed up for us. January was an exception. Normally, funds are submitted before the end of the month. But in January, there was a delay.

Senator McFalls: When the system is automated, will the distribution be on the day that the funds are submitted?

Laurie Jones: We now have to allow for the post office, etc. With the automated process, funds should be distributed on the last day of the month or the next day after that.

Ethics Recertification

Laurie Jones: I was asked to talk about the short turn-around for the ethics recertification. This is a product of the feedback from new employees. A lot of people have already finished with it. The drop-dead date is no later than 2/10, but we will extend this. It is not as hard of a deadline as we say. We want it completed by 2/20. We can work on the last stragglers after that. When the BOR comes to us, we want to say that we did it.

Senator Zuiderveen: Can you get fired if you do not do this training?

Laurie Jones: We do not want anyone to get fired for not doing this. We are being flexible so that everyone can get the training done. You do not have to do the refresher training. You just have to do the quiz and certification.

Senator Studstill: How do you know if you have done it?

Laurie Jones: The system will tell you.

Iris Saltiel: I did the quiz, but I never got the recertification.

Laurie Jones: Yes, you need to do both to get the credit.

Holiday Schedule

Laurie Jones: The original schedule had us closing on the 17th (Monday) and had us opening on January 2nd. We are floating the idea to change the schedule to require only five days off like we did in 2011. We could close on the 18th to do this.

Senator Owen: The final grades are due on the 14th. There are some gap times.

Salary Study Update

Laurie Jones: Phillip Blount finished the faculty portion of the study, but he needs to go back to fix a few things. His associates should have this fixed in the next week or two and then we will meet with the Salary Study Committee to figure out what we should do with this information. They are working on the staff study now and will be finished in March, probably.

Executive Officer Stokes: The Budget Advisory Committee met ten days ago and one of the discussions was about meeting with the Provost in early March to convince him to ask for more money than what we are getting from the state. We need to include money to begin addressing what the salary study tells us. The next meeting is on February 24th.

Senator McFalls: Will this salary study be made public?

Laurie Jones: We can make the results public.

Business Intelligence Committee

Executive Officer Stokes: We need to nominate someone for the Business Intelligence Committee. For information about the committee, please see Sri's presentation during the January 2012 meeting. The committee member will serve one year.

Senator Schwartz: I nominate myself.

Senator Hogan: Second

Motion passed.

Grievance Committee

Senator Shumaker: This is a reminder that we need nominations for the Grievance Committee. This committee serves the Faculty as a whole. Please send your nominations to the Committee on Committees by February 17th.

Meeting adjourned at 4:42