

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Members Present: Tina Butcher, Alison Cook, Rajeev Dabke, Michael Dentzau, Sherika Derico, Katey Hughes, Michelle Jones, Krystal Kennel, Tesa Leonce, Chris Markwood, Ellen Martin, Chris McCollough, Clay Nicks, Yesem Peker, Carolina Pelaez-Morales, Andrew Puckett, Amanda Rees, Diana Riser, Brian Schwartz, Kim Shaw, Richard Stephens, Neal Thomson, Alan Tidwell

Guests Present: Richard Baxter, Mark Flynn, Deidre Greer, Linda Hadley, Frank Hardymon, Tim Howard, Laurie Jones, John Lester, John McElveen, Ellen Roberts, Dennis Rome, Gina Sheeks, Uma Sridharan, Glenn Stokes, Lashica Thomas, Amy Thornton, Brian Tyo, Margie Yates

- I. Call to order at 3:00 PM
- II. President's comments and announcements – Chris Markwood
 - a. Georgia legislative session has come to an end.
 - i. Created/approved budget. Both LeNoir and Library projects passed and are awaiting Governor's signing.
 - ii. Two percent merit pool approved (pending System approval)
 - iii. Title IX bill did not make it out of committee, but it will likely come back next year.
 - iv. Campus Carry bill passed and is now being sent to Governor. Some exceptions are included, especially including when minors are present.
 - b. Budget hearing was held over spring break with USG. They were very interested/complimentary in student success rate, which is reflective of faculty/staff actions. They are receptive to partial health fee increase.
 - i. Course fees: They are not receptive to course fees. They said that CSU has more course fees than any other university. They mocked certain fees, such as the "jogging fee." Their view is that we should be reallocating resources as needed. They were most skeptical over fees in PE, Business, English, Geography. CSU made a plea to give them one more look in light of what we give our students.
 - ii. Diana Riser: Do you know if their focus is on the amount of the fee or its existence? Chris Markwood: I think it's the existence of these fees. Example: Business fees that are used to buy software may be available with a textbook purchase. Example: Writing Center and how the fees are used to support students.
 - iii. Tuition: Discussion that the BOR will consider a small increase in tuition (probably no more than 2%). If granted, that will give us some flexibility in funding items that were lost, as well as items like salary equity survey.
 - iv. Handout: Federal Higher Education Update (attached)
 - v. Enrollment for the System update (emailed to faculty). We were one of the institutions that lost enrollment. We need to do everything we can to find the students that will be a good fit for the CSU community. We will be rewarded this upcoming budget due to the cycling effect. However, we will be hit during the

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

next round. We have hired a consultant to look at enrollment management, and we are looking at a long-term solution.

1. Alan Tidwell: During previous visit from (former) Vice Chancellor Hughston, I brought up how the most growth is coming from Atlanta. Atlanta institutions are benefitting from the growth in Atlanta. Trying to communicate that to USG is difficult. Chris Markwood: I think they realize that, but Georgia Southwestern, for example, did grow. Brian Schwartz: How much are we down? Chris Markwood: 1%. Some institutions are talking about capping enrollment. If that happens, we might benefit. We are looking at putting some resources into growth. Gain new students, help students progress, things that raise money to help support the first two.
- vi. Efficiency study from Chancellor's office: The Chancellor's office was receptive to Dr. Markwood's suggestions about using in-house expertise to conduct this study. They may want faculty on that committee.
- vii. Parking: With the expectations of increasing campus security, our plan is to rollout a decal requirement for parking. \$45 students, \$90 faculty/staff, \$180 reserved parking space (i.e. president's parking spot). Goal is to provide all full-time faculty with \$45 increase in salary with the goal of easing the cost. This increase is independent of merit/salary increase. There is some free parking downtown, including RiverCenter deck and street parking. This change will allow us to hire several additional security and law enforcement officers. We will separate parking from policing.
 1. Ellen Martin: Has there been thought to prorating parking fee for staff members below a certain salary? Chris Markwood: That was the thought behind giving the \$45 pay increase. Neal Thomson: The tax consequences mean that I don't get that amount of relief. I would rather the parking fee be lowered by \$45. Chris Markwood: We will look into that. Question: What about adjunct faculty? Chris Markwood: There will be semester passes for adjunct faculty (no cost). Neal Thomson: Is the \$180 fee for reserved spots just for those that already have them? Chris Markwood: That is the current plan, but we will reevaluate in the future. Diana Riser: I'm not sure many staff will be able to afford the fee based on their income. Chris Markwood: We did look to find the lowest rate we could charge. Amanda Rees: I'm assuming you will be reaching out to the surrounding neighborhoods? Chris Markwood: Yes, that is a good idea. Rajeeve Dabke: So this will take place in Fall? Chris Markwood: July 1 (beginning of fiscal year). Linda Hadley: Is the decal for one car only? Chris Markwood: We are looking at a hanging decal. The office will be housed in Logistics under Steve Morse. Neal Thomson: Will that

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

change anything with the parking deck? Chris Markwood: No, because that is a separate student fee.

2. Diversity Forum was an amazing and inspiring conference and dinner.

III. Provost's comments and announcements (12:57 time stamp) – Tina Butcher

- a. Two students received honorable mention in the Barry Goldwater scholarship.
- b. Association for Southeastern Biologists meeting had a number of recognitions for CSU. Wanted to congratulate those faculty and students.
- c. Curriculum changes: New transfer students with fewer than 30 hours who have completed a first-year experience at former institution can use that to satisfy CSU's first-year experience program. LEAD 1705 (Servant Leadership) can also be used to satisfy that requirement. Melody Shumaker is the point of contact for first-year and learning support requirements.
- d. Academic advising assignments are difficult to manage. We have the technological capability to improve this, so we will begin talking to department chairs about this process. Work with UITS, ACE, and Institutional Research and Effectiveness to develop a better automated advisor assignment process. Wayne van Ellis is working on coding in Banner that will help us to better identify some of our students (i.e. students in online). Students will still be able to be assigned manually if needed.
- e. April 14th (Friday): Scholastic Honors Convocation. Legacy Hall 2 PM. Kristen Hansen is point of contact.
- f. May 2nd: Strategic planning and faculty/staff awards (9:30 AM – early afternoon)
- g. If scheduled to teach graduate-level class in summer or fall, you need to submit your materials soon (if you need to be approved or renewed.) The link will be sent by the Provost's Office.
- h. Attachment has dates for Summer/Fall ROAR.

IV. Executive Officer's comments and announcements (23:05 time stamp)

- a. Reminder: This is second to last Faculty Senate meeting of this academic year. The final one is May 1st. Last meeting will include officer elections, given that Colleges will have already elected new senators.

V. Standing Committees (24:05 time stamp)

- a. Information Technology Utilization – Marguerite Yates
 - i. Thanks to UITS for amazing job moving part of COEHP downtown. Technology worked in offices and classrooms.
 - ii. Thanks to members on the committee, including representatives from across campus.
 - iii. Met once in the fall and will have met two times this semester.
 - iv. Purchased 30 licenses for Zoom for classroom/conference usage. Process is underway for checking out these rooms.
 - v. Mobile app strategy: what kind of mobile app would be beneficial for CSU? Jennifer Pitts and Casey Hergett are heading up subcommittee.

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

- vi. Emergency Management audit was conducted. We will be using an off-site place at Georgia College (where D2L is housed).
 - vii. Progress on Banner workflow admission
 - viii. How are we reducing student costs? We are using iClickers and Turning Point. Can we make it less expensive? No recommendations from committee at this point. A survey will be going out to faculty.
 - ix. UITS has free computer repairs on personal devices. Microsoft Office 365 can be downloaded free. Over 30 software titles can be downloaded at campus locations.
- b. Teaching and Learning Enhancement – Amanda Rees
- i. Two types of grants
 - 1. Interdisciplinary Grant: \$14,422 over 11 departments/4 colleges
 - 2. Teaching and Learning Grants: Travel to conferences awarded \$11,043: 9 faculty across 7 programs and 3 colleges.

VI. New Business

- a. Promotion & Tenure policy (for discussion only, vote at a later meeting) – Ellen Roberts (31:20 time stamp)
 - i. Document was distributed to faculty (see attachment), and forums were held.
 - ii. Committee revised and improved document along the way. We may not have agreed, but we had good consensus. Changes are in red. We are here to address changes/concerns. I believe this is a big improvement, but this is not a perfect document, nor is it set in stone.
 - iii. Questions/Comments?
 - 1. Brian Schwartz: What is the process for this going forward? Ellen Roberts: Bringing it to the Faculty Senate for a recommendation. If sent forward, it will be sent to President Markwood. I think the next step will depend on what comes out of this meeting. I would like to take this to faculty vote before the term ends. Discussion on whether or not Faculty Senate would vote on changes today. Brian Schwartz (BS): I object to the procedure for voting. An affirmative vote requires the majority of those present rather than those voting. I think that is unfair; an abstention counts essentially as a No vote. Ellen Roberts (ER): There has been extensive discussion on this, and I think the majority agree with what is written. In part, this is to encourage faculty not to abstain. BS: There are still instances where abstaining is the correct choice. That problem should not reflect negatively on the candidate. ER: The onus for presenting documentation that says the faculty member merits tenure promotion is there. There should not be an “I don’t know” vote. BS: The candidate is not there to make sure the committee members review their material. Maybe the committee member realizes when reviewing material that there is a conflict. Issues have come up during committees where I have had to abstain, and it’s not a reflection

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

of the candidate. ER: If a faculty member realizes that there is a conflict of interest, then that faculty member should recuse him/herself. Diana Riser: It's not always possible, based on number of tenured faculty members, to recuse. Neal Thomson: The downside is that there could be a situation with 1-0-4. BS: You could make a recommendation that majority for or against is required; otherwise, the committee would state that they could not make a recommendation. The other solution is to just send the vote and not make a recommendation either way. For example, we do that in Senate—we look at the majority of those voting, not the number here. For Post Tenure Review, you're voting on unsatisfactory or satisfactory, not a recommendation. Neal Thomson: You can still go up a second time. BS: The second time you are in or out. ER: Keep in mind that this is a recommendation from committee, including vote, recommendation, and strengths/weaknesses. BS: The recommendation should have a lot of weight. If it doesn't, then we shouldn't have these committees. Tim Howard: I personally felt like the examples given for abstentions were failures in the system in other ways. Therefore, I would rather see it address the system. Faculty get the first voice because they are closest to the work of the faculty. To not take a position is to defer to administrators who are further removed. I couldn't find an example of a committee member who needed to abstain. BS: I and others gave you examples. Tim Howard: If the process is not working, then you should contact the dean, etc. BS: In the heat of the moment, I did not know what to do in a situation, so I abstained. If forced, I would have voted for the candidate. Tesa Leonce: I'm just concerned about giving the option to abstain. If there are criteria set, then I would be concerned that faculty on the committee who are appointed think that they do not have that information. I need clarification on scenarios where a committee member would need to abstain. ER: We cannot give specifics, but maybe we need to train the chairs of these committees better. In those situations, we need to stop the committee proceedings, consult with appropriate administrator, and then resume later. Diana Riser: In effect, it is a No vote. Discussion (Neal Thomson, Brian Schwartz, Ellen Roberts) on Yes/No/Abstention counts and effects. Ellen Roberts: Are there other things that others want to ask?

2. Neal Thomson: Post Tenure Review policy: page 6—sounds like PTR will be used when making program changes. The purpose of PTR is to make sure the faculty member is still maintaining teaching, professional development, service, not to make changes based on program changes. ER: The idea that PDP should be flexible, based on program changes.

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

Discussion on the statement. ER: You're right—the reference to the PDP was lost, so we should strike that statement as written.

3. Clay Nicks (CN): Page 10, unusual circumstances. Can you tell us about creating a special process for those with 50% or more administrative load?
ER: I think the concern is that sometimes you have a chair who has had to give an unfavorable position, and those are the people who end up reviewing you and you go forward. It's usually at the level of the Provost that is aware. Chris Markwood: Going up for Full Professor, I was the Dean of a College that didn't house my discipline. Therefore, the Provost had to establish a process for that situation. CN: Should we establish that process at the administrator level? CM: The intent was that if there were exceptions, it would be established ahead of time in writing. I'm okay with going ahead with something more prescriptive. CN: If they're going up for a faculty promotion, then faculty should have a role in that. Discussion (Tim Howard, Ellen Martin, Ellen Roberts, Neal Thomson, Brian Tyo) on going up for promotion in an academic discipline.
4. Diana Riser: What about a step where the appropriate parties would vote in favor of the alternative plan? Ellen Roberts: Who would be the parties? Diana Riser: The faculty in that area and others as demanded. Ellen Roberts: The difficulty is that there are some people who are excluded for a reason; the administrators (but not the faculty) know about the situation. Brian Tyo: What about if you skip obvious steps where you single people out? The committee can still speak as a committee, with individuals removing themselves as necessary. Amanda Rees: One of the challenges when faculty step in and out of departmental leadership roles—it's really good to know what will happen when you go into a leadership role. These documents also think forward so people can think about whether the change in responsibility is a good idea and to know the implications.
5. Linda Hadley: I would ask the committee to take the route of the last T&P Committee. Under the best of circumstances, you would have tenured, full professors in these positions. If you have faculty administrators, have them go through the regular process, and then deans/provost/president use their discretion to evaluate the promotion and tenure (i.e. in cases where faculty members are trying to get even). That is a better option than going through a completely separate process. As a dean, I could go against the faculty vote with justification. Brian Tyo: During each step, the faculty member has an opportunity for rebuttal. ER: The applicant has an opportunity to include a letter for the next level of review. Do you like that idea better? Amanda Rees: The only challenge is that at the college T&P/PTR committee, sometimes it is difficult to see a different decision the

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

next level(s) up, and that can be confusing when our decisions are overturned. It does make someone second guess what is going on. Linda Hadley: I would go to that faculty committee meeting and communicate why I am going against the committee recommendation. Brian Tyo: I think that is also an AAUP stance. Discussion (Neal Thomson, Amanda Rees, Ellen Roberts) on process. Tim Howard: I'd like to believe that our decision makers will appreciate concerns generated with certain recommendations before they are made. There may be certain circumstances where administrators will know about confidential information that cannot be conveyed to the committee.

6. Discussion on the discussion and vote readiness (Brian Schwartz, Kim Shaw, Neal Thomson, Ellen Roberts). Will return next month. Neal Thomson: Not having an alternative pathway would be more legally defensible. ER: Except that we also have a statement that administrators proceed without bias. Kim Shaw: If you know of other issues, please send them to me before next meeting.

7. **Motion (Ellen Martin): Strike paragraph about administrator alternative process from Promotion and Tenure Policy.
Second (Neal Thomson)
Motion passes 15-0-1**

- b. Replacement for ADP – Laurie Jones (76:00 time stamp)
 - i. Moving Human Resource management information systems from ADP to PeopleSoft June 18 (biweekly employees) and July 1 (monthly employees). We will be sending out more information and overview (April 5th 11 AM and April 7th 2 PM in CCT). There are no Java issues, so those of you that approve time—will be much easier. Reviewing your pay, sick leave, and benefit deductions will be much easier. We will have paperless vacation and sick leave reporting each month. Amanda Rees: If folks are looking to move their pay from 10 month to 12 month, when is that deadline? Laurie Jones: I think the earliest availability will be Fall 2018. System is strongly considering 9 month faculty being paid over 12 months, an option faculty could choose at the beginning of the academic year. There are pros and cons. We will give you scenarios and examples. Linda Hadley: Are we going to bimonthly payment for everyone? Laurie Jones: My understanding is that it is tabled until the completion of the PeopleSoft implementation.
- c. Course fees – Frank Hardyman (82:50 time stamp)
 - i. We put a lot of time and effort to the presentation to the BOR, including a detailed spreadsheet. A year ago we had 135 fees that were denied. We resubmitted 54 fees for consideration this year. Before that March 24th meeting, Terry Moshier and I had a relatively short (~30 min) phone call with two representatives from the USG Budget Office and asked for a follow-up phone call (which was not granted.) The

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

context of that phone call continued to be “Is there any other way to fund these activities?” rather than on individual course fees. USG gave us more background on the Business and Policy manual, specifically on elective fees and a pathway to approval. We spent a lot of time on justification, yet the feedback is that the pathway to approval is not likely. They are focused on reducing costs to students. In answer to questioning, they responded that they would look at each fee. He requested a separate discussion about the fees, which was not granted.

- ii. Amanda Rees: When will they get back to you? Frank Hardymon: Next meeting is April 18th and 19th; last year we heard verbally a day before that meeting.
- iii. Frank Hardymon: The 1.2-1.5 million fees that were approved last year: they are still on the table for reapproval. Now that those have been approved, we are on the radar. We will get audited on these fees to make sure we are using those fees to support the labs. Chris Markwood: I have asked Frank’s office to do an internal audit of all fee money. Those guidelines will be extremely strict, and we need to verify that these fees are used for the appropriate intent.
- iv. Brian Tyo asked about process BOR created and differences in fee distribution differences across different departments and within a single department. Chris Markwood: There is still a judgment decision on the part of USG to make sure the fees are being used for their intent. Discussion (Chris Markwood and Brian Tyo) on differences within departments. FH: They sent us a spreadsheet with what was approved last year. They grouped them according to area and then asked us to ungroup them, which is why they will be evaluating/auditing course by course.

VII. Old Business

- a. Workload Policy – revisions – (for discussion only, vote at a later meeting) (94:00 time stamp) Tina Butcher, Glenn Stokes, Academic Deans
 - i. Current draft attached
 - ii. Kim Shaw sent input from last meeting as well as review through Dean’s Council and conversation with Dr. Markwood. Primary changes (refer to attachment)
 - 1. Introductory paragraph (preamble) created, including real-world problem solving inclusion that includes close supervision by faculty members.
 - 2. Standard teaching workload for full-time regular faculty members: added tenure or tenure-track language; removed sentence (“for departments that use contact hours instead of credit hours”)
 - 3. General statement on teaching activities replaced outdated, previous list. There will be a level of workload policy that will live at the college level. If there are lab/studio courses, they will be addressed at the college (rather than campus) level and specifics included in college policies.
 - 4. Workload credit for administrative duties is dependent upon complexity, duties, number of students, etc. (edits made to that statement).
 - iii. Questions/comments/concerns

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

1. Amanda Rees: In preamble, research is listed third. Is there a reason for that? It might be read in order of importance. Glenn Stokes: It was not listed in any particular order. Amanda Rees: Are we going to find a discrepancy between colleges in regards to labs? Also, some institutions weight graduate courses differently. To me, that seems to be an institutional issue rather than a college issue. Tina Butcher: Differences between colleges will exist due to differences in disciplines; the purpose is to try to get the equity piece in here. We had decided to leave the graduate piece out, but I am open to discussing it further. Glenn Stokes: At the institution level, it would be difficult to say that graduate courses across the university would be more work than undergraduate level courses. This first year will contain adjustment as needed. Amanda Rees: My understanding is that the graduate-level courses demand more time. Brian Tyo: AAUP talks about how you shouldn't assume one level is more demanding than another. Amanda Rees: There is also that expectation that you will be publishing two times in five years to maintain teaching of graduate courses. I think these standards should reflect that. Chris Markwood: I don't think anyone is disagreeing with that, but the intention that those would be addressed at the college level. Diana Riser: Isn't that included in the second paragraph which gives leeway to that type of course?
2. Linda Hadley: This was never intended to be a new policy; it is restatement/clarification of what already exists. We realize that the teaching loads are all over the place across the university, and we realize that the teaching policy was not clearly stated in any one place. There was never an intent to develop a new policy or develop a document that would address every issue. It was developed as an umbrella to then give different departments and colleges the leeway for flexibility in developing policies. There are certainly differences in disciplines. Last time, we got bogged down with lab sciences. It seems to me that is more of a curriculum issue. We have to face the fact that the issue is more of a financial issue. If we have courses with six contact hours, yet the student is only getting one credit hour for the lab, that maybe we need to revisit the curriculum so that we can get paid for those hours and perhaps get additional faculty in order to support those courses. This policy was never intended to give answers to all these questions, but rather to give the deans the flexibility to address the issues for the various disciplines in the colleges.
3. Tesa Leonce: Is this policy an addendum to the Faculty Handbook? Linda Hadley: It is a statement of the faculty workload policy as it exists. It is based on how BOR policy applies to CSU.

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

4. Is there an allowance for class size differences? (question from audience member) Yes, that is allowed at the college level.
5. Dennis Rome: COLS does not have a college-level workload policy, and we will get into the weeds this summer.
6. Tina Butcher: This quickly becomes complicated as you consider differences in courses. Amanda Rees: It also has implications for us. If there will be change, how will this affect how we work with students?
7. Dennis Rome: I think the major change is documenting what you do (accountability). I think evaluations will therefore be more meaningful. It will take into account time to completion. I think this is a wonderful opportunity to see what we are doing and how it affects our students.
8. Ellen Martin: Statement on overload pay ineligibility for faculty with other assigned duties. Are there exceptions to that? Tina Butcher: Yes, we are aware that the statement may need to be tweaked. Linda Hadley: Under certain circumstances (i.e. someone gets hit by a bus), that could be worked out. Chris Markwood: Here's what policy-maker sees: Does the overload affect the production of research (or other reassignment)? Richard Baxter: Does it meet the student needs and how can we be more fiscally responsible? Glenn Stokes: If someone steps in due to an emergency, that is a different situation that would not be standard overload. Linda Hadley: If there is a difference between normal loads (3:3 vs. 4:4), then should overload pay be allowed for 3:3? It implies that you don't need that workload release to begin with.
9. Chris McCollough: What we're talking about is future efficiency/accountability studies. Life sucks; get a helmet, essentially. They will hold us accountable, so we might as well own it. Amanda Rees: It's not as if we don't already do this work, and I think it's legitimate to say what are the implications for faculty? I'm trying to understand whether we can do the work we do in this new surrounding. Richard Baxter: The faculty in the COA prepared the policy; I had nothing to do with it except to include that if you got a different workload from someone else, it had to get prior approval from the dean. That was the only change I included. I am very proud of this draft. I found that when we increased the cap from 23 to 28 per section while other programs were reducing caps in the core and giving 3:3 teaching loads. Amanda Rees: Is your policy accessible to other faculty members? Richard Baxter: Yes, it's online, and I'm very proud of it.
10. Neal Thomson: Shouldn't there be a statement that using overloads is not a persistent solution to a problem? Tina Butcher: I am not opposed to a statement like that. Glenn Stokes: University System policy has very specific language related to overloads. Discussion on next steps to vote on

April 03, 2017

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

whether to endorse the document. Tina Butcher: Can you send us the list of senators to include in email? Kim Shaw: Yes, I will send you the list. Glenn Stokes: If approved, this can be added to the Faculty Handbook without a vote of the entire faculty. Discussion on the importance of discussing this document at the college level. Dennis Rome: April 21 is the next college-level meeting. Kim Shaw: May 1 is the next senate meeting and May 2 is the next university faculty meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 PM